

NEWS IN BRIEF

TOMORROW'S NEWS: A NEW DEAN AT DENTAL SCHOOL

President Meyerson and Provost Reitz will announce tomorrow the appointment of a successor to Dean Lester Burket, who retires in June as Dean of the School of Dental Medicine.

The new Dean's name is being withheld today as a courtesy to the Dental faculty, who will hear the announcement first at the School's Faculty Meeting tomorrow at 4 p.m.

Those interested in knowing the Dean's name and background before the December 21 issue will find News Bureau releases posted in the Faculty Club, the Information Center and the Dental School after the Faculty Meeting.

KENAN PROFESSOR: EDWARD C. BANFIELD

A new endowed professorship stressing "commitment to teaching and interest in students" at Pennsylvania has been filled by Harvard's Edward C. Banfield, Henry Lee Shattuck Professor of Urban Government there since 1959.

The announcement of Professor Banfield's selection and of a grant of \$750,000 from the William R. Kenan Jr. Charitable Trust to endow the chair was made last week by President Martin Meyerson and Provost Curtis Reitz. Professor Banfield will join the faculty with the 1972-73 academic year.

He is chairman of President Nixon's Task Force on Model Cities and a public member of the President's Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. A 1938 graduate of Connecticut State College, he held government posts until 1947, when he began teaching at Chicago and working toward the Ph.D. he received there in 1951.

He is author of ten major works in political science and urban subjects, two of them (*Boston: The Job Ahead*, 1966, and *Politics, Planning and the Public Interest*, 1955) co-authored with Martin Meyerson.



THE SECOND TIME AROUND

Campus mail is taking on a new look as Chemistry Professor E. R. Thornton's recycled stationery makes the intramural rounds. Ordered through a local office supply company, the rubber stamp that says THIS ITEM IS BEING RECYCLED may be used in U.S. mails too, according to Professor Thornton.

A WIND TUNNEL AT TOWNE SCHOOL

Officials from the University and from the Westinghouse Corporation jointly dedicated a new low speed wind tunnel laboratory last week at the University's Towne School of Civil and Mechanical Engineering.

The wind tunnel was built with the help of funds and equipment, including a 50 hp motor, donated by Westinghouse. It was designed and constructed under the direction of Dr. Norman A. Evans, Associate Professor of Mechanical

(Continued on Page 8)

IN THIS ISSUE

- SENATE: *Abraham on Input* • *Warren on Wolfman*
- *Invitation from Van Pelt House* • *Rothe on Advising*
- THE COLLEGE: *Freshman Seminars; Grading Policy*
- WHARTON: *Grading Change in Graduate Division*
- OF RECORD: *Christmas Holidays* • BULLETINS
- *Engineers Study the Ways of the Wind* • LETTERS
- COUNCIL: *Rebuttal; Honor Code; ROTC Final Vote*

Almanac

Volume 18, Number 15

December 14, 1971

Published weekly by the University of Pennsylvania

THE BUDGET: INCREASING INCOME IN RECREATION AND ATHLETICS

A proposal to help finance athletics and recreation by increasing income from campus sources is scheduled to go before the Budget Committee this month.

The proposal is one item in an overall drive to realize major savings outside the academic area. Other financial proposals concerning intercollegiate athletics will be taken up after the Ivy League college presidents discuss the issue at their December 15 meeting.

"The necessary savings cannot be realized simply by cutting program," according to Presidential Assistant Robert Zemsky, author of the income-producing plan for Penn recreation and athletics.

Season Passes

His proposal calls for a system of passes—one for recreation, the other for intercollegiate sports—available to students, faculty and staff. There would be single admissions as well, but the passes would be "a very much greater bargain," Professor Zemsky said.

"If this program is of interest to a large number of people—and we honestly think it is—then the cost of recreation and athletics would be shared widely," he continued, "and we would not tax those whose interests lie elsewhere."

For students, a tuition increase would very much exceed the cost of such a voluntary pass system, he said.

Charges could differ for various segments of the campus population, with faculty and some staff paying higher fees than students and lower-paid staff.

All of the fees would be modest, however, and could by no means carry the load, he said. "In some areas it is our hope that pass holders might receive a reduced rate compared to what they pay now in the facilities that do charge."

The success of the voluntary fee program would depend greatly on campus response, he said. "With just minimal participation we would be at ground zero; maximum participation would give the program new resources," Professor Zemsky added.

As income rose above a certain projected level, any additional funds would be used for new recreational equipment and program improvements, under the Zemsky plan. "As it now stands, the budget barely allows for replacements."

THE SENATE

From the Chairman:

A MATTER OF INPUT

One of the recurrent concerns that have been expressed to me with considerable feeling during these past seven months as your Chairman has been that of the diminishing voice and influence in University policy—councils of senior members of the faculty, in general, and departmental chairmen in particular—in favor of that of junior faculty and students. This strongly perceived diminution of influence—be it regarded as factual or fancied—is deemed present not only at the level of the University Council and the Faculty Senate but also at that of the top echelons of the Administration.

It is difficult to ascertain, let alone measure (even in these days of super-quantification!) the range and extent of the above charge—yet there is little doubt that it contains a considerable degree of accuracy. For one, there is no doubt whatsoever that rarely, if ever, does the point of view of the senior faculty, assuming its cognizance, carry the day in the Council. Not only in its structure and composition, but in its approach to substantive issues, the University Council's center of gravity of voting power lies elsewhere—specifically with a fairly predictable concord of students and below senior-level faculty. The case is far less clear in the Faculty Senate and may well be inapplicable there.

On the other hand, the diminution of influence by senior faculty is probably most apparent, if least provable *a priori*, at the level of the Administration which, quite naturally, serves—and must serve—as the ultimately decisive focal point of the claims and counterclaims of, by and for the myriad interest groups that converge on the University community's nerve center in College Hall. That the Administration has actively endeavored to diffuse power and influence among these various groups is readily demonstrable; that far more of these groups have been brought into the councils and counsels of the University decision-making structures is equally clear. To what extent their input has been heeded, will be heeded, or should be heeded, is far less clear, of course—and that may well be a beneficial phenomenon in the administrative process.

Stipulating the general accuracy of the foregoing analysis of the contemporary status of senior faculty input and influence, how might it be redressed or enhanced—assuming its desirability? One course of action is obvious: far greater participatory activity in the committees and assemblies of the apparatus of University governance. There has been noticeable absenteeism and withdrawal from University Council meetings, for example. Understandable though such a course of action may well be, given the frustrations of sitting through two hours of questionably productive sessions, it is self-defeating: sooner or later votes are taken. Another possibility is more concerted action at the administrative input level by formally or informally organized grouping such as departmental chairmen or by holders of Chairs other than Benjamin Franklin Professorships (the latter already seem to constitute a more or less organized whole that appears to have the ears of the Administration). Or perhaps a concerted effort might be engendered to rethink, and subsequently to restructure, the process of governance so as to centralize rather than diffuse the authority of the decision-making process while still retaining the advantages of constituent input.

In the final analysis, however, there is no substitute for the elbow grease of direct involvement in the political process of any institution—be it private, quasi-public or public.



The ROTC Issue:

Responding To Dean Wolfman's Comments

An article entitled *ROTC: A Reply to President Meyerson* by Dean Bernard Wolfman was published on page 4 of the *Daily Pennsylvanian* for Thursday, November 18, 1971. (Ed. note: ALMANAC December 7.) I have read and reread his article and I find that I understand neither what Dean Wolfman means by his statements nor his purpose in submitting the article to the *Daily Pennsylvanian*. Why did he offer an answer to a question asked by the President at the very end of a Council meeting by submitting an article for publication, rather than by communicating directly and personally with the President?

The first numbered paragraph of Dean Wolfman's statement asserts that the ROTC-University relationship: (1) "Represents the University's continuous affirmation of the acceptability as an academic discipline of a program designed to train Army and Navy officers to lead soldiers and sailors in the military and naval establishment"; (2) "All truly academic aspects of the program are necessarily subordinate or peripheral to that design"; (3) "The principal allegiance of the instructors in the program is the military and naval hierarchy, with criticism and the pursuit of truth at all times subject to that overriding allegiance". In my opinion, these arguments are discussed in considerable detail in Appendix 1 of the Dwyer Report, and it is very clear from that document that no positive, unequivocal statements like those quoted from Dean Wolfman can describe or even represent the situation as it exists and has existed for many years. Why would Dean Wolfman choose to make three such positive assertions without giving consideration in the same statement to important and cognate facts and opinions assembled by his colleagues?

Partly Insulting, Partly Irrelevant

In his second numbered paragraph, Dean Wolfman appears to imply that the presence of ROTC programs on the campus is in some way comparable to the hypothetical presence of political parties or the United States Government or the NAM or the AFL-CIO. He then concludes that the study of "things military, the military establishment" is intolerable. Why did he assert that such pressure would be comparable? Why is the study of the military establishment intolerable? Are there some things that can be studied and others that cannot in a free university?

The fourth numbered paragraph of Dean Wolfman's statement seems to me partly insulting to a large number of his colleagues and partly irrelevant. May I state in all sincerity that I have participated in the ROTC program, watched its development and operation within the University, and worked closely with a number of officers appointed to participate in the programs at Penn. I sincerely believe that the programs have been helpful to students, appropriate for the University, and in accord in all essential ways with the ethical principles I have personally evolved for my own guidance, both as a citizen of the United States and as a professor at the University of Pennsylvania. With respect to what has happened at other universities, one should be, in my opinion, extremely careful in arriving at definite conclusions. Our colleagues in other schools with whom we like to consider our-

selves closely associated have in several instances gone through the same difficult attempt to analyze the appropriateness of ROTC in a university. They too have found the problem extremely complex and they have been quite incapable of arriving at fixed and definite conclusions. Regardless of the decisions reached and implemented there has been no unanimity of opinion among students, among faculty members, and among administrators.

I am sure that all of the persons who have been involved for the past several years in the investigation of the relationship of ROTC to the University of Pennsylvania would have liked very much to have come to definite conclusions supported by a logical array of facts and axioms. Unfortunately they have not found that to be possible within their interpretation of intellectual honesty and comprehensiveness. We should respect their appraisal of the complexity of the problem, whether or not we agree with conclusions presented in Council or outside.

—S. Reid Warren, Jr.

OPEN LETTER TO THE FACULTY

The faculty and student residents of Van Pelt College House have an open apartment for the housing of visiting faculty and guest lecturers. We would like to offer this facility and suggest that you consider the possibility of lodging your guests here. This service is offered free of charge.

It is hoped that such guests would be willing to meet with members of the House and perhaps participate in an informal discussion during one of the nights of their stay.

Such discussions form an integral part of the life of Van Pelt House. The project was conceived as a means whereby resident faculty and students could gather in an atmosphere that would be conducive to both congenial associations and intellectual growth. We believe that we have to a large extent accomplished this, and that the House can offer a unique experience to visitors.

If any member of the faculty wishes to reserve our suite, he should communicate his request to me hopefully at least one week in advance. I can be reached by telephone at EV 2-8494 or a message can be left at 594-5202. Requests can also be mailed to Box 121, 3909 Spruce Street.

—David S. Cohen

Advising: Words from the Wise? *by Kenneth Rothe*

Will Rogers once said, by way of advice to investors, "Buy what goes up—if it don't go up, don't buy it." The realities with which we must deal do not often allow for hindsight of this sort to yield dividends. The feeling persists that the young require advice more than the old. This arises no doubt through faith in the repeatability of experiences, allowing older members of society to anticipate the futures of those who have not yet come of age, by remembering (however inaccurately) their own pasts. All too often advice given is not tempered by the humbleness and thought appropriate to a situation where the giver is taking some responsibility for the direction of another's life. Advising is a serious process and should not be entered into lightly.

The undergraduate finds himself in a peculiar position. As a freshman he comes with his own set of reasons for seeking what he believes the university offers. These may be as near to the true offerings as preparation for graduate training or as far as vocational preparation. He and society anticipate that the total growing experiences of the 18- to 22-year-old person can be most successfully pursued in an environment such as ours. That this is not the case for many people in this age group, irrespective of intelligence, has been slow in dawning. As an institution we have only just begun to actively encourage breaks in education and the continuing education of older people. These efforts, while increasing, remain a small part of the mission of the university. We must still grapple with the problems of the heterogeneous group of individuals which makes up Pennsylvania's undergraduate body.

What resources can be brought to bear in the area of advising? It is properly assumed that most people seek advice from fellow human beings in preference to consulting written material. One wonders whether anything written on the topic is ever read. Recognizing this, the tasks fall on the academic community at large. Faculty, staff, and peers form the human fabric from which any program can be built. Involvement of each is necessary if a sensible approach is to be attempted.

It should be realized that in terms of time devoted to being in the presence of others, the peer experience is by far the most consuming. If, in a situation such as Penn's, each student would develop a heightened sense of responsibility for his fellows much would be gained. The limitations on peer group advice may be more apparent than those of the faculty. Faculty members are chosen because of their relationship to

a field of scholarship and remain here because of a desire to teach and explore in that field. We are as tightly bound to our own pasts as others. For some students a given faculty member will be able to provide very useful guidance, for others none. The third resource mentioned above is the staff. Penn is fortunate in having some fine professional services available to students. The psychologists and psychiatrists who work in offices such as the Counseling Service and Student Health are of continuing assistance to confused students. The Academic Offices and the other counseling groups in the Student Affairs division supplement these resources. However, the number of people involved is very small and not likely to increase while budgetary stringencies persist.

Before considering a model for an advising system there are two points which must be mentioned. The first deals with the advisee. He or she is a total human being with many interacting roles to play. Separation of the roles into easily discernible entities may be useful for those studying behavior. But to make the assumption that advice bearing on one role can be accepted and incorporated into action without reference to other roles is naive in the extreme, if not actually damaging. Any model predicated on principles which ignore the complexity of the interacting facets of a person's life will be ineffectual. The second point: unless the would-be advisee seeks out the person who can help him, no advice can be given. I make the distinction here between seeking advice and simply knowing that help is available. The vast majority of the undergraduate body knows that the Counseling Service exists, that faculty members are approachable, etc. A major problem which must be addressed is that a large proportion of those in need do *not* seek advice, or do so too late. A general attitudinal change is necessary before this situation is going to be dealt with at Penn. People must be encouraged to air their thoughts earlier in a receptive environment.

With the above in mind let us see what can be done to approximate a workable program with the resources at hand.

The freshman year is the most important time during which to focus each student's thinking upon his future. If early in this year increased interaction with the members of the academic advising staff, vocational and counseling services, together with close contact with at least one faculty member occurs a good start will be made. This increased interaction is to allow not only better understanding of the services, but

(Continued on page 4)

ADVISING (Continued from Page 3)

location of one or more people to whom the freshman may turn, as questions arise.

We hope to arrange enough courses, of fifteen or fewer, taught by fully affiliated faculty so that for a significant number of hours each week freshmen will have easy access to a concerned older person. Both the size of the class and the hours in contact are important to developing the rapport required. The learning experiences resulting from attendance at large lectures may not lead to significant differences in the attainment of knowledge. The effect of these lectures on interpersonal relationships, however, is devastating. Small classes at this juncture (first term at Penn) serve to encourage both faculty/student and peer group concern which cannot otherwise develop. Freshman oriented programs such as those at Hill Hall can also further increase awareness.

It is difficult to place too much emphasis on the first year. I mention as an example the University of Sussex, England. Sussex, founded a few years ago, decided that freshmen were in greater need of special attention than others. Accordingly, they inverted the normal class procedure investing far more faculty time in the first year than the last. They felt students in a major could study on their own with the aid of some large lecture courses while the freshmen should have tutorials and small classes to prepare for later independence. This attitude could have a significant effect on the morale of the student body and seems far more responsible than the traditional approach which we use.

If the freshman year program is successful one can realistically hope that each entering student will be able to find at least one older person in whom to confide. The success of the advising system in reacting to each student's needs as they arise will depend in considerable measure on the relationship between these two people. No individual can ever hope to field all of the questions raised by an advisee. This means that in order for the student to be aided the advisor must admit his ignorance and move to the role of an enabler or advocate.

The simplest mechanism that I have seen to bring specific resources to everyone's attention is to follow a pattern developed at other universities (Stanford is a recent example). A minimally staffed *Central Advising Office* is placed in an obvious location on the campus. Its function is to ascertain what information or aid is required and then expedite the receipt of the assistance by referral to the appropriate resource. The counselors are available to all members of the campus community. In particular they relieve faculty of the necessity of trying to remember details; a single phone number suffices. Students are free to inquire at will. Communication between the many offices dealing with their concerns is facilitated. Common difficulties become more immediately obvious. The Stanford version is staffed by one counselor and one secretary. Penn can afford to launch a similar project and should do so. I would favor this even if it means garnering funds from the existing advising programs.

I have avoided, until now, discussing the specific role each particular advising service on campus is to play. In most cases the area of expertise of each office is quite clear. Academic advising is carried by faculty members in the several school offices. The Counseling Service and Student Health were mentioned above. Placement, Preprofessional, Vocational, and Study Abroad, offices are self explanatory. None of these areas is sufficiently staffed, but they at least provide help on a limited basis.

There is one link missing in the chain, however. It is a Prevocational service. Most freshmen do not enter Pennsylvania with a clear picture of their strengths and weaknesses

and how these impinge on likely success in a vocation. Many have never systematically considered where their talents can lead them. It is most important that the university arrange for them to do so, for it is through these considerations that they become motivated to make the best use of their studies at Penn. Motivational problems have a truly deadening effect on performance and account for a not inconsiderable part of the apparent lack of interest that many students show in their coursework. The Counseling Service should be encouraged and supported in developing prevocational seminars. Everyone involved in advising should raise questions related to goal orientation with each student.

In summary I believe that advising is everyone's business at a university. Faculty, staff and students need to do their part. While structures can make more apparent the available resources, the ultimate success of any advising program rests with the concerns of the people participating. Let us hope that in the coming months and years increasing numbers of us will choose to become active in this area.

THE COLLEGE

FRESHMAN SEMINARS APPROVED

At last week's Faculty Meeting, the Educational Policy Committee's recommendation was approved, but only after a series of cautions about the effect on other students and a warning not to "allow the administration to default on its financial responsibilities," since 173 new classes will be required to carry it out. The text adopted:

The Committee on Educational Policy recommends that the College work toward the goal of providing an opportunity to every freshman who so desires to take at least one course taught by a full member of the faculty and limited to an enrollment of approximately 15 students.

The objective of such courses should be to guarantee close contact between the freshman student and a member of the faculty, and at the same time to present the student with a rigorous intellectual experience. Courses should be available in a wide range of academic areas. They might be departmental or interdepartmental; and it is anticipated that they will vary greatly in form and content. Hopefully, they will also enable the student to consult more freely with a faculty member about his academic plans and problems.

The Committee noted that a number of practical difficulties, both budgetary and curricular, will attend the implementation of this recommendation. We recognize also that the recommendation is not the unique solution to the problems of the freshman year. Nevertheless, we found the benefits envisaged by the proposal sufficiently great to justify a serious effort to put it into effect.

MAIL BALLOT ON GRADING POLICY

The Executive Committee of the College has proposed a written interpretation of grading policy, which was discussed at the December 7 meeting but will be voted upon by mail:

The College regulations require that the academic performance of every student in every course be evaluated and graded as a direct responsibility of the faculty member. This does not include such deviant practices as contracts without evaluation, self-marking, pass/fail administered by the instructor, student committee decisions that differ from regulations, and similar schemes.

One member called the statement a "thinly disguised censure of Doppelt and Segal"; the Dean described it instead as a kind of common law, "so long accepted that we have never bothered to put it into formal regulations."

"In submitting this for endorsement, we are simply asking the Faculty, 'Is this what we mostly believe in?'" he explained

after some members questioned voting at all upon an Executive Committee interpretation.

The Executive Board interpretation was by definition not subject to amendment. But when Philip Pochoda's *reductio-ad-absurdum* rewrite was introduced as a separate motion, it was both entertained and entertaining. (It was also defeated.)

... This does not include such deviant practices as contracts without evaluation, self-marking, pass/fail administered by the instructor, student committee decisions that differ from regulations, grades which discriminate on the basis of sex, religion, skin color, national (state or city) origins, height or general appearance; grades which adhere too closely to a curve or grades which deviate too far from a curve; and, most ominously, any utilization of grades which threatens to establish a personal, intrinsically rewarding relationship between faculty and students.

WHARTON SCHOOL

NEW GRADING AT WHARTON GRADUATE

Following is the background and text of the new grading system adopted on November 23.

A review of the current grading system was undertaken in Spring 1970 by the Wharton Graduate Standards Committee. Comments and suggestions were invited from faculty and Wharton Graduate students.

A Subcommittee on grading was appointed in the Fall of 1970, consisting of three faculty representatives: Professor Jerry Wind, Professor William Hamilton and Professor Ervin Miller; three student members: Mr. Robert Bennett, Mr. Kenneth Bridgewater, and Mr. Harvey Rubinstein; and one member of the administration: Mr. Scott Lederman.

The Subcommittee's Report was presented to the Wharton Graduate Standard's Committee and after careful deliberation the Committee submitted a proposal for a change in the grading system to the faculty on November 2. This proposal was accepted with some revisions by the faculty on Tuesday, November 23rd.

Effective in the Fall Semester 1972 the Wharton Graduate Grading System will consist of the following grades:

Distinguished

The "Distinguished" category will include those students who have performed outstanding work as determined by the instructor.

Pass

The "Pass" category will include all students who meet the requirements of a given course as determined by the instructor.

No Credit

The "No Credit" category will apply to all students whose work is deemed unsatisfactory by the instructor.

Incomplete

The "Incomplete" category will apply to students whose work has not been completed within the prescribed time because of circumstances deemed appropriate by the instructor. Work should be completed within a reasonable time prior to the end of the next term.

Academic Standards

The following guidelines will be used to implement the new grading system:

The instructor will determine those who deserve "Distinguished" grades in a given class. It is anticipated that experience will result in about 15% of all students being so classified. Within individual sections, wide variations are possible.

A "No Credit" grade will not be made a part of student's

permanent record; however, an administrative record will be maintained.

Any student who received one or more "No Credit" grades should be placed on probation. If the course in which a grade of "No Credit" is received is required, it must be repeated in the next term. If the course is optional, an alternative may be selected. Any student who receives a grade of "No Credit" in one-half or more of the courses taken in a term, or who fails to remove himself from probation in the following term, will be subject to dismissal.

A student may be removed from probation by completing all courses taken for credit in the semester following probationary action.

Any internal method of performance evaluation can be used by instructors but it is expected that at the outset of every term instructors will inform their students of the requirements that must be satisfied to complete a course with a "Pass" and also what is expected to obtain a "Distinguished" grade.

Recognition of Outstanding Performance

The Graduate Office will prepare an "Honors List" at the conclusion of each term. A student will be considered for the "Honors List" after completing nine courses (one year) and also after meeting the requirements for graduation. This list will consist of the top 5 percent of the students under consideration based on the percentage of "Distinguished" grades received.

Review

The recommended grading system will be reviewed at the end of a two year period (Summer 1974). This review will be conducted by the Wharton Standards Committee as seated in 1974 under the direction of the Director of Wharton Graduate.

—Samuel R. Sapienza, Director of Wharton Graduate

WASHINGTON

MORE ON THE OMNIBUS HIGHER EDUCATION BILL

Recent action by the Senate tends to confirm the point made in the November 23 issue of ALMANAC that no action will be forthcoming on a compromise higher education bill for some time. Instead of forwarding its bill (S-659) to a conference committee to reconcile differences between it and the House version the Senate returned it to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee for further amendment. The committee has agreed to return an amended bill to the Senate for debate late in January. Following debate at that time the Senate will decide whether to send the new bill to conference. The debate may be long and hard since it will undoubtedly involve antibusing and other amendments related to school desegregation and others concerning sex discrimination.

HEALTH MANPOWER TRAINING

The President signed into law the Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act (HR 8629) and the parallel Nurse Training Act (HR 8630) on November 18. While this legislation authorizes almost \$1.2 billion of expenditures during the current fiscal year, the Administration has requested a supplemental appropriation that would permit funding only about one-half of the authorized sum during the present year. Funding for subsequent years will face a similar problem, although in both cases it is likely that Congress will pass an appropriation bill providing funds somewhat in excess of those requested.

—Donald S. Murray

OF RECORD



CHRISTMAS VACATION

Following is the text of a memorandum issued November 10 by the Director of Personnel

Since Christmas Day and New Year's Day fall on Saturdays this year, the University will observe Friday, December 24, and Friday, December 31, as the days of observance for these holidays for all personnel.

Salaried University employees not represented by collective bargaining units will be excused from duty at the close of work on December 23 and in addition to the holidays will be granted a special winter vacation of the four working days between the two holiday dates, December 27 through 30 inclusive. Personnel under collective bargaining agreements will be governed by the holiday provision of their respective agreements.

Employees required to be present for duty on either of the holidays will be compensated on an overtime schedule. Employees on duty on any of the vacation days will be given compensatory time off at a later date.

Salary checks for the entire month of December will be distributed on Wednesday, December 15, for all employees normally paid on a semi-monthly basis; checks for persons paid on a monthly basis will be distributed on Friday, December 17.

—Fred C. Ford

OF RECORD

CHRISTMAS TREE
FIRE HAZARDS

Following is the text of a memorandum issued December 1 by the Senior Safety Engineer

Due to the inherent fire hazards associated with live cut Christmas trees it is suggested that only artificial type trees be purchased for campus use.

If you select a metallic tree it must be lighted from a remote source rather than from electric light strings due to the possibility of electric lighting wire shorts. Such shorts present not only a fire hazard but also a severe life hazard.

If you select a nonmetallic tree it should be clearly labeled "incombustible" or "fireproof." This is most important because according to the National Fire Protection Association some artificial trees on the market are as combustible as a live cut tree and may even give off toxic gases as they burn. Many of the imported, so-called "Hong Kong" trees are known to burn with considerable violence.

Your cooperation in this matter will assure a fire-safe Christmas and could possibly avert a serious tragedy in your department which could mar the holiday for all of us.

MERRY CHRISTMAS

—Benjamin F. Vilbert

BULLETINS

STRAVINSKY RECORDED IN RUSSIAN

The Department of Music has made a pressing, in limited edition, of the March 1971 performance of the University Choir and the Penn Contemporary Players of Igor Stravinsky's *Les Noces* (The Wedding). This performance, which was done in the original Russian, was broadcast several days later to the Soviet Union by the Voice of America. These recordings may be purchased for \$3.50 each in the Music Department Performance Activities office, Room 518 Annenberg Center.

MUSEUM HOLIDAY SCHEDULE

The University Museum will be closed during the holidays on December 24, 25 and 31 and on January 1. This is the first year the Museum has closed on Christmas Eve and New Year's Eve.

HOLIDAY SCHEDULE FOR GYMS AND POOLS

Gimbel-Sheerr facilities closed for maintenance, Dec. 13-Jan. 16.
Weightman Hall closed for maintenance, Dec. 24-Jan. 16.

To December 23:

	Weekdays	Saturdays	Sundays
Hutchinson Gym	11:30-9:30	10:00-5:00	2:00-5:00
Hutchinson Pool	Noon-5:00*	Noon-5:00	2:00-5:00
Ringe Courts	11:30-9:30	10:00-5:00	2:00-5:00
Weightman Hall	11:30-9:30	Closed	Closed
Weightman Pool M/W/Th	12:00-3:00	Closed	Closed
Weightman Pool Tu/F	12:00-6:00	Closed	Closed

*Open Tuesday and Friday evenings, 7:30-9:00 P.M.

December 28, 29:

Hutchinson Gym	11:30-7:30
Hutchinson Pool	12:00-7:00
Ringe Courts	11:30-7:30

January 3-15:

Hutchinson Gym	11:30-7:30	10:00-5:00	2:00-7:00
Hutchinson Pool	12:00-7:00	10:00-5:00	2:00-7:00
Ringe Courts	11:30-7:30	10:00-5:00	2:00-7:00

For additional information telephone Ext. 6100

UPCOMING IN WINTER SPORTS

Dec. 18	8:45	Basketball	Temple	Home
Dec. 23	8:00	Basketball	W. Kentucky	Away
Dec. 26	Hockey	St. Louis U. Tournament	St. Louis
Dec. 28	Hockey	St. Louis U. Tournament	St. Louis
Dec. 28	Basketball	Kodak Classic	Rochester, N. Y.
Dec. 29	Basketball	Kodak Classic	Rochester, N. Y.
Jan. 5	8:00	Hockey	Cornell	Away
Jan. 7	8:05	Basketball	Dartmouth	Home
Jan. 8	7:00	Hockey	New Hampshire	Away
	7:05	Basketball	Harvard	Home
Jan. 11	8:00	Basketball	Princeton	Away

MEMORIAL BOOK FUND

The University has established an endowed fund which will purchase books for campus libraries in memory of deceased alumni and friends designated by the donor. The fund will pool and invest all gifts; thus income can provide more than one book over the years in memory of the deceased. Special bookplates will be placed in each book, and a list of those so remembered will be kept in the Rare Book Room at Van Pelt Library. The Alumni and Friends Memorial Book Fund can be contacted at 417 Franklin Building.

IN A NEW PENN FACILITY, ENGINEERS STUDY THE WAYS OF THE WIND

Wind tunnels are used to study many things other than the design of airplanes.

The new low-speed wind tunnel at the Towne School, for instance, will be used to conduct basic investigations into wind effects on buildings, bridges, transmission towers, smokestacks and cable-supported structures at speeds up to 140 miles per hour.

Architectural problems involving heat loss and ventilation, the behavior of towed cables in oceanographic studies, building sway, howling communication wires, and air pollution caused by poorly designed chimneys are other problems that can and should be studied in advance, according to Dr. Norman A. Evans, Associate Professor of Mechanical Engineering at the Towne School.

In recognition of this, the National Science Foundation recently granted Dr. Evans \$61,500 to study low shear flow around bluff bodies. What this means in simpler terms, he says, is that he will be looking at the way wind patterns form as they are shed by buildings and other tall structures. These wind patterns, or vortices, have been responsible for such spectacular structural failures as the Tacoma Narrows Bridge disaster in 1940, and more recently, the sudden collapse of of three out of eight giant cooling towers at Ferrybridge, England.

The Pennsylvania investigations will consist of a systematic series of experiments using bluff (non-streamlined) cylinders of varying lengths, diameters, and taper ratios representing simplified models of buildings and other structures. By subjecting these bluff bodies to air flows whose turbulence and velocities simulate the variations present in a natural wind, important data can be obtained for use in structural mechanics, architecture, and even ocean engineering where submerged struts and cables undergo stresses and strains similar to those caused by wind effects.

The new wind tunnel, which took two years to complete, was built with the help of funds and equipment donated by the Westinghouse Corporation. Its return circuit total length is about 130 feet, and the test section is 6 feet long, 40 inches wide, and 30 inches high. Wind speeds generated by a 50 hp Westinghouse motor will range between 2 and 200 feet per second, with special wind shear effects creatable by a stacked array of flow retarding flat plates.

Using the tunnel, Dr. Evans NSF project will examine vortex shedding from a single body such as a building or tower; the buffeting effects that vortices shed by an upstream body have on a downstream body; vortex shedding and interaction with multiple bodies including side-by-side structures; and finally, the effect that an oscillatory body, such as a cable, will have on the pattern of the vortices it sheds.

Vortex shedding is a complex, unsteady, wave-like motion the side effects of which received little attention prior to the Tacoma Narrows Bridge incident. Results of the investigation following that disaster revealed, however, that it was not the direct force of the wind that caused the bridge to fall, but the periodic resonancies created by the structure itself as it interacted with the wind speeds as low as 30-40 miles per hour. By testing scale models in advance at various stages of completion, the safest construction sequence and design modifications for bridges and other structures can be more correctly determined, Dr. Evans says. Incomplete bridges, he adds, are especially susceptible to excessive wind loading.

Wind effects also play a role in structural fatigue and foundation settlement and tilt that leads to cracked masonry

and plaster in building interiors. Structures which require precise alignment, such as microwave transmission towers, have also been known to become unserviceable due to excess buffeting. Wind tunnel tests on models of the English cooling towers revealed that it was their particular grouping that caused maximum stress on the towers in the leeward row, rather than those closest to the wind. Over a period of time, these stresses ultimately caused the towers to fall.

Among the most important areas yet to be studied by aerodynamicists, says Dr. Evans, are cable-supported structures such as the roof of the new Madison Square Garden.

"No one knows what effect the wind has in excitation," he says, "because the motion of a flexible structure actually changes the local velocity distribution of the approaching wind." Dr. Evans expects to start his tests with a single cable and work up from there.

"It is becoming increasingly apparent that even closer cooperation between structural designers and aerodynamicists will be needed as designs and construction techniques become more sophisticated," he concluded.

—Don Fey

LETTERS

THE NUMBERS GAME

As the brave new University sallies forth, nothing manifests its direction so well as the language it uses; I was delighted to note all the progressive use of alphanumeric in the last edition of ALMANAC (Vol. 18, No. 12). In particular, the very creative avoidance of the man-woman, human-machine discrimination in the announcement of the A-3 Assembly was a superb thrust forward.

However, I do have a modest proposal to make. For such a lofty institution as ours, wouldn't the designations Alpha, Beta, Gamma and Delta have a much better ring than the present A-1, A-2, A-3 and A-4? They sound so much more intellectual and literary, and they allow a much more convenient expansion for the future. For example, various grades of Betas (the present A-2's) could be distinguished as to tenure by the designations Plus or Minus.

Any institution, however fast it is changing, must maintain contact with the past. I believe my proposed use of Greek letters provides just such a contact and pleasant reminder of those bygone days when our students used these very same letters as designations of social rank.

And, in addition, my proposal would, I think, be another great step forward. May I urge all your readers who support my plan to send a short memo to our Number One A-1 indicating their approval?

Sincerely yours,

530-30-3723, A-2

NUMBERS TO KNOW

The University has been informed by the City of Philadelphia that the University's radio code numbers this winter will again be:

102 for day classes, and

2102 for evening classes.

These code numbers will be used by broadcast media to identify the University in announcements of the closing of institutions due to adverse weather conditions.

THE COUNCIL

A TEACHER IS TO TEACH

In response to a student member's query at Council, Provost Curtis Reitz warmly denied that Professor Edward Banfield (Page 1) might have chosen Pennsylvania for a lighter teaching load as reported in the campus press. "Ed Banfield is a superb and dedicated teacher," the Provost said. "I am sure that he will teach as much as or more than any normal faculty member. Anyone who ever looked at his work, whether at Chicago or Harvard, will recognize that a man who loves teaching as much as he does will be in the classroom."

A PARTIAL HONOR CODE IN EFFECT

For the coming examination period, the Council recommended two provisions of the newly-proposed Honor Code be implemented by the schools, and sent the Code as a whole to the Educational Policy Committee for review and possible revision.

The portions that are to be implemented state that "the instructor is given the ultimate responsibility for maintaining honest conduct in his course," and that "proctoring is recommended."

Council asked the Educational Policy Committee for urgent consideration, Professor Kravis pointing out that "the students themselves have come forward with this desire."

Suggested especially for review were the "F—discipline" provision, which conflicts with present College regulations, and the self-perpetuating character of the proposed Honor Board.

NEWS IN BRIEF CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

Engineering, and will be used to investigate wind effects on buildings, bridges, transmission towers and other structures at speeds up to 140 miles per hour. It will also be possible to study various architectural and air pollution problems with the help of the new wind tunnel. (See Page 7.)

A.C.E. POSITION FOR MRS. EMERSON

Mrs. Alice F. Emerson, Dean of Students, has been named to the Academic Affairs Commission of the American Council on Education, for a three-year term starting January 1.

The Commission is concerned with students, faculty and curriculum in higher education, as "perennial elements" in a changing social and economic atmosphere.

THERE IS STILL TIME . . .

The University's statistics are "very peculiar" in this year's United Fund Torch Drive: fewer givers gave more per person, according to co-chairmen Henry Abraham and Ray Saalbach.

But the Drive is still short of its goal, and needs more dollars as well as more donors.

Like the downtown Torch Drive, the campus campaign has been extended into December in the hope that "end-of-the-year" gifts will bring the University up to the mark of \$83,317 set for it.

THE ROTC ISSUE: YES TO RESOLUTION #2

After Resolution #2 polled the majority in a five-way straw vote at Council December 8, the so-called compromise resolution on ROTC was introduced formally, amended slightly and carried promptly. The voice vote was almost unanimous.

The 59 members present and voting had a choice among four amendments, plus the option to abstain formally, in the straw-vote stage. Under special Rules of the Day, if the primary resolution based on the Dwyer Report (which recommended working to "assure continuance" of ROTC) failed, the Council was to express preferences among the other choices until all but one dwindled and died. The surviving resolution would still require formal action.

Resolution #1 did fail in the straw vote, polling 17 yeas, 40 nays and 1 abstention.

Resolution #2 took its majority on the next round, polling 37 of the potential 59. Sixteen votes went to Resolution #3, which would have eliminated all curricular ROTC. Four went to #4, which called for elimination of extracurricular ROTC as well; and two voters registered formal abstention.

After #2 was introduced formally by Steering Committee Chairman Abraham, two amendments were introduced by Dean Wolfman. The first, to eliminate "in common with other institutions" below, carried. The motion to eliminate Item 3 in the Resolution failed. The text, as amended, constitutes the Council's advice to the President:

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, William Tortu*

ALMANAC: 515 Franklin Building, Ext. 5274

EditorKaren C. Gaines

Assistant EditorAnne M. Geuss