

NEWS IN BRIEF

AAUP PANEL ON COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

The local chapter of the American Association of University Professors will hold a panel discussion Monday, December 6, at 3 p.m. in Room 213 Law School on "Collective Bargaining on the Campus."

Professor Julius Wishner will moderate. James O. Freedman, president of the local chapter, said guest panelists will represent both state and private institutions which have collective bargaining contracts.

HAROLD MANLEY AT A-3 ASSEMBLY NOVEMBER 18

The A-3 Assembly will hold its fourth meeting Thursday, November 18, at 1 p.m. in Room 200 College Hall. Harold E. Manley, Vice-President for Business and Financial Affairs, will be guest speaker.

As originally conceived, the A-3 Assembly is a representation of interested A-3's hoping to provide a communications mechanism which will serve to refer, comment on, and help in areas of concern to A-3's. It does not presume to speak for or commit individual A-3's to any specific position or course of action, an A-3 Assembly spokesman said.



No
Vote
Yet . . .
See Page 8

FACULTY RATE ON HOCKEY TICKETS

Faculty season tickets for Penn home hockey games are now on sale at the Class of '23 Ice Rink. Faculty may purchase the half price season tickets for Penn's 12-game home schedule that begins on Dec. 1 with Colgate. The faculty rate for the book is \$18 with a limit of two per person.

OPEN LETTER TO WOMEN FACULTY

Mortar Board, the senior women's honor society, cordially invites all women faculty members of the University to a sherry party on Friday, November 19, at 4 p.m. in the Roof Lounge of High Rise North (3901 Locust).

'ALL MY SONS': PLAY PROMPTS DISCUSSION SERIES

Themes from Arthur Miller's *All My Sons*, the current production of the Annenberg Theatre Lab, will be the basis for a series of free campus discussions, open to the public.

Saturday, November 20, at Hill Hall (Back Upper Lounge) at 10:30 p.m., Dean George Gerbner (Communications) will moderate a discussion with Ilona Gerbner, director of "All My Sons"; Gerald O'Grady of SUNY at Buffalo, who is working on a book on Miller; and Harvey Winston (Psychology).

Sol Worth (Communications) will moderate the Monday, November 22, Communications Colloquium at the Annenberg Center Colloquium Room at 4:00 p.m. Participants will include George Gerbner, Gerald O'Grady and Van A. Harvey.

"All My Sons" will be presented at 8 p.m. on November 18, 19 and 20. For ticket information, call Ext. 6791.

(Continued on Page 8)

IN THIS ISSUE

- LETTERS: *Numerus Clausus; Peripheral Activities*
- STUDY: *Social Policies for Pollution Control*
- *Response on Equal Opportunity* • *Administrators' Response to the Proposals of March 31*
- COUNCIL: *Three Resolutions on ROTC*

Almanac

Volume 18, Number 12

November 16, 1971

Published weekly by the University of Pennsylvania

A New Penn Institution:

THE PRESIDENT'S CONFERENCE

A standing President's Conference, developed to serve as a clearinghouse for knowledge of present and proposed activities in the University, held its first meeting Monday, November 15, in the Council Room of the Furness Building.

President Meyerson said the standing body of 31 members and 13 observers is replacing the previous President's Staff Conference. "The new Conference, unlike the old one, will have representation from groups such as the University Council (both faculty and students) and the Administrative Assembly," he said.

The President's Conference will convene monthly—and more often if necessary—and a smaller group may be chosen from within the Conference to meet more frequently.

The Conference will normally be made up of:

Members

Henry J. Abraham	Chairman of the Senate
Mark W. Allam	Dean, School of Veterinary Medicine
R. Jean Brownlee	Dean, College for Women
Carl C. Chambers	Vice President for Engineering Affairs
Richard C. Clelland	Acting Vice-Provost; Acting Dean of the Wharton School
Joel Conarroe	University Ombudsman
Jean B. Crockett	Chairman-elect of the Senate
Richard De Gennaro	Director of Libraries
Robert D. Dripps	Acting Vice President for Medical Affairs
Charles E. Dwyer	Member of the University Council
Neal Gross	Dean, Graduate School of Education
John C. Hetherston	Vice President for Facilities Management & Construction
John N. Hobstetter	Associate Provost for Academic Planning
Stanley E. Johnson	Chaplain
Lawrence R. Klein	Chairman, Academic Planning Committee
Joan Manes	Graduate-professional student member of the Steering Committee
Harold E. Manley	Business and Financial Vice President
Martin Meyerson	President
Gloria K. Olmstead	Head of Grammateis
William G. Owen	Secretary
Curtis R. Reitz	Provost and Vice President
Gerald L. Robinson	Executive Director of Personnel Relations and
	Chairman of the Administrative Assembly

(Continued on Page 8)

LETTERS

NUMERUS CLAUSUS

Professor Abraham's article in the ALMANAC (November 2, 1971) is an eloquent statement of a great democratic principle. And yet, all the arguments against the concept of *numerus clausus*—discriminatory quota systems—seem only to apply to discrimination against minorities. Reverse discrimination is seen as inherently bad, and so it is, given ideal circumstances (e.g., in which all prejudice could be abolished instantly and a new world constructed without prejudice). I find myself emotionally opposed to reverse (or any other) discrimination. But I also ask myself, what proof can be offered that reverse discrimination is inherently bad, given the choice before us: to use reverse discrimination, or to prolong an inherently undemocratic status quo? A neutral alternative does not seem available. Is it really true that a *minimum* quota, seeking to achieve democratic goals, is bad in the same way that a *maximum* quota obviously is?

Perhaps the alternative of "goals and timetables" is the best we can do. Still, I ask myself if it isn't true that the underlying reasons for an absolute stand against reverse discrimination have more to do with quest for "quality," the best candidates for jobs, than with the great democratic principle. If it all comes down to qualifications, then the dilemma is this: Minority groups have been systematically excluded from certain jobs by definitions of qualification which have been formulated by the dominant group—in this case, white males, mostly Protestant. That is, if we were to examine with real care our definitions of scholarly quality, might we not come up with far different criteria than those we now have? Does not the whole role-definition of the professorial scholar presuppose a "man's world (white)" with women in subservient roles? Otherwise, who does the housework which permits the scholar to devote his life exclusively to his discipline? Is this type of role-model, this type of teacher, really "best" for today's world, which is not going to be so dominated by males? Is it really true that the ability to formulate mathematical proofs extemporaneously is more important in the University than "soul"?

Perhaps the quote from Sidney Hook is correct: the "consequences of imposing any criterion other than that of qualified talent on our educational establishments, are sure to be disastrous on the quest for new knowledge and truth as well as subversive of the democratic ethos." But the democratic ethos did not succeed in producing democracy in this instance. Are we being asked to wait another hundred years? Hopefully not. Hopefully, we will ask very deep questions about what Professor Hook means when he says "qualified talent," and about the discrimination at lower levels of education, which starts in children's story books, which has encouraged, if not forced, women, Blacks, et al., to end up less qualified and in short supply.

Only when we have righted our criteria of "qualified talent," undertaken exhaustive searches for candidates for our scholar-producing undergraduate and graduate schools who will help fill the gaps produced by past discrimination, and defined our goals and purposes for the future world (not the status quo), can we claim the right to the democratic ideal of no reverse-discrimination. Even then, we shall probably merely eliminate the type of discrimination exemplified by turning down a Black or a woman and hiring a less qualified white male. We shall not have reached the goal of eliminating the causes of discrimination. Groups which have in the past been victims of discrimination and which have succeeded in breaking down those barriers by extraordinary dedication and performance may well think that quota systems are unnecessary. I cannot help wondering whether the absence of a quota system can ever do the job for Blacks and women, who have been around a lot longer in the U. S. than many already-integrated groups. If we do not take steps—whatever they be—which produce real results above and beyond conforming to the white male definition of nondiscriminatory practice, it seems to me that our celebration of democratic ideals will be hollow indeed.

—Edward R. Thornton, Professor of Chemistry

PERIPHERAL ACTIVITIES

I am not an old-timer, but I have been at the University of Pennsylvania long enough (six years) to have seen some important changes in outlook and atmosphere that I find particularly distressing. It is not the increasing effort being given to organizing along more functioning lines, to reevaluating what we have been doing and planning for improvement, or to making our research and teaching more relevant. All this is needed.

My concern is that the degree of attention and visibility being given to these and other peripheral activities has gotten way out of proportion. There is something wrong with a supposedly great academic institution that gives more attention and visibility to (a) committee work, (b) women's rights groups, (c) power-seeking students, (d) popularizers and social activists on the faculty (or even worse, anarchistic academic revolutionaries who speak great thoughts over coffee (or pot) but whose concrete accomplishments are either meager or nonexistent) than to (a) research, scholarship and teaching, (b) equitable criteria for all, (c) better communication, (d) important research, teaching, and learning contributions made by members of the faculty and student bodies.

What is needed, it seems to me, is far greater attention to the latter concerns. With this in mind, I would like to propose that the ALMANAC set aside space each week to honor one outstanding faculty member for serious research contributions to his field and one outstanding student for outstanding academic achievement. Let me be clear about this. I am not just proposing that another name be added to the space traditionally allocated for this purpose (perhaps set in larger type). Rather, I am proposing that a feature article be prepared about both the man himself (or is it person), and his contribution. Although but a small step, this might help to focus more attention (relatively speaking) on the main purpose of our university, and hopefully, proportionately less on flamboyancy, noise, and propaganda.

—Joseph M. Scandura, Associate Professor of Education

Until March 31, 1971, ALMANAC was a monthly—and sometimes bimonthly—newspaper sent to the faculty and to senior administrators. With its conversion to a weekly for all A-1, A-2, A-3 and full-time A-4 personnel, it also received a new set of priorities. These were designed largely by the President, the Provost and Vice President, and the Chairman of the Senate in consultation with their colleagues and with specific reference to the Shayon Report on University Communications. Briefly, ALMANAC became an internal publication of record and journal of opinion. Its function is to record the official acts of the University and to act as a channel of expression for those of the University community who wish to use it so.

Faculty members do occasionally make public the results of their work either directly to ALMANAC or to it through the News Bureau—especially when the work relates to larger issues before the campus and society. Below is one of half a dozen such studies that have been summarized since the redirection of the publication.—Ed.

SOCIAL POLICIES FOR POLLUTION CONTROL

As part of his research on the development of "viable social policies for the environment," Professor Samuel Z. Klausner, (Sociology) directed a three month Volunteer Action Program in Philadelphia during the summer.

His volunteers (John Carroll, '68 C, '72 Law; Fred Fletcher, a law student at Washington and Lee; and Glen Gross, '73 Law) employed what he calls a "social-scientific approach" in their efforts to assess the effectiveness of laws and governmental agencies affecting the environment in the Philadelphia area.

Rather than being a detailed account, their Perspective in Environmental Law Enforcement in Philadelphia was designed to provide a broad range of views and perspectives to single out some of the problem areas in Philadelphia's fight against pollution.

In broad terms, industry, government and individual citizens are considered the polluters; ecology-minded citizens groups

and government agencies that "attempt to manage the environment for the benefit of all" are the adversaries in Philadelphia's battle against environmental abuse.

Industry, which tends to be the target of most complaints and enforcement efforts, appears more or less united in its own needs toward solution of the problem; self-named pollution adversaries are still widely scattered in approach.

The eight specific recommendations listed below call for a uniformity of environment control laws on both federal and state level as well as a coordination of efforts by the various government agencies and citizens groups working to control pollution. The study suggests that one way government and citizens groups can be effective is by concentrating their efforts on educating the general public on environmental issues and in promoting courses on environmental problems in the school systems.

The researchers found that industry's noted reluctance for expending capital on anti-pollution devices is primarily a matter of economics. "The economics of the situation dictate that one industry not expend capital to install these devices unless and until all of its competitors are compelled to do so. Even state laws involving pollution control can prove discriminatory to industries that compete for interstate or nationwide markets."

"Industry thus favors federal legislation, evenly applied, and would also like to see all environmental problems handled by one agency so that a comprehensive plan for abatement can be negotiated which will take into account all phases of the problem."

Industry spokesmen suggest specific proposals to encourage voluntary compliance, such as a tax write-off for expenses incurred in abating pollution.

An interesting aspect of the study involves corporate attitudes. Where environmental problems were once relegated to public relations departments, they are now increasingly the responsibility of environmental engineers.

Philadelphia's municipal government is cited as a major source of environmental pollutants. (The city of Philadelphia ranks fourth on Air Management Services' list of the top 15 polluters.) City incinerators, built to dispose of solid wastes created by the urban populace, themselves create air and water pollution; city sewage treatment plants also foul the environment.

AMS has no authority, at present, to make agencies comply with their regulations but a degree of voluntary cooperation exists. The Streets Dept., for example, has agreed to bring its six incinerators up to compliance levels by 1974. The Water Dept., on the other hand, has reached no compliance schedule but estimates are that their share of the problem cannot be abated before 1976.

Education or Incinerators?

Another facet of the problem, noted by one high city official, is that "the cost of improving municipal installations must be borne by the taxpayers of Philadelphia who would seem to prefer that their tax dollars be spent for education and housing before being expended on new incinerators."

Emphasizing the need for public education in ecology is the information that citizens collectively account for over 60% of Philadelphia's air pollution, primarily through automobile emissions and the burning of trash. Citizens also create serious solid waste disposal problems as a result of food waste and an ever-increasing use of disposable packaging.

Citizens groups in Philadelphia, of no single mind about the effectiveness of present anti-pollution law enforcement and recommendations for future efforts, could provide a needed service by enlarging their ecology education efforts. The broad-based concern that public education would hope-

fully generate would supply impetus for strong controls on municipal and industrial polluters.

With regard to enforcement, citizens have been active in lobbying for legislation. Recent federal, state and local laws containing standards and stronger remedies are partially the result of persuasion by citizens groups. The Philadelphia Air Management Code, which establishes emission standards which make it easier for the public enforcer to abate pollution, is an example of citizen effort leading to law.

Citizen group diversity, of positive value for educational purposes, is a drawback when the goal is political action. Concerted effort is needed to lobby for environmental control laws.

Another question examined was whether citizens groups adequately represent the public interest. The differences of opinion among environmentalists themselves would indicate a negative answer. The environmentalists disagree on the extent of pollution, on methods of control and on the priority which each of the problems should be given. Also, since the cost of abatement will be high, there is no guarantee that the environment groups have adequately weighed the benefits of clean-up against the costs to other problem areas badly in need of money for solution. Therefore, the report concludes, "the role of the citizens groups seems to be not to bring litigation but rather to continue to educate and lobby."

In the Government's Hands

This leaves the government to manage environment control. On the state level, an encouraging step toward protecting the environment was taken when the governor of Pennsylvania, on December 3, 1970, signed the bill creating the Dept. of Environmental Resources. The DER is responsible for the coordination of environmental decisions in the Commonwealth (including the Philadelphia area) from fiscal management to soil and water conservation and includes a strong enforcement arm. Although the DER's biggest problem is disorganization, at the moment, it is viewed as an organization with strong potential for curbing ecological misconduct.

The DER's present attitude is that successful abatement is best attained by an order tied to a time schedule with which a company can reasonably comply. "It is better for a company to spend a large amount over a period of time to clean up its processes than to pay a lump sum criminal fine or civic penalty and not as adequately abate its problems."

Although many citizens feel that the \$300 maximum fine provided under the Air Management Code amounts to less than a slap on the wrist to major industries, the low fine has two major advantages. "First, it permits access to municipal court, where the docket is relatively current and fast justice can be achieved. Secondly, the ability to bring to public attention the names of large corporate offenders employs a powerful tool—the fear of bad publicity."

In light of the political pressures that could hinder local anti-pollution law enforcement, at least one school of thought advocates federal intervention. "Decision-making responsibilities would be taken out of the hands of municipal employees or political employees and given to federal administrators who are, theoretically, immune to city politics."

To date, the federal government has maintained a hands-off policy in Philadelphia primarily because of a lack of federal manpower in the area. "The local office of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has made recommendations but not instituted any action. However, with the dramatic increase of federal manpower scheduled to take place in the local EPA office, and the increased organization of air, solid waste and water pollution decisions, the watchdog may soon show its teeth."

(Continued on Page 4)

The report concludes that "because environmental management requires regulation of human relationships to a common resource, such management is properly left to the government as a common forum of social decision-making."

Recommendations

1. *An Environmental Impact Review Board* should be established. Environmental impact statements, presently required for federal construction projects, should be required for all new construction as a necessary prerequisite to the granting of a state or county permit. These statements should give a detailed description of social and physical environmental effects and include an outline of alternative methods. Reports submitted to this Board should be made public.

The Environmental Impact Review Board membership should be interdisciplinary in background and divergent in philosophy. Impact statements should be reviewed not only by engineers, but by social scientists equipped to relate decisions to the costs and benefits and assess their effect on the organization and quality of social life. Religious and secular moral leaders should be able to comment on the social impact of projects in the light of moral values.

2. *The Commonwealth legislature* should pass forward-looking state-wide land use planning with certain controls maintained in Harrisburg but providing for implementation with appropriate modification at the county level.

3. *Legislatures* should establish uniform minimum environmental standards among counties and states.

4. *An Environmental Coordination Council* should be established. Its members would be the spokesmen for the various municipal, state and federal anti-pollution law enforcement agencies operating within a region. The Council would be responsible for establishing lines of communication among the agencies and for coordinating enforcement plans.

5. *Administrative agencies* should retain responsibility for the enforcement of anti-pollution laws. These agencies are equipped with technical expertise and the professional personnel necessary for the task of establishing meaningful compliance schedules with industry. Prosecution should rarely be undertaken by purely prosecutorial branches of government (unless working with the pollution control agency) since they are less likely to have an in-house technical capability respecting overall environmental management and are more exposed to extraneous political considerations.

6. *Local prosecutors as well as private citizens* should act as public watchdogs over the pollution control agencies. An action in mandamus should be readily available to the public so that agencies remain responsible to the community.

7. *The Commonwealth Department of Education* should promote the teaching of courses on environmental problems in both primary and secondary schools. These courses should stress not only the physical impacts of pollution but the social impacts as well.

Industry, governmental enforcement agencies and citizens groups should increase their efforts to educate the public-at-large concerning environmental issues and thus encourage and perpetuate rational concern. News media should also be encouraged in their efforts to critically report environmental news.

8. *Citizens groups* should establish lines of communication between one another in an attempt to form regional coalitions and issue consensus position papers on all regional environmental issues. This, rather than direct initiation of legal action, should be the focus.

Notice to Honorary M.A.'s

Recipients of the honorary Master of Arts degree who were unable to attend the October 14 reception and ceremony may call for their diplomas at the Office of the Secretary, 112 College Hall

Response to Proposals:

UNIVERSITY EMPLOYMENT/EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

At a special meeting on October 29, 1971, the Faculty (A-2) and Secretarial (A-3) personnel of the Laboratory of Biochemistry, Department of Animal Biology, the School of Veterinary Medicine, reviewed the "University Employment Policies and Equal Opportunity Proposals." Fourteen members participated and adopted the following proposals and recommendations. Each one was voted on separately and approved unanimously. The assembly also voted to publicize its conclusions by requesting the Chairman of the Animal Biology Department to forward them to the attached list of individuals and offices. The decisions are given below:

A-2 and A-3 personnel of the Laboratory of Biochemistry, School of Veterinary Medicine, consider the "University Employment Policies and Equal Opportunity Proposals (UEP-EOP)" to be inadequate because these policies and proposals fail to meet the criteria of Executive Orders 11246 as amended by 11375 as well as the guidelines of the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and fail to instill a sense of the seriousness of the situation and the need for prompt remedial action. The administration of the University should forthwith confer with the University women's organizations and with representatives of minority groups to develop an affirmative action plan which meets the requirement of the Executive Orders and the guidelines set by HEW and the Pennsylvania State Human Relations Commission.

The following specific comments and recommendations were adopted with respect to the inadequacies of UEP-EOP:

A. There is no sense of urgency; even after many years the proposals could still leave substantial amounts of *de facto* discrimination even in those areas where existing pools of qualified personnel could permit a solution to problems.

B. The UEP-EOP provides no means for effectively checking compliance. A mechanism acceptable to the organizations of women and to representatives of minority groups should be adopted for this purpose and should extend to the appointment of a University-wide review committee, responsible for surveillance over compliance by the University with the Executive Orders, guidelines and goals of equal opportunity.

C. Where review and checking procedures show failures to comply with UEP-EOP, there must be adequate provisions for enforcement.

D. The plan fails to make adequate distinction between the problems faced by women and those faced by minority groups. In the area of grievance procedures, it is most unlikely that a group concerned with and able to deal with the grievances of women could adequately deal with the grievances of black people and other minority groups.

E. The proposals should be changed so that in most cases *recommendations* and *suggestions* are converted to *requirements*. For example, item 2 of UEP-EOP concerning personnel committees should read "Each school must include women and members of minority groups on its personnel committee." (If need be from another school.)

F. The grievance mechanism of UEP-EOP is inadequate and inappropriate because Committees on Academic Freedom and Responsibility have neither the appropriate composition nor powers and could be faced with substantial conflicts of interest. There should be separate grievance mechanisms defined in the proposals, concerned solely with equal opportunity, which meets criteria set forth by representatives of women's organizations and minority groups and complies with Federal and State requirements.

G. A mechanism should be included in the proposals for establishing a set of University goals towards meeting equal opportunity standards based on individual goals adopted by each School and Department.

—Robert J. Rutman, Head, Laboratory of Biochemistry

Distribution: President Meyerson; Provost Reitz; Dean Allam; Dr. R. R. Marshak; Dr. E. J. L. Soulsby; A-3 Assembly; A-1 Assembly; Members, Department Animal Biology, School of Veterinary Medicine; W.E.O.U.P.; Mr. James Robinson, Office of Equal Opportunity; Almanac; News Bureau; Office of the Ombudsman; Daily Pennsylvanian.

The Proposals for the Consideration of the University Community issued in March, 1971, by President Martin Meyerson and Provost Curtis R. Reitz contained an invitation to all sectors of the University to comment and make further suggestions. A special committee of the Administrative Assembly wrote a reply during the summer, noting that it confined itself to "those topics which either affect administration or should be influenced by administrative opinion and function." The report was sent informally to President Meyerson, who said he "took its recommendations very seriously" in preparing his October report to the Trustees and would continue to draw on it in the coming year. The following is a condensation; the full report will go before the Administrative Assembly for approval at the Spring meeting.

The Changing of the University: A Pragmatic View

The proposed academic options for undergraduate education are the single most exciting prospect for the University offered in the *Proposals*. Their fulfillment is important if the University is to realize its expressed ambition of attracting superior students and of continuing to build Pennsylvania's reputation as an intellectually creative institution.

Implementation of the proposal, however, will have to be tempered by the University's financial prospects and its total long-term academic goals.

The balancing factor is quality. Pennsylvania could move toward year-round programs, for example—as is suggested in the discussion of the University calendar. But will it stint on quality because it cannot afford year-round staffing of residential, dining and recreational facilities? Or because it cannot provide additional student aid or counselling? Will the University decrease the size of its student body, or will it offer its proposed new academic options to a limited number of those it admits and risk criticism from those it cannot serve?

We believe that certain risks *must* be taken if the University is to progress. We suggest, however, that they be assumed only after all administrative and financial implications are weighed against the academic gains suggested by the undergraduate options.

We are enthusiastic about the interest of the President and Provost in offering a variety of educational options to students. Curricular changes within the University, however, can have a direct impact on a number of administrative functions. For example, with students coming and going outside the traditional four-year structure, new approaches would have to be found to raise those all-important operational funds which are now produced largely through Annual Giving on a Class basis. The resulting breakdown of Class ties would eliminate the traditional way of fixing continuity of interest of the alumni.

In another administrative area, major curricular changes made without reference to admissions, student aid and graduation requirements, can also upset the University's financial equilibrium. Indeed, this happened during the recent reduction of course requirements in the College and College for Women.

Although there appears to be confusion at the moment about the relative goals of "continuing education" and "lifetime education," we believe the proposal to bring more alumni into continuing education in some form will be of benefit to them and to the University. We suggest that evening graduate degree courses should also be made available in other Schools

as they now are in Engineering—and part-time teachers' certification programs for the many men and women who have neither the time nor the means to attend the University on a full time basis. We feel that such an innovation might, among other advantages, help improve the University's local reputation as an institution making its resources accessible to the community.

Before leaving this subject, let us express general approval of the suggestions for improving the status of undergraduate education at Pennsylvania—especially the intention of opening up the strengths of the graduate and professional schools to the undergraduate students. Liberalizing opportunities for undergraduate students need not be limited to adding new programs, but could also be set in motion by breaking down some of the traditional academic barriers and broadening the scope of programs already in operation.

Attracting . . . and Keeping Able Students

Admissions policies and procedures have been the center of considerable debate at the University, especially during the past year. The committee believes that discussions and decisions concerning this important phase of the University's operations should take cognizance of several documented trends affecting higher education.

(1) the beginning of a decline in the number of young people in the college-bound age group; (2) the increasing number of gifted high school graduates choosing not to pursue a college education; (3) the increasing cost of a college education within the framework of a recession economy; (4) growing competition between public and private sectors of education.

All of these factors tend to decrease the number of qualified applicants to private educational institutions. Looking to the future, therefore, if the University is to attract more able students or—to maintain the current level of excellence—high priority must be given to the recruitment effort. An accelerated program, even using volunteer help, would require more staff and a larger budget for the Office of Admissions and Financial Aid.

Bringing more able students to the University carries with it an obligation to provide high calibre academic programs and supportive student services. It is not enough to recruit the students; we believe the University must insure them a rewarding educational and personal experience.

There is increasing need at Pennsylvania for both academic guidance and outside-of-the-classroom support, such as that provided by the Residential Life staff, the Office of the Dean

of Students, and a variety of other counselling services.

The Pennsylvania Gazette recently asked, "Whatever happened to those carefree college kids?"

It proceeded to report: "Coeducational housing, almost complete absence of curfew and dorm rules, wide latitude in choices of curriculum—all these have set the student adrift on a sea of freedom with his own ability to handle responsibility the only life preserver."

A study made recently of 1,454 undergraduates who withdrew from Harvard College during a five-year period showed that 43.3 per cent left for psychiatric reasons.

In the last ten years, the suicide rate on American campuses has risen 25 per cent.

The new style of living which has removed restrictions and restraints from students has left them with a need for other kinds of support which they can seek out on an individual basis.

Another concern of the *Proposals* is logically related to this discussion. If the University's obligation to provide high-quality education to neglected groups is to be dispensed fully, the total University must be committed to the same principle. Students who have come from underprivileged backgrounds, black students, small-town students—all require supportive services to make life on a big university campus livable. The "collegiate plan" has been suggested as one means of overcoming the impersonality of a large university. If made available to the entire student body, it would be. But, can Pennsylvania, now or in the near future, afford to offer this option to all comers?

The committee recognizes that passage of the Higher Education Act would help alleviate some financial problems of low-income students. It might also, however, increase the number of students here who require special services.

We believe that the goals of attracting superior students, providing high-quality education for all including the disadvantaged, and encouraging transfers, older students and early admissions are all attainable under certain conditions:

by increasing staff and budget for recruitment, admissions, student aid, counseling and other supporting services,

or

by reducing the size of the total student body.

Unless one of these courses is followed, however, we believe the University will risk sacrificing quality.

Better Use of Available Talent

The time has come, the *Proposals* seem to say, for the University to begin to stretch its imagination about using its human resources to better advantage. We agree, and have made other suggestions along the same lines.

Perhaps it is appropriate here, however, to comment upon what we believe to be a misuse of resources. During the recent (and current) period of financial stringency in which a "job freeze" has been imposed, new responsibilities and programs have been added to many overtaxed departments at the University. This committee suggests that the University reconsider the technique of job-freezing, which creates an atmosphere of retrenchment leading many able and ambitious employees to look for opportunities elsewhere and leaving a diminished staff to carry the load. We suggest, too, that when new projects and programs are added, some consideration be given to reviewing and withdrawing less important ones. A serious morale problem and further attrition of valued employees might be averted.

One of the *Proposals* of the President and Provost is that there be "increased personal involvement by alumni, faculty and students" in the student recruitment program. Subject to

the usual question, "How?", we agree. And, on such a volunteer basis, members of the administrative staff might be available to provide additional social or advisory contacts for students.

On the subject of academic advising, this committee observes that the College of Arts and Sciences, our largest undergraduate division, has a distinctly inadequate student advisory system. All other undergraduate schools have good-to-excellent advising programs. Until the College makes academic advising a significant part of its responsibility to students, it is difficult to envision the implementation of a large-scale faculty advising program as suggested in the *Proposals*.

We believe that academic excellence must be supported by high-quality administration which, in turn, can be assured through constructively critical reviews of operating philosophies, standards of procedure and follow-up practices. This committee suggests, therefore, that the concept of "Advisory Boards," as described in the *Proposals*, be extended to the University-wide administrative functions of the University. The committee envisions boards or "visiting committees" composed of alumni, lay friends of the University, scholars and professional administrators of other universities—men and women experienced in university administration, finance, personnel work and other essential services. We suggest that such boards be set up to serve as consultants to University operational offices.

Talents within the University should be used to better advantage, too, especially since many administrative offices are hindered by a shortage of staff. An example of such talent, currently rendering an important service to the University is that of Dr. Dan M. McGill to the insurance programs.

We have alluded to the need for appointing more administrative staff members to appropriate committees of the University where they would add a kind of experience not now adequately represented. Senior administrators, for example, who consistently use University administrative services should be appointed to the committees delegated to advise and assist those offices. Recently, administrators were called upon to help select the new director of parking, telephone and mail services. The committee suggests a broadening of this practice. We request that appropriate members of the Administrative Assembly continue to be consulted on a regular basis concerning appointment of senior administrators, departmental business administrators and the like.

We raise a question concerning the relationships of University committees to operational functions of the University. Some committees now in existence—some permanent and some *ad hoc*—have badly defined lines of authority in relation to professional staff. A frequent weakness of *ad hoc* committees is that no one is made responsible for follow-up; this can result in the perpetuation of activities which have long outlived their usefulness. We ask for a clarification of these relationships, and suggest that committees or advisory boards in the future be established with attention to these shortcomings. They can be the cause of considerable frustration, unnecessary or duplicated effort and "institutional sluggishness."

Equal Opportunity . . . for All

The committee is encouraged by the policy statement on equal opportunity for women, blacks and members of minority groups. Some action has already been taken to institute a federally-funded training program for new employees to be trained as clerk-typists and secretaries. We add a word of caution that currently-employed clerical and secretarial workers be given *equal opportunity* to obtain training for advancement.

We are encouraged, too, by the information that a training officer is being sought to supervise the program, and we suggest that, as soon as feasible, access to training opportunities be extended university-wide. We encourage the adoption of a management development program which will utilize internal staff knowledge.

The committee suggests that some mechanism be created to follow up and assure compliance with *all* aspects of the President's affirmative action plan. We note, for example, that a subcommittee of the Council is active in behalf of women *faculty* members; but we know of no equivalent action being taken in behalf of administrative women.

This committee proposes that the University take a critical look at its personnel practices as a whole. The University of Pennsylvania is one of the largest private employers in the metropolitan area. We understand that, with an organization of this size and nature, it is unrealistic to expect—or to want—absolute uniformity in hiring, promotion and training. We feel, however, that up to this time the University has failed to support its Personnel Office by elevating it in the administrative hierarchy and staffing it adequately. Consequently, too much of the burden of seeking, hiring and training employees is left to the discretion of department heads who sometimes lack the necessary information or interest to do the job adequately.

Patterns of discrimination have developed which are, to say the least, baffling. The process of having a job reclassified, for example, can be slow and cumbersome, making it difficult to give recognition for an employee's superior performance and increased responsibilities. Cases can be cited in which one person doing essentially the same work as another is given a different job title, making equal pay avoidable. While department heads are informed of job openings within the University, frequently the information is not posted. Employees are not encouraged to improve themselves.

The Administrative Assembly has already expressed its views concerning the need to improve administrative salaries. (The A-1 Salary Survey, issued January, 1971, indicating salary levels at the University of Pennsylvania, on the average, to be approximately 18% below counterpart levels in the local employment market. See ALMANAC April 13.)

Improving the Financial Outlook

Throughout the *Proposals* of the President and Provost a limitation on action is implied, if not stated, because of the University's uncertain fiscal picture. We are well aware of this obstacle and have indicated our concern for maintaining academic quality and equality of opportunity at the head of the priority list. Much can be done within these two spheres without increasing expenses; indeed, we believe within the body of this report we have indicated ways in which the University might cut expenses and save money in the long run.

We also suggest:

- A review of accounting and budgeting methods to overcome inaccuracy, delays and overspending of budgets.
- Development of a standard program budgeting system which includes income and overheads. Re-study of current cost-accounting practices for research and training projects to obtain faster and more complete recovery of the University's expenditures.
- Application of systems engineering and operations research to appropriate administrative operations. Investigation of optimum use of computers currently restricted by staff reductions.

It is a major responsibility of the Development Department to cooperate with the executive staff in raising funds for operations and expansion. We agree with the suggestion that part of the responsibility must be accepted, and efforts re-

doubled, by academic department heads to bring their needs to the attention of both public and private sources for financing.

All efforts, however, should be effected in conjunction with the Development Office. If the University's best development prospects are to be realized, cultivation of prospects and long-range planning for the whole University must be considered. The Development staff must, therefore, be a part of the earliest planning stages whether or not plans were initiated through the Development Office.

We agree that new ways must be found to provide more financial aid for students and we support the development of a long-term loan program. While Federal assistance to higher education in one form or another seems assured, it appears that it will be limited to the most needy, leaving those students on the edge of financial insecurity to fend for themselves. We propose, therefore, that a major campaign be launched as soon as possible to raise money for scholarships and fellowships to help meet the growing demand for student aid.

And Finally . . .

All segments of the University should be encouraged to become spokesmen and salesmen for Pennsylvania. Public relations should not be relegated entirely to the efforts of the Public Relations Department.

If the University of Pennsylvania is to realize its potentials and achieve the goals envisioned for its future, it will be done through the good will and common effort of faculty, students, administrators, alumni, Trustees and the community at large.

We consider the invitation to comment on the President's and Provost's *Proposals* an important gesture in itself because it provides a rare opportunity to show that we are listening and that we are willing to help.

We hope it will be a continuing and fruitful dialogue.

Respectfully submitted by the Administrative Assembly Ad Hoc Committee to respond to the President's and Provost's *Proposals* for Consideration by the University Community.

Audrey A. Cale, Chairman	Margo Marshall
Francis M. Betts III	James A. Nolan
Frederic Harper	Shirley Winters
James L. Malone	James B. Yarnall

THE COUNCIL

ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Meyerson called attention to changes in faculty salaries since the publication of 1970-71 AAUP data, predicting that the 1971 raises will alter Pennsylvania's position in standings when 1971-72 data is published. He also noted that the recent proposal on equal opportunity (ALMANAC October 19) should not be confused with the University's Affirmative Action Plan, which is a separate document due for completion shortly.

Provost Reitz said action is still in progress toward freeing federal restrictions on teaching fellows' increases, with the University's attorney "optimistic" on the graduate students' behalf. He also announced the formation of an assembly by the professional librarians, who are seeking Council representation; and said that a set of guidelines on an academic honor code for undergraduates is in progress.

A report on the new Council members seated, and on action taken on by-laws, will be carried in the November 23 issue of ALMANAC.

(Continued on Page 8)

NEWS IN BRIEF CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

GROUP PROCESS IN SOCIAL WORK

"Delivering Social Services Through The Group Process" will be the theme of the Helen U. Phillips Symposium sponsored by the School of Social Work at the International House on Friday, November 19, from 9:15 a.m. to 4 p.m.

The main paper will be by Dr. Mary Louise Somers of the School of Social Services Administration, University of Chicago. Workshops will be conducted in Health Corrections, Public Assistance, Education, Family Services and Aging. Registration is \$5 for students and \$8.50 for others. Those interested should contact Dr. Joseph Soffen, Ext. 5523.

COUNCIL CONTINUED FROM PAGE 7

ROTC: NO VOTE UNTIL DECEMBER 8

Debate on ROTC and NROTC continues at the December 8 meeting of Council. Three proposals have been circulated and are being discussed under special rules-of-the-day prepared by the Steering Committee.

Council is not expected to legislate a final wording on the issue, moderator Roger Walmsley said, but, only to express preference for one of the options in informal or straw votes by show of hands. The resolutions as of November 10 are printed below. The first is drawn from the Dwyer Report (ALMANAC May 4) and the second was framed by its signers. The third is a summary, now proposed for revision by members who favor termination.

RESOLUTION #1

WHEREAS the Steering Committee referred to the Committee on Undergraduate Affairs consideration of the report on ROTC prepared by a committee of the Wharton School faculty; and

WHEREAS the Steering Committee upon recommendation of the Committee on Undergraduate Affairs subsequently appointed a subcommittee to examine the question of whether the presence of ROTC on the University campus should continue under any conditions; and

WHEREAS the subcommittee has submitted a report which recommends unanimously that the ROTC units at the University of Pennsylvania be retained subject to conditions outlined in the report; and

WHEREAS the Committee on Undergraduate Affairs has considered the subcommittee report and has recommended that the ROTC units and the programs in Military Science and Naval Science at the University of Pennsylvania be continued provided, through negotiation between the University and the Department of Defense, the relationships between the two parties can be modified or aligned to be consistent with the established principles and standards of the University; be it therefore

RESOLVED, That the University Council endorse the recommendation of its Committee on Undergraduate Affairs and advise the administration to enter into negotiations with the Department of Defense to achieve relationships which will be consistent with the established principles and standards of the University and which will assure continuance of the ROTC units and the programs in Military Science and Naval Science at the University of Pennsylvania.

RESOLUTION #2

WHEREAS, the University's independence from external control over matters affecting the quality of its degrees is a basic academic principle; and

WHEREAS, the current institutional arrangement between the Department of Defense and the University regarding ROTC grants an undue special status to ROTC by allowing an outside authority

to participate in the determination of curriculum and in the appointment to the University faculty of instructors who do not enjoy academic freedom and tenure, and whose basic allegiance is to an external organization, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That:

1. The Council, while fully acknowledging the authority of individual faculties with respect to course accreditation, express its sense that the above principle of independence can best be protected if credit toward a degree is given only for such courses as are offered under the auspices of an established civilian academic department, approved in the usual manner by a faculty curriculum committee and taught by a regularly appointed member of the department involved, who may be either a civilian or a member of the military service; and

2. The University Council advise the President of the University to negotiate with the appropriate authorities, in common with other institutions, toward alterations in the relationship of ROTC programs to the University. In the negotiations he should be guided by the basic principle cited above and by considerations mentioned in the College and Wharton reports. The proposed alterations should be brought to the Council for further discussion and advice within the current academic year; and

3. In the event that the changes which can be negotiated are not satisfactory to the University Council, the Council should not recommend termination of the University's ROTC contracts without submitting this question to a poll of both faculty and students.

Herbert Callen, Richard A. Clarke, Jean B. Crockett, Edward Hill, Irving Kravis, and William Tortu

RESOLUTION #3

WHEREAS the ROTC units and the programs in Military Science and Naval Science at the University of Pennsylvania are, by their inherent nature, oriented to the destruction of human life and not to the enrichment or promulgation of human life; and

WHEREAS these activities are presently supported at this University through contractual arrangements between the University and the military services; be it therefore

RESOLVED, That the University Council express to the Administration its abhorrence of the continued presence in any form of ROTC activities and urge the administration to negotiate with the military services toward the prompt termination of all such activities whether curricular or non-curricular in nature.

PRESIDENT'S CONFERENCE (Continued from Page 1)

James H. Robinson	Director of Equal Opportunity Office
John A. Russell, Jr.	Vice Provost for Student Affairs
Donald T. Sheehan	Director of Public Relations
William E. Stephens	Vice-Provost; Dean of the College
Benjamin H. Stevens	Coordinator of Urban, Regional and Environmental Studies
E. Craig Sweeten	Vice President for Development and Public Relations
William Tortu	Undergraduate member of the Steering Committee
Roger Walmsley	Moderator of the University Council
Vincent H. Whitney	Member of the University Council
To be elected	Head of the A-3 Assembly

Observers

Assistants to the President and the Provost and Vice President:

Francis M. Betts, III, Arnold Eisen, Renee Fox, Carolyn R. Gehring, Frances S. Hardy, Patricia Meyers, Donald S. Murray, Donald M. Stewart, Veronika von Nostitz, and Robert M. Zemsky.

Alice F. Emerson	Dean of Students
Peter Seely	Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid
Fred A. Shabel	Director of Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics

University communications media (on invitation)