

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION SEMINAR

In the December 7 ALMANAC it was announced that University personnel would for the first time come under the regulations and protection of unemployment compensation effective January 1, 1972.

A series of seminars was conducted in December to acquaint administrative and office staffs with the operation of this program. Although these seminars were well-attended, we find that some departments were not represented. Therefore, we will conduct another seminar on Wednesday, February 9, at 10 A.M. in Lecture Room A, Basement Medical Labs Building. It is requested that those departments not represented at the December seminars make every effort to attend this session.

—J. B. Kramer, Benefits Officer

NEWS IN BRIEF

BUDGET COMMITTEE: ON FACULTY HIRING

The Budget Committee has advised the President and the Provost that it can foresee the probability of "an essentially balanced budget" for fiscal 1973 without further reductions in faculty size. The recommendation suggests "faculty appointments be authorized in a number which will result in a total faculty salary expenditure for the University next year no greater than the current budget (before compensation adjustments)." It also recommends that a procedure for selective schools and departments where appointments are to be made be established by the Provost with the advice of the Subcommittee on Academic Programs.

GO WELL, MR. RUSSELL

Vice Provost John A. Russell told his staff at a luncheon Friday that he will leave the University as of June 30.

THE NEW MATH?

"Far from cutting back 75%," said President Meyerson more than once last week, "we propose to quadruple, at least, the number of graduate fields in which we are top-ranked nationally."

He was responding to the arithmetic of a metropolitan daily, which had taken the total number of graduate groups here (over 60), subtracted the number in which Mr. Meyerson proposed we achieve "superlative" position (12 or 15) and headlined a "75% cutback" in graduate programs.

"I hope no one seriously believes that a University of our potential would strip itself to a total of 12 or 15 fields," the President said later. "It is one thing to aim to become truly preeminent in that number, surpassed by almost no other institutions in those fields, and I feel very safe in doing so. But it is quite another to suppose that we could have so few fields altogether and still be able to develop the kind of disciplinary and interdisciplinary strengths we are striving for."

Editor's Note: (The full text of the January 12 report appeared in ALMANAC January 25. See especially paragraph G on the second page of the report.)

IN THIS ISSUE

- SENATE: *Of Common Sense* (Abraham)
- AAUP Nominations • *Faculty-In-Residence Experiment*
- *Future of the University: A Proposal* (Callen)
- COUNCIL: *Agenda; Conflict of Interest*
- *Report of the McGill Committee* (Full Text)

Almanac

Volume 18, Number 21

February 8, 1972

Published weekly by the University of Pennsylvania

DYSON TO HEAD DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION: STELLAR AND SIXTEEN OTHERS WILL SERVE

President Martin Meyerson has announced that Dr. Robert H. Dyson Jr., Professor of Anthropology and Curator of the Museum's Near East Section, will serve as Chairman of the University Development Commission which will help launch a major academic development effort for the '70s.

Dr. Eliot Stellar, Director of the Institute of Neurological Sciences and Professor of Physiological Psychology in the Department of Anatomy, will be Vice Chairman.

The following faculty members have agreed to serve:

Dr. Renee Fox, Professor of Sociology in Psychiatry;

Professor Britton Harris, Chairman, City Planning;

Dr. Arthur Humphrey, Director, Chemical Engineering;

William Keller, (C '73);

Dr. Julius Margolis, Director, Fels Center;

Dr. Robert W. Nason, Assistant Professor, Marketing;

H. M. Neiditch, GSAS;

Ruth Ann Price, (CW '74);

Dr. Philip Rieff, Benjamin Franklin Professor, Sociology;

Dr. Burton Rosner, Professor of Psychology;

Dr. Barbara Ruch, Associate Professor, Japanese;

Dr. J. Robert Schrieffer, Mary Amanda Wood Professor, Physics;

Dr. Otto Springer, University Professor, German;

Carol Weiss, Graduate School of Education student;

Dr. John Wideman, Associate Professor, English;

Dr. Bernard Wolfman, Dean and Professor, Law;

Dr. Michael Zuckerman, Associate Professor, History;

Ex officio members will include Dr. Henry Abraham and Dr. Jean Crockett, as Chairman and Chairman-Elect of the Senate Advisory Committee; Dr. Lawrence Klein, Chairman of the Academic Planning Committee; and Dr. Ralph Amado, Chairman of the Educational Policy Committee; Also serving ex officio will be three Trustees' committee chairmen: John Eckman (Development); Henry Chance II (Long Range Planning); and Dr. Carl Kaysen (Educational Policy).

Faculty nominees and the general charge to the Commission were discussed with the Steering Committee of Council at its January 26 meeting, President Meyerson said. The Senate Advisory Committee may also nominate additional members.

At a preliminary meeting Saturday, the group was given the initial charge by the President and the Provost. Since its work will be primarily influencing the fund-raising efforts of the University, the group also heard a presentation from Vice President E. Craig Sweeten.

"We soon realized," said Dr. Dyson, "that our first task must be the formulation of a very specific agenda to review with the major committees concerned with our efforts; that is, the Steering Committee of the Council, the Senate Advisory Committee and the Council of Academic Deans."

THE SENATE

From the Chairman:

OF COMMON SENSE

Unlike the *Daily Pennsylvanian* and WEOUP (Women for Equal Opportunity at the University of Pennsylvania) I do not possess powers of clairvoyance. Consequently, I shall refrain from commenting here—calmly or shrilly—on the contents of the Affirmative Action Plan Report, which has not been published to date (2/4/72) and is still very much in draft form. (As Chairman of the Faculty Senate, I have been invited to comment on three separate draft versions and have done so in writing to the appropriate authorities.)

However, there is now officially extant a report on which I should like to venture some observations: the Report of the University Council's Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Appointment and Promotion Policies and Procedures, chaired by Professor Dan McGill (which is reproduced in full, *infra*). It has just been submitted to the Council's Steering Committee where, in all likelihood, it will be discussed at its February 23 meeting. Without endorsing it in every nuance, the Report strikes me as a timely, sensible, and realistic document. The following random comments may serve as illustrations of that sentiment.

First, the Report's carefully delineated endeavor to standardize appointment and promotion procedures at both the Department and School levels of that so delicately crucial process is as commendable as it is necessary in order to achieve fundamentals of fair and equitable procedure. Deviations should be permitted in only the most persuasive circumstances.

Second, whereas the Report urges that students, especially those at the post-baccalaureate level, should be encouraged to make suggestions for new appointments or for the promotion of existing faculty members; that student evaluation of teaching effectiveness be made an integral part of the personnel procedures of the University; and that student input into personnel decisions "is highly desirable and is strongly recommended," it wisely insists that there should be *no* student representation on either the Departmental review or School personnel committees. In the language of the Report:

Generally speaking, students lack the maturity and perspective to evaluate the professional competence of faculty members whose intellectual development should be several stages beyond that of the students. Moreover [these committees are] concerned with matters of great sensitivity that not only affect the harmony with which the department members work together but also the future careers of the persons whose cases are being considered. In addition, *students, being transient members of the academic community, do not have to live with the consequences of their decisions.* This is a particularly relevant point in this context since personnel decisions, especially those involving tenure, tend to have long-range implications for the institution. (P. 15, italics added.)

Third, although the Report subscribes to the general statement of principles set forth in the Introduction to the statement on "Faculty Appointment and Promotion Policies" approved by the Educational Council in 1960, it concludes that instructional responsibilities and research efforts have not been kept in proper balance; that, for many years, research has been assigned a higher priority than teaching. The Committee believes, understandably, that "the two academic functions must be given equal weight if the University is to discharge its traditional responsibilities" (p. 26) and insists that its internal

rewards system "must be structured in such a manner as to promote the twin goals of good research and good teaching" (p. 26). That leaves unsettled the vexatious problem of just *how* one *effectively* measures good teaching—but the basic recommendation is unquestionably sound.

Fourth, while decrying "inbreeding" and its undesirable effects, the Report sensibly urges a University policy that will "seek out the most highly qualified prospects for its faculty, without geographical, institutional or other arbitrary restrictions" (p. 29). In short, *quality (ability)* should be, must be, and—hopefully—will be *the* governing criterion in personnel policy!

Fifth, the just-stated conclusion logically leads the Committee to considerations of University policy toward women. Its Report strongly "deplores any discrimination that may have occurred in the past" and naturally insists that women applying for and holding faculty positions be judged by the same criteria as men, and that they be "accorded the same treatment as men with respect to all substantive conditions of employment, including rank, compensation, and research opportunities" (pp. 30-31). But, the Report concludes, there should *not* be

any *preferential* treatment of women, or any other special group, even though directed toward the redressing of inequities that have existed in the past. The Committee would be *especially opposed to a quota system or to a presumption that any candidate is superior or inferior by reason of sex alone.* Such approaches would almost inevitably lead to a deterioration of faculty standards. (P. 32; italics added except for "preferential" which is in the original.)

Those charged with final responsibility for the University's Affirmative Action Plan would do well to heed and to adhere to those so perceptively enunciated basic principles and admonitions.



AAUP: NOMINATIONS ARE IN ORDER

AAUP Chapter President James O. Friedman (Law) has named this year's nominating committee, which will propose a slate of four officers and three board members for 1972-73. Elections will be held at the annual meeting at noon on April 19. The committee urges members to send suggestions to any of the four members: Dr. Morris Mendelson, Associate Professor of Finance; Dr. Brian Chellas, Assistant Professor of Philosophy; Dr. Ann R. Miller, Associate Professor of Sociology and Senior Research Associate in Population Studies; and Dr. Marvin L. Sachs, Assistant Professor of Medicine.

INTELLECTUAL EXPERIMENT: FACULTY-IN-RESIDENCE

A Faculty-in-Residence program has been proposed for University residence halls, and a call is being issued for faculty members to join the live-in experiment.

To counter what they call "disappointment and alienation" from both new faculty and students who had expected a community of scholars, the organizers have proposed to create "houses" (in the hi-rises, floors) devoted to specific subjects: a dramatic arts floor, a mathematics floor and others, generally following Middlebury's successful pattern of Language Houses.

Year-round living space and a modest program budget are proposed for each faculty member involved. "College House proves that the goal is both worthwhile and attainable," said Jim Cocroft, teaching assistant and coordinator of the project, "but College House alone can't reach everyone. Another project, or series of projects is needed—meaning faculty is needed."

Those interested may contact Mr. Cocroft at EV 2-5127 evenings, or leave word for him at Political Science, Ext. 7641.

The Future of the University of Pennsylvania: A Proposal

by Herbert Callen

The University of Pennsylvania faces a crisis of survival. It is a crisis shared with other great, private academic centers. Tuition costs have risen to prohibitive levels but they lag behind operating costs. Only 18% of college students remain in private institutions, and this remnant decreases by approximately 1% per year. The imminent demise of the great traditional, scholarly institutions is a potential national catastrophe. We, the faculty of the University of Pennsylvania, must set our minds and imaginations to a solution of this national crisis; a solution which best should begin at our own University. We must find a role for the University of Pennsylvania which will permit its survival and protect its essential strengths.

The University will not survive by following traditional patterns. We cannot provide the same function as the public universities, complacently telling ourselves that somehow we will "do it better." We do it worse. The ever-larger freshman classes glut our capacity in swollen survey courses and in bloated introductory lectures. Students properly demand smaller classes, closer student-faculty interaction, and a highly personalized advisory system. Freshmen and sophomores critically need guidance at least as much as they need instruction. But our faculty has not been selected for its ability to provide guidance to young students. Scholarly distinction is highly correlated with ability to teach a scholarly discipline, but there is no evidence that it is correlated with the ability to relate emotionally and supportively to freshman students. There are many colleges and universities which do select their faculty for precisely this capability. It may be heresy, but I believe that to our freshmen we deliver an inferior service at an exorbitantly inflated price.

Are we then to retreat from undergraduate education, to focus on research and graduate education? That is simply not a feasible proposal. Graduate enrollments are neither increasing nor self-supporting. And our society is becoming increasingly parsimonious in its support of scholarship and research.

Fortunately our faculty is well suited to the education of junior and senior undergraduate students who, having selected a major, are relatively committed and focused. If we do rather badly in the education of freshmen and sophomores, we do quite well in the education of juniors and seniors. I am continually impressed by the contrast in morale of the sophomore and junior classes. The distinction between the first two years and the second two years of undergraduate education is, in fact, greater than the distinction between the senior year and the first year or two of graduate education. Many of our graduate courses are open to advanced undergraduates, and it is rare that one can distinguish between the students. But the freshman and sophomore, engaged primarily in maturation, in adjustment to an adult world, and perhaps to a somewhat amorphous concept of "liberal education," is a very different student indeed.

I propose that the University of Pennsylvania concentrate its undergraduate emphasis on the junior and senior classes.

President Meyerson, in another connection, has proposed that this university should build upon its areas of strength, and de-emphasize its areas of weakness. I would apply that theorem to suggest that we should build upon our junior and senior undergraduate education and de-emphasize our freshman and sophomore education.

There are those who will object that the cost of upper-class education is greater than the cost of lower-class education, and that therefore my proposal is a blueprint for bankruptcy. I do not believe that to be true. We have indeed educated freshmen and sophomores cheaply in the past, in huge impersonal lectures. That is no longer acceptable. We are already instituting Freshmen Seminar programs as well as General Honors programs, Colleges of Thematic Studies, and various other similar proposals. The low cost of freshman and sophomore education is a fact only of history. The increasing effectiveness with which students represent their interests insures that the costs of upper-class and lower-class education will converge.

The cost of upper-class education can be at least partially reduced under my proposal. To some extent the present costs reflect the small enrollment of students in some major fields, necessitating classes which are very small and very expensive. By admitting students at the junior level we shall be able both to increase and to balance the population somewhat more evenly among major fields, thereby decreasing the average cost of instruction. But most important, concentration on education at the upper-class level will enable us to provide a uniquely valuable quality education, which will justify the premium tuition which we must charge.

Experimental and Tentative

I would suggest that this plan, or any other plan, should be explored experimentally and tentatively rather than precipitously. I believe that we should seek an increasing number of transfer students while decreasing the size of the freshman class. The number of transfer students should be determined primarily by the size and quality of the applicant pool. Requests for transfer applications were received from 8000 students this year, despite an official policy of discouraging such applications. The 8000 were informed that we take relatively few transfer students, and that no financial aid whatever is available. Despite this, fully 1200 returned their applications. This pool is potentially comparable in size to the pool from which we now draw our freshman class. I believe that the pool might well be expanded, both in quantity and quality, by imaginative and attractive programs.

An extensive program of loan funds could draw to the University, for the junior and senior years, middle-income students who are now effectively disbarred. Families who cannot undertake the obligation of four years of tuition might well be able to undertake two years financed through loan programs. The shift from outright tuition grants to loan programs could have great economic advantages for the University, and the extension of educational opportunity to middle-income families would have important social benefits.

Combined upper-class undergraduate and Masters programs, taking three or four years, would be logical and attractive in some fields.

I would propose that the University of Pennsylvania might extend to some high school graduates, of high academic ability, a provisional deferred acceptance into the junior class, contingent upon their maintenance of an appropriate academic standing in the first two years at a tax-supported institution. Such students could be assigned academic advisors at the University of Pennsylvania to maintain contact through the first

two years. Again, such a program would decrease the cost of education to the student and would permit us to provide instruction at that stage at which we are most proficient.

In some cases I would propose that students be permitted to engage in other than purely academic work during their first two years, again under the guidance of an academic advisor at the University of Pennsylvania. A student with a constructive job, perhaps taking one or two courses in evening school, would in many cases be more ready to assume upper-class undergraduate work than a counterpart who follows our traditional freshman and sophomore curriculum.

The challenges are many, and I have not explored the full range of possibilities, nor the full implications of any one. But this would be a new and dramatic direction for the University, and one which would provide a leadership role not based on gimmickry, but based on an honest recognition of the strengths and the limitations of this University as it is.

(Dr. Callen, Professor of Physics, is the immediate past chairman of the Senate.)

THE COUNCIL

AGENDA FOR FEBRUARY 9

For the Council meeting starting at 4 p.m. Wednesday, February 9, the agenda includes three items:

A. Proposed amendments to the by-laws on (1) making the Personnel Benefits Committee a standing committee of Council; (2) composition of consultative committees in the selection of deans and (3) changes in procedure for electing members to the Steering Committee of Council.

B. The Steering Committee's motion to create a special committee on the representation of professional non-faculty and paraprofessional employees in the governance of the University.

C. Discussion but not action on the Report of the Subcommittee on Conflict of Interest (see below).

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Both the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Committee on Research have adopted the May 14, 1971, Report of their joint Subcommittee on Conflict of Interest, titled "Policy on Extramural Consultative and Business Activities of Fully-Affiliated Faculty Members." The text is available in full at the Office of the Secretary.

Subcommittee Chairman David E. Boyce said the Report restates and reaffirms the existing policy on extramural consulting; that it proposes an operational definition of "continuing engagement" as one extending over more than one academic term; and that it provides a new form for annual reporting. It also proposes major new policies regarding fully-affiliated faculty who are associated with business organizations.

"I would like to indicate that all of the members of the Subcommittee fully concur in this proposal except one," Dr. Boyce told the Faculty Affairs and Research Committees in transmitting this Report. "Professor John Lubin of the Wharton School has argued in the meetings of the Subcommittee, and in a recent memo to me, that he favors a procedure requiring a faculty member to disclose his business organization's proposed activities, but *not* requiring the response of the University in order for him to proceed. In contrast, the proposed policy asks that the faculty member's chairman, and dean or director, *concur* in his proposed extramural activity. Professor Lubin feels such a response would be too cumbersome to be practicable. In support of the Subcommittee's recommendation on

this point, it should be noted that the existing policy on extramural activities requires concurrence of a member's chairman and dean for any continuing extramural activity, including businesses. The proposed policy further details this basic precept with regard to a faculty member's extramural business organization."

Discussion but not action on the Report is slated for the February 9 Council meeting. Members of the faculty wishing to convey their positions may consult the constituency list in the September 14 ALMANAC, noting substitutions as follows:

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 7. College (History, etc.) | Edward M. Peters |
| 15. Wharton (Pol. Sci., Sociology) | Stefan J. Kapsch |
| 18. Medicine | Peter C. Nowell |
| 19. Medicine | Howard Rasmussen |
| 20. Medicine | Philip G. Mechanick |
| 21. Medicine | Brooke Roberts |

MCGILL COMMITTEE REPORT

The Report of the Council's Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Appointment and Promotion Policies and Procedures has been submitted to the Council Steering Committee for consideration at its February meeting. The Report begins with the introduction below, and continues in the text opposite. A 16-page appendix (Exhibit I) is available for inspection at the Office of the Secretary.

December, 1971

This Committee was appointed by the Steering Committee of the University Council and was composed of faculty and student members of three Council committees, namely, the Faculty, Post-Baccalaureate and Undergraduate Affairs Committees. In legal status, it is an ad hoc subcommittee of those three standing committees. It was asked "to survey faculty appointment and promotion procedures and policies in the various schools and faculties of the University and to prepare a report for the Council summarizing and analyzing these practices, with such comments as it would consider useful and desirable."

The Council authorized the appointment of the Committee on May 14, 1969 but primarily because of the difficulty of obtaining nominations for student members, the Committee was not constituted until March, 1970. The first meeting was held on March 16, 1970. As an aid to its deliberations, the Committee obtained from the dean of each school a statement of the appointment and promotion policies and procedures applicable to that school. The statements have been summarized and presented in tabular form as Exhibit I of this report. Contact has been maintained with the various schools throughout the period of this study and the descriptions embodied in Exhibit I are current as of the date of this report.

In an effort to gain greater insight into the policies and problems of the various schools, the Committee sought and obtained personal interviews with Provost David Goddard, Associate Dean Gordon Keith of the Wharton School, Dean Alfred Gellhorn of the Medical School, Carl Chambers, Vice-President for Engineering Affairs, and Dean Bernard Wolfman of the Law School. The policies and procedures of the College were ably explained by former Dean Otto Springer and the other two College representatives on the Committee, Ralph Amado and Theodore Hornberger, both of whom are currently serving on the College Personnel Committee. On April 29, 1971, the Committee discussed its tentative report with the University Council Committees on Faculty Affairs, Post-Baccalaureate Affairs, and Undergraduate Affairs. This meeting generated a number of suggestions which have been incorporated in the final report. Altogether, the Committee met twenty times in formal session. On most issues, the Committee was able to reach unanimous agreement. As might be expected, some of the recommendations were supported with varying degrees of enthusiasm.

Dr. Dan M. McGill, Chairman

Dr. Ralph D. Amado, Dr. Joseph Bordogna, Edward M. Glenn (Student), Dr. Sidney W. Hess, Dr. Theodore Hornberger, Miss Anne L. Putnam (Student), Dr. Otto Springer, Dr. Vincent H. Whitney

FACULTY APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Present Procedures and Policies

The procedures and policies currently followed in the various schools are set forth in some detail in Exhibit I*, and it would serve no useful purpose to repeat the information in this section. The purpose of this section is to summarize general procedures and policies, noting significant differences among the major schools. The discussion is organized along functional rather than school lines. Unless otherwise noted, the described practices are applicable to both appointments and promotions, without distinction as to whether or not the personnel actions involve tenure. The general procedures within a given school tend to be the same for appointments and promotions.

Initiation of Recommendations

In most schools of the University, recommendations for the appointment or promotion of faculty members originate with the departmental chairman. As a matter of fact, under existing University regulations the departmental chairman is vested with the authority and charged with the responsibility of performing this function. In practice, however, any faculty member can initiate appointment or promotion procedures by making recommendations to his departmental chairman or to a properly constituted committee within the department.

There are a number of schools that do not have conventional budgetary departments and different procedures must be followed therein. In the Annenberg School of Communications, for example, the usual procedure is for the Dean or the Executive Committee to initiate all recommendations. In the Graduate School of Education, ad hoc Search Committees are appointed by the Dean and are given the responsibility of making recommendations for new appointments; the Faculty Personnel Committee or Program Coordinators normally initiate recommendations for reappointment or promotion. In the four Engineering Schools, the school director (who is a counterpart to the departmental chairman) is responsible for all appointment and promotion recommendations, although as in all the schools any faculty member can suggest such action.

The Law School has a Standing Committee on Additions to the Faculty that generates all actions associated with faculty appointments. The Committee consists of three faculty members appointed by the Dean, one student nominated by the Law School student organization, and the Dean *ex officio*. The Committee maintains extensive files on potential additions and interviews many individuals for every position vacancy. The Dean initiates all promotion actions, with the advice of the Standing Committee acting without the student member. (In other words, the student member participates in the search for new faculty members but does not review recommendations for promotion. The rationale for this arrangement is that the appointment of a new faculty member usually has curricular implications, since he will have been employed to teach a particular branch of the law, and the Law School faculty believes that the students should have a voice in the determination of what is to be taught.) Student comment on the teaching ability of candidates for promotion is traditionally sought before final action is taken on the recommendations. All recommendations for promotion must be endorsed by the tenured faculty members holding a rank equal to or higher than that under consideration.

In the School of Social Work, all recommendations for appointment and promotion are originated by the Personnel Advisory Committee, which is appointed by the Dean. The Dean of the School of Nursing initiates all recommendations for appointment and promotion, since there are no departments within the School. Most of the appointments are at a rank below that of assistant professor, since few of the faculty members hold doctorates, and promotions are rare. Finally, in the School of Allied Medical Professions which does have departments, recommendations for initial appointments flow from a Search Committee which is appointed by the Dean and includes at least one representative from the department involved.

*May be inspected at the Office of the Secretary.

In making his recommendations for appointment or promotion, the departmental chairman is expected to consult with other members of the department, especially those holding the rank of professor. In some departments, particularly the smaller ones, all faculty members with the rank of assistant professor or above participate in appointment decisions. Those holding a rank higher than that of the person being considered generally participate in promotion decisions. The Wharton School requires the departmental chairman to consult with all full professors in the department on promotions, although the recommendation need not be unanimous. In the Medical School, the departments of which tend to be very large (some having as many as two hundred faculty members), the general practice is to have departmental personnel committees which act on all matters of a staffing nature. These committees are typically composed of eight members, four appointed by the departmental chairman and four elected by the members of the department. As a rule, only senior faculty members sit on the personnel committee.

Input and Documentation

The basic documentation for an appointment or promotion recommendation is a resume, usually prepared by the nominee, that sets forth the essential facts concerning the nominee's educational background, teaching experience, research contributions, public service, and other relevant activities. In some schools, e.g., the Wharton School, copies of the nominee's major publications must accompany the departmental chairman's letter of recommendation in order that the quality of the nominee's research can be assessed by the school review committee.

In all schools except two, recommendations for promotion and tenure appointment must be supported by letters from recognized scholars at other academic institutions, research organizations, governmental agencies, or business firms. The primary purpose of these letters is to give evidence that the nominee's academic accomplishments have been of such scope and quality as to make him known to his peers at other respected institutions. The letters may be sought by the departmental chairman, and attached to his letter of recommendation, or by the school review committee from persons suggested by the departmental chairman. Letters are not *required* under any circumstances in the School of Nursing but they are frequently submitted. The Law School does not make a practice of acquiring nor does it deem essential the use of letters from outside sources on the grounds that its faculty is perfectly capable of evaluating its own members and no other law schools with which it compares itself use outside sources of evaluation. On the other hand, the various schools of the medical complex, which might with some legitimacy have claimed immunity from external evaluation, place great importance on letters from respected colleagues at other institutions.

Several of the schools, including Wharton, the Law School, the Graduate School of Fine Arts, the Graduate School of Education, and the School of Veterinary Medicine, require personal interviews for new appointments. The candidate is generally interviewed by both departmental and school representatives. Some departments invite a prospective faculty member to deliver a lecture or lead a colloquium in order to demonstrate his grasp of the relevant subject matter and his powers of oral expression.

Except in the Law School which has a student representative on the Standing Committee on Additions to Faculty and the Graduate School of Education which has non-voting student members on its Faculty Personnel Committee, students play no role in new faculty appointments, since they could not be expected to be familiar with the qualifications of the persons being considered for appointment. Their views are sought by various formal and informal means in connection with recommendations for reappointment and promotion. As a minimum, the departmental chairman is expected to make discreet inquiries among the students as to the teaching ability of any faculty member being considered for promotion to a tenured position. The procedure is formalized in some schools, e.g., Ann-

berg School, the Engineering Schools, the Medical School, and Wharton, through the mandatory use of teacher evaluation forms completed by the students. In other schools, evaluation forms are used on a voluntary basis. In the School of Allied Medicine, information on the teaching qualification of current faculty members is available from the Student Advisory Committee and teacher evaluation forms completed by the students and summarized by the School.

Decision Making Process

Review Panels. Recommendations for faculty appointments must be approved by the dean (or other administrative head) of the school involved, the Provost, the President, and the trustees.

The school deans and the Provost seek the advice of others in reviewing recommendations for appointment and promotion from the departmental chairman. In every school there is a committee or group that reviews all departmental recommendations and passes along its judgment to the dean. In some schools the review committee is made up of all tenured faculty members or all faculty members with rank equal to or higher than that under consideration. In other schools, there is a formally constituted committee appointed by the dean, sometimes from a panel elected (School of Veterinary Medicine) or recommended (School of Dental Medicine) by a designated group of faculty members.

The composition of these review committees and their *modus operandi* differ sharply among the schools. The College, for example, has a standing personnel committee made up of full professors, including some departmental chairmen. The full committee seldom meets, however, and then only to discuss policies rather than cases. The chairman appoints a panel of five faculty members for each general area of the College to consider personnel recommendations from that area. The panel may or may not have face-to-face meetings to discuss the cases before them. If not, the case materials are reviewed individually by the panel members who submit their opinions to the panel chairman by letter or telephone. The panel chairman reports to the chairman of the personnel committee who, in turn, advises the dean of the panel's reaction. The case never goes before the full personnel committee. The hope is that the panel will reach a consensus but divided opinions are frequently rendered.

The Wharton School has two personnel committees, one for the social science departments and one for the departments teaching business subjects, with the chairman of each committee being an *ex officio* member of the other committee. The committees contain only full professors, but as a matter of policy, departmental chairmen are not appointed to the committees. The committees meet regularly and consider, as a whole, cases brought before them. To expedite their work, they appoint subcommittees composed of their members with the greatest expertise in the discipline being considered to read the publications of the nominee. The subcommittees report back to the full committee which as a body attempts to reach agreement on the disposition of the case. Split decisions are not at all uncommon. In these cases the dean is heavily influenced by the majority opinion but must take account of the minority views.

There is an extra layer of review in the Engineering Schools in order to permit independent consideration of budgetary and other constraints. There is a personnel committee for the four schools appointed by the Vice-President for Engineering Affairs and composed of senior faculty members from the four schools not on the executive staff. There is also an executive committee which includes the Vice-President for Engineering Affairs as Chairman, the two Assistant Vice-Presidents (one for undergraduate programs and the other for graduate programs), the directors of the four schools, the research director, and an elected faculty member as secretary. The school directors are considered to be counterparts of departmental chairmen. Within the schools, the search and evaluation functions may be carried out by the faculty as a group or by a committee of the faculty, depending upon the size of the school. The personnel committee acts primarily as a policy board, establishing criteria to be followed by the school directors in making appointment and promotion recommendations. On any appointments or reappointments that do not involve tenure, the committee chairman may go directly to the executive staff for a merit review. For any other type of case, an ad hoc review panel is formed, with the chair-

man being a member of the personnel committee and the members (who need not be on the personnel committee) being persons best qualified to evaluate the research and writings of the nominee. The review panel bases its recommendation on the merits of the case without regard to budgetary or other constraints. The review panel submits its opinion through the personnel committee to the school director who originated the recommendation. The school director then submits the materials, including the report of the ad hoc panel, to the executive committee. The personnel committee would have no further involvement unless the executive committee sought its views. The executive committee reviews each individual case on its merits, within any administrative or budgetary constraints that might be applicable. The Vice-President for Engineering Affairs receives the recommendation from the executive committee and transmits it to the Provost.

There is also an extra layer of review in the Medical School. The first layer is represented by the school personnel committee appointed by the dean and consisting of six full professors. The dean also sits on the committee as a voting member. There is no prohibition nor tradition against appointment of departmental chairmen to the personnel committee. There are more departments than positions on the committee which means that not all departments are represented. (This is the usual situation in all other schools, also.)

The second layer consists of the school's executive committee. This committee, which as its name suggests has broad responsibilities, embraces within its membership all departmental chairmen, the steering committee of the Medical School faculty council, representatives from the various medical centers affiliated with the School, and a number of students. The total membership numbers approximately fifty, with some faculty members below the rank of full professor. The dean is a voting member of the committee.

Recommendations of the departmental chairman are sent concurrently to the dean and the school personnel committee. The personnel committee as a body considers each individual case. It bases its decision on the academic merits of the case, without regard to budgetary or other constraints. It transmits its recommendation directly to the executive committee, not through the dean. Each member of the executive committee receives a complete file on the case except for letters from outside sources which are considered to be privileged information. The executive committee may only approve a recommendation or ask that the personnel committee re-evaluate the case; it does not have veto powers. The recommendation of the executive committee is transmitted to the dean. Having participated in the decision at both the personnel committee and executive committee levels, the dean can be expected to go along with the recommendation that eventually reaches his desk.

In all schools the recommendations of the personnel committee (and other review bodies) are advisory to the dean and he is not legally bound to follow them. Only under exceptional circumstances would a dean follow a course of action different from that recommended by the personnel committee. If the latter disapproves a recommendation of the departmental chairman, the dean may accept the decision (in which event the papers would go no further), or ask for a reconsideration of the case, or send the file forward to the Provost, along with the report of the personnel committee and any comments that he might have. If the committee approves a recommendation with which the dean disapproves he may ask for reconsideration or forward the case to the Provost with his dissenting views. In the great majority of the cases, the personnel committee concurs in the recommendation of the department and the dean forwards the file with his blessing.

The next hurdle is the review by the Provost's Staff Conference. This is a non-statutory body appointed by and advisory to the Provost. It is presently composed of the Vice-President for Engineering Affairs, the Vice-President for Medical Affairs, the Dean of the College, the Dean of the Wharton School, the Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, the Vice-Provost for Research and the Budget, and the Vice-Provost for Student Affairs. The guidance of this group is sought on a wide range of matters, including all faculty appointment and promotion recommendations. These recommendations are acted upon by the Provost's Staff Conference as a body under the chairmanship of the Provost, with a member abstaining from voting on a case that originated in his own school. The group attempts to reach a unanimous judgment but dissenting votes are sometimes registered. The Provost is not

bound by the decisions but almost invariably goes along with them. In connection with both appointments and promotions, the Provost may make an independent inquiry into the qualifications of the candidate. He frequently plays an active role in the recruitment of new faculty members, including visits to the offices of the persons being sought.

The President is a member of the Provost's Staff Conference and participates in its discussions as his schedule permits.

Criteria. The communications from the various schools stressed the procedures followed in appointing and promoting faculty, with little attention being given to the criteria applied in the decision-making process. This is perhaps natural, since it is easier to describe procedures than to explain criteria. Nonetheless, all the schools indicated that they placed great weight on the nominee's teaching ability and scholarly contributions, as reflected in his research and publications. Most also mentioned service to the University in the form of administrative assignments and service to the community broadly defined. Several of the schools in the medical area emphasized clinical ability. Professional recognition was mentioned by some.

None of the schools apparently assigns numerical weight to the various criteria, nor have they attempted to describe with any precision how qualitative weights are arrived at. While they may have norms for the amount of time that a faculty member should spend at the assistant and associate professorship ranks before being recommended for promotion, they have not articulated them. The Law School is unique in this respect. It has a definite and presumably articulated policy of promoting assistant and associate professors after three years of satisfactory performance. Satisfactory performance is defined as effective teaching plus one significant publication during the three-year term. The publication can take the form of an article in a law review, so long as it reflects the results of a significant piece of research. New faculty members are usually brought in at the assistant professor level, although appointments without tenure at either the associate or visiting professor level are sometimes made when the individuals possess considerable experience and have distinguished themselves in their chosen fields of law. At Harvard Law School the normal procedure is to promote a man to the rank of full professor with tenure after three years as an assistant professor.

Committee Recommendations

The recommendations contained herein reflect the reasoned judgment of the Committee after a thorough study of existing procedures and policies and thoughtful consideration of the various issues involved. The Committee lays no claim to omniscience nor clairvoyance and recognizes that other individuals of equal insight and objectivity might arrive at different conclusions.

Appointment and Promotion Procedures

This section is devoted exclusively to appointment and promotion procedures; the criteria that should be followed in making appointments and promotions are dealt with in the next section. The recommended procedures are believed to be appropriate for most schools of the University and most departments within these schools. They may have to be modified in the Engineering Schools and in the Medical School—and possibly other schools. The schools and departments involved should have the burden of demonstrating that the proposed generalized procedures are not appropriate to their circumstances, and, if alternate procedures are employed, that they conform to the spirit of the recommended procedures.

Departmental Level. As the basic administrative unit in the academic hierarchy, the department has the primary responsibility for developing and maintaining a high quality faculty. This is a responsibility that should be shared by all members of the department, even though the ultimate burden rests on the departmental chairman. Thus, the members of a department should participate to the fullest extent practicable in the process by which new members are appointed and existing members are promoted. Furthermore, where relevant and practicable, the views of faculty members in other departments of the University should be sought.

It seems desirable to make a clear distinction between the initiation of recommendations for appointment and promotion and a

review or evaluation of these recommendations. Any member of the faculty, irrespective of rank, should have the right to nominate individuals for appointment or promotion. Students, especially those at the post-baccalaureate level, should likewise be encouraged to make suggestions for new appointments or for the promotion of existing faculty members. Large departments would be well advised to appoint *ad hoc* or standing committees to search for candidates qualified to fill existing or prospective vacancies. A small department can constitute all of its members into a search committee when the need arises.

The review function must be performed with greater selectivity. The Committee deems it inappropriate for a faculty member to participate in a formal vote concerning another department member of the same rank or, except for full professors and tenured associate professors, concerning the appointment of another individual to the same rank. In such instances, there is an inherent conflict of interest that should not be permitted to influence departmental personnel decisions. Thus, while the views of all faculty members should be sought and evaluated, the decision in each case should be made by the faculty members having a rank above that of the individual or position being considered. Specifically, if a department is considering the appointment of an assistant professor, the final decision would be made by the associate and full professors. The same procedure would be applicable if an assistant professor were being considered for promotion to associate professor. By the same token, promotions of associate professors would be considered only by faculty members holding the rank of professor. Appointments to the rank of associate professor would be considered by tenured associate professors and professors. Appointments or promotions to the rank of full professor would be acted upon only by faculty holding that rank.

While student input into personnel decisions is highly desirable and is strongly recommended, there should be no student representation on the review committee. Generally speaking, students lack the maturity and perspective to evaluate the professional competence of faculty members whose intellectual development should be several stages beyond that of the students. Moreover, the review committee is concerned with matters of great sensitivity that not only affect the harmony with which the department members work together but also the future careers of the persons whose cases are being considered. In addition, students, being transient members of the academic community, do not have to live with the consequences of their decisions. This is a particularly relevant point in this context since personnel decisions, especially those involving tenure, tend to have long-range implications for the institution. Finally, the procedural problems associated with the selection of the students to serve on the committee would be formidable, as they have been with other committees at the University.

Departmental size permitting, all faculty members of the appropriate rank should constitute the departmental review committee for any particular case under consideration. On matters of promotion or major appointments faculty members on leave or temporarily absent should be given an opportunity to express their views. The deliberations of the review committee should be made a matter of official record and the votes of each member should be recorded. In transmitting the recommendation of the department to the dean, the chairman should indicate whether the action had the unanimous support of the review committee. If not, the vote should be indicated. Any member of the review committee should have the right and be given the opportunity to file a dissenting report that would accompany the majority report. The departmental chairman should be obligated to forward to the dean any positive recommendation of the review committee even though he might be personally opposed to it. He should, of course, be permitted to transmit any dissenting views that he might have, in the same manner as any other member of the committee.

Finally, the Committee urges that there be a mechanism for a yearly review by each department of all faculty members eligible for promotion. This recommendation does not imply the preparation of a complete dossier on each faculty member every year. It does imply that as a minimum the chairman should meet individually with each assistant and associate professor to discuss his status

and any problems that may loom as obstacles to his ultimate advancement to the highest professorial rank. In addition to providing guidance and encouragement to the faculty member, this procedure would help to ensure that promotion decisions are the result of rational consideration of all relevant factors, including those advanced by the candidate. In the event that a department decides (1) not to renew the term appointment of an assistant or associate professor, (2) not to promote an assistant professor before the expiration of his terminal appointment as assistant professor, or (3) not to promote a non-tenured associate professor before the expiration of his term appointment, the departmental chairman should so inform the dean in writing, setting out the controlling reasons for the decision. At his discretion, the dean may ask the personnel advisory committee to review the action of the department involved.

The responsibility for documenting an appointment or promotion recommendation rests with the department. The chairman is responsible for preparing the case and assembling all necessary documents, although in a large department it may be necessary to delegate some of the duties. The documentation should include a listing of courses currently being taught, the number of graduate students being supervised, and major committee assignments. The review committee should thoroughly familiarize itself with the qualifications, accomplishments, and activities of the nominee. His teaching ability should be assessed through the mandatory use of a teacher evaluation form that should be standardized as much as possible throughout the University. Student organizations should participate in the development of these forms. The forms should be distributed in class by the teacher and completed by the students during class time in order to obtain the highest possible percentage of participation. The completed forms should be assembled by a student and turned over to the teacher's departmental chairman. The forms should be made available to the teacher, his departmental chairman, and any regularly constituted group of faculty members charged with the responsibility of judging the teacher's qualifications for promotion. Neither the completed forms nor the tabulated results should be made generally available. Under no circumstances should the results be published or otherwise made public. The performance evaluation should encompass research supervision, academic advising, laboratory technique, and other relevant duties. The performance measurement should be applied to persons at all ranks, including full professors. While information concerning full professors would have no bearing on their rank it would be useful for other purposes, including the determination of salary levels.

The Committee places great importance on external sources of evaluation as a supplement to and check on the internal evaluation of nominees. Thus, it strongly endorses the practice of requiring at least three letters from other institutions. This in no way reflects adversely upon the ability of a department or school to judge the qualifications of its own faculty. It provides an element of objectivity that would tend to balance the bias that is likely to be present to some degree when faculty members are asked to judge their own colleagues. Of course, prudence must be used in the selection of the outside references and in the evaluation of their responses. The references should include some persons not suggested by the nominee. The Committee believes that the external letters should be assembled by the departmental chairman rather than by the school review committee in line with its conviction that primary responsibility for evaluating and upgrading the faculty must rest with the several departments. It would see no objections to additional outside letters being solicited by the school committee if that procedure is favored by a particular school.

School Level. The functions of the school personnel committee should be (1) to acquaint the departmental review committees with the procedures and standards that should be followed in considering faculty appointments and promotions and (2) to ensure that uniform procedures and standards are applied in the various departments. The second function is an especially critical one. It is highly unlikely that the several departments of a school will be of equal academic quality or that the chairmen will be equally zealous in their pursuit of academic excellence for their departments. Moreover, some departmental chairmen and their colleagues may lack the temperament to apply rigorous standards to their personnel actions. They may be inclined to take favorable action on all cases

coming before them and rely upon review panels at the higher levels of administration to block the unwarranted recommendations. Thus, it is necessary to have broad-gauged and courageous persons on the school personnel committee.

In view of the onerous duties of the school personnel committee, this Committee has concluded that only full professors should serve on the review committee. This would minimize charges of conflict-of-interest and also assure a measure of maturity and distinction among the committee members. While there is some division of opinion within the Committee, the majority are inclined to believe that departmental chairmen should not be eligible to serve on the school personnel committee. In terms of their basic qualifications they would tend to be excellent prospects for committee membership. However, there is a potential conflict of interest that argues against their eligibility. They would always be under pressure to act favorably upon cases from other departments in order to gain reciprocity on their own recommendations. There is some danger of this type of reaction among any group of departmental representatives but the pressures on the departmental chairman to cooperate with his cohorts is infinitely greater. It seems inappropriate for the dean to be a member of the personnel committee, since it is advisory to him.

The Committee gave careful consideration to the question of whether the school personnel committee should be appointed or elected. While there is a certain emotional appeal to the notion of elected representatives, the Committee concluded that the members should be appointed by the dean. In the first place, the committee is advisory to the dean and it would appear logical to let the dean select his own advisors. Secondly, the committee membership must be carefully balanced in terms of the disciplines involved, and the expertise and temperament of the members. It would be disastrous to the morale of the school if only persons with extremely rigorous standards were to be elected to the committee and it would be worse still if only those with flexible standards were to be elected. It is doubtful if the proper mixture of talents and temperaments would be produced by the electoral process. A related difficulty would be to determine the constituencies that should be represented on the committee. It is not feasible for every department to have its own representative—if it is to be a working committee (as opposed to a committee from which *ad hoc* panels are drawn), and the grouping of disciplines would be a source of contention. Finally, the type of person needed on the committee might shrink from having to stand for election. It is difficult enough to persuade people to serve on the committee on an appointive basis and the difficulties would be compounded by forcing them to face an election. Some of these objections to the elective process could be overcome by having an official slate of candidates proposed by a nominating committee elected by the faculty or appointed by the dean, but little would be gained over the present procedures.

For reasons noted earlier, there should be no student representation on the school personnel committee. Their presence on this committee would be even less appropriate than on the departmental committee.

The Committee favors a type of arrangement under which the school personnel committee or a substantial subcommittee thereof considers, as a body, the recommendations of the departmental committee. There is much to be gained from a discussion of the cases by the committee convened in a face-to-face meeting. In the College the workload might be so heavy that the cases would have to be parceled out to subcommittees.

All appointment and promotion recommendations involving tenure should be placed before the school personnel committee. Initial appointments without tenure should also be considered by the committee. On the other hand, reappointments not involving tenure could appropriately be processed by the dean without review by the school personnel committee since the faculty members involved typically have had little opportunity to do more than demonstrate their teaching ability. Thus, a full-scale review of their original credentials may not be justified, especially in the light of the other responsibilities placed upon the personnel committee.

The recommendations of the school personnel committee should not be binding on the dean. If the dean should decide to act contrary to the committee's recommendations, he should so inform the

Provost and attach to his comments the recommendation and commentary of the committee.

Provost Level. The review procedures at the Provost's level appear to be working well and no changes are suggested. The Committee on Appointments and Promotions, as the Provost's group is known when it considers personnel recommendations from the school, serves the same function vis-a-vis the schools as the school committees do with respect to the departments. It attempts to make sure that reasonably uniform standards of excellence are being applied by the various schools of the University. Because of the volume of cases that come before it, the committee can give only cursory attention to the substantive evidence submitted in support of a recommendation. The members would rarely read the nominee's publications or go back of the testimony concerning his teaching ability. The committee seeks to assure itself that proper procedures have been followed and that aberrations from commonly accepted standards of scholarship and teaching competence are kept to the minimum and are justified by circumstances. The four major areas of instruction—arts and sciences, business, engineering, and the health sciences—are represented on the committee and this representation should be maintained.

If a recommendation for promotion or tenure fails to gain the necessary approval at all levels of review, the nominee should be given an opportunity to discuss with his departmental chairman the reasons for disapproval. The nominee is entitled to such an explanation as a matter of elemental courtesy and decency, but perhaps more important it may point the way to correction of the deficiencies that led to the unfavorable action. To facilitate this explanation, personnel review committees at all levels should document the reasons for any negative actions that they may take.

Personnel recommendations should be processed as expeditiously as possible, consistent with adequate consideration of the issues involved. If at all possible, all recommendations should be disposed of before the end of the academic year in which they originate. Unless the circumstances are exceptional, the school personnel committee should dispose of a case within six weeks after it goes on the docket, and the Provost's Staff Conference should, in turn, render its decision within a month.

Appeals Tribunal. The Committee believes that the multi-level procedures that have been recommended in the foregoing pages will cover the overwhelming number of personnel actions generated each year. Occasionally, the handling or disposition of a case will be questioned, with accompanying public debate and controversy. In order to bestow even greater credibility on the decision process, it is recommended that provision be made for an appeals tribunal.

This tribunal would be completely independent of the review committees previously described. It would be appointed by the Steering Committee of the University Council from the faculty members of the Council and would be a standing committee (but not of the Council). The authority and responsibility of such an appeals tribunal would be limited to the procedural aspects of a dispute and would not extend to the substantive issue of academic qualifications. This is a crucial distinction. The Committee would limit the tribunal's jurisdiction to procedural matters for two reasons. First, the general procedures recommended herein would ensure that the academic fitness of a faculty member would be evaluated by those best qualified to judge his qualifications and in a manner calculated to assure a fair and impartial appraisal. Another review by a committee of individuals even further removed from the appellant's field of specialization is not likely to achieve greater equity. Secondly, appeals based upon alleged infringement of academic freedom and prerogatives should be considered by the school Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, with appeals from that body being taken to the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility. This would leave only procedural issues to be considered by the special appeals tribunal. The Committee recognizes that some disputatious cases will involve both substantive and procedural issues and possibly allegations of academic freedom infringement. Thus, it seems necessary that the appeals tribunal be empowered to decide (1) whether the issue before it is substantive or procedural and (2) whether a question

of academic freedom is involved, in which case the matter would be referred to the school Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility. To permit this determination, all appeals from faculty personnel actions should go initially to the appeals tribunal, irrespective of the nature of the complaint. Only the faculty member involved should be permitted to activate this appellate mechanism; third party appeals should not be permitted. Finally, the tribunal would not have the authority to affirm or set aside the previous decisions on the cases coming before it. It would review the procedures followed and render an advisory opinion to the Provost with a copy to the appellant.

Policies or Criteria

The Committee subscribes to the general statement of principles set forth in the Introduction to the statement on *Faculty Appointments and Promotion Policies* approved by the Educational Council in 1960. The Introduction is reproduced verbatim herein:

A measure of a university's distinction is the quality of its faculty, and those charged with the responsibility for appointments, reappointments, and promotions at the University of Pennsylvania must assure a faculty of an outstanding educational institution [sic]. The essential requisite to membership in one of the University's faculties is a commitment to both the advancement and communication of knowledge. These activities go hand in hand, for research and scholarship are unavailing if their results are not communicated to others; and a lively stimulus to learn is best imparted by one who is himself learning and adding to our heritage of knowledge.

It is important that a member of a faculty should be interested in students and desirous of associating and communicating with them as well as that he be possessed of the temperament and ability to do this successfully and to stimulate the intellectual growth and attainments of others. A broad human concern for youth and its intellectual problems and ambitions and a desire to stimulate and participate in the learning process of those persons with whom he comes in contact are of much greater importance in assessing the potential qualifications of an individual for membership than is polished technique in didactic instruction. Indeed it is felt that at the university level the instructional emphasis shifts largely from rote learning and the inculcation of factual data to the assumption of responsibility for the learning process by the student himself with assistance, encouragement, stimulus, and inspiration by members of the faculty.

The University is committed to both its undergraduate and graduate programs, recognizing them as continuous stages in the education of its students. Some persons are members of faculties that are concerned solely with graduate and professional instruction, others are members of faculties concerned with undergraduate instruction as well. The level of instruction at which an individual's interest may focus is not relevant to considerations of promotion in faculty grade. The concern of those responsible for evaluating faculty performance is rather with the growth of intellectual power of an individual and with his ability to communicate new knowledge and insights to students of whatever degree of maturity as well as to the scholarly community beyond the University.

Unequivocal evidence of maturing scholarly interests, as demonstrated by increasingly significant performance both in teaching and research, and by other means constitutes the essential prerequisite for promotion in faculty rank. Publication and other performance which display discriminating judgment, imaginative insight, and breadth of scholarship weigh particularly heavily in assessing the competence of an individual. Quantity of scholarly publication is of some significance as evidence of the scholar's ready and timely communication of the results of study and research to his colleagues, but it is of much less weight than is the quality of his research efforts.

Some appropriate participation in scholarly and professional society activities and some external recognition of qualifications and attainments are likewise elements in assessing the propriety of appointments and promotions. Participation of the faculty in academic administration is essential to the proper governance of the university community. Certain members of the faculty with particular interest and ability in administration will from time to time be invited to participate in this activity to an extent exceeding the common responsibility. In such cases a compensatory reduction in instructional assignments will be made. A sincere concern for the welfare of the academic community and responsible participation in departmental and school and faculty affairs are relevant factors in considering promotion in addition to quality performance in teaching and research.

The Committee affirms its belief in the traditional notion that teaching and research are inextricably intertwined and that in

general the best teachers will be those actively engaged in creative research activities. It believes, however, that instructional responsibilities and research efforts must be kept in proper balance. It has concluded that for many years, for one reason or the other, research has been assigned a higher priority than teaching. It believes that these two academic functions must be given equal weight if the University is effectively to discharge its traditional responsibilities. Moreover, the rewards system within the University must be structured in such a manner as to promote the twin goals of good research and good teaching. The Committee's recommendation that student evaluation of teaching effectiveness be made an integral part of the personnel review procedures of the University is a manifestation of its concern with the teaching function.

In voicing its plea for more emphasis on the teaching function, the Committee is fully aware that pedagogy takes more forms than classroom performance. It embraces the learning experience that comes from the teacher-student involvement in a research project, laboratory experiment, artistic performance, or other educational endeavor. In fact, any intellectual exchange between a faculty member and a student, ranging from a formal classroom confrontation to informal office discussions, constitutes a form of teaching. Thus, some credit should be given for academic advising and other forms of informal teacher-student interchange when appraising the overall effectiveness and contribution of a faculty member. Finally, the Committee recognizes that a faculty member who cannot communicate with a large assemblage of students may be very stimulating to a small group of advanced, highly motivated students in a seminar or research setting and in that sense should be regarded as satisfying the teaching role.

Ideally, the faculty member of a distinguished university should be both a good teacher and a good research scholar. Although the two talents are often found in combination, not infrequently the very practical question arises as to the promotion of a faculty member who is a good—perhaps even spectacularly good—teacher but is deficient at research or vice versa. This is the problem with which personnel review committees are all too frequently confronted. One solution would be to have separate academic nomenclature for teachers and researchers with separate criteria being applied for their advancement in faculty rank. The Committee considered this proposition and rejected it unanimously, primarily on the grounds that the typical faculty member will—and should—engage in both teaching and research. As noted above, the basic theory is that the truly exceptional teacher must also be engaged in research. The Committee's view is that the truly gifted teacher who keeps abreast of the literature in his field and maintains his professional competence should be promoted and adequately compensated even if he does little or no research. Likewise, the exceptionally brilliant research scholar should be promoted and appropriately paid even if he is ineffectual as a classroom teacher. (Hopefully he would be kept out of the classroom except possibly for small seminars of advanced graduate students).

With respect to the great bulk of faculty members, the Committee feels that competence in both teaching and research should be a criterion for advancement. More specifically, the nominee should be very good in both areas or exceptionally strong in one and thoroughly competent in the other. A review committee should recognize various degrees of competence within these broad parameters. Unusual ability in one area should offset some deficiency in the other, subject to some minimum standard of competence in both areas.

Some weight should be given to administrative service at the University, community and governmental service, and service to the nominee's professional societies. Outstanding performance in any of these areas should be balanced against some inadequacy in the two basic areas of teaching and research.

Administrative service within the University poses a special problem. Efficient administration is vital to the sound functioning of an educational institution, as it is with any organization. Many of the administrative positions require incumbents with the full range of academic credentials. Administrative responsibilities, however, tend to be demanding and preemptive. By their very nature they are likely to take priority over the other responsibilities of the incumbent. Thus, the quantity and quality of the incumbent's research output is almost certain to suffer and his teaching effective-

ness may be impaired. As a consequence, it is virtually impossible for a junior faculty member to qualify for promotion by the usual standards while holding down a major administrative post.

The Committee sees two possible solutions to this dilemma. One is for the review committees to assign enough weight to significant administrative contribution to counterbalance deficiencies in the more traditional areas of scholarship. The other is for the dean and the Provost's Committee on Appointments and Promotions to take the initiative and recommend to the department promotion of the individual concerned on the basis of purely administrative considerations. The department should then satisfy itself that the individual meets or exceeds the minimum standards of research and teaching capability. The Committee favors the second approach since it would not distort the procedures and criteria established for normal cases. Normally, assistant professors should not be appointed to major administrative posts.

Other Issues

The Committee considered a number of other issues that are relevant to the appointment and promotion process but do not fit neatly within the foregoing expositional framework. They are set out in random order below.

Inbreeding. In this context, inbreeding refers to the practice of staffing academic departments with individuals who did their graduate and possibly undergraduate work at the institution involved. It is generally regarded to be undesirable for at least two reasons: (1) it leads to academic parochialism and (2) it encourages laxness in the recruiting of top quality personnel. In order to guard against the pernicious influence of inbreeding, some schools have a rigid rule against employing the products of their own graduate schools until the individuals have had a period of seasoning at some other institution. This Committee shares the general concern about inbreeding and urges a posture of vigilance against its undesirable effects. However, the policy of the University should be to seek out the most highly qualified prospects for its faculty, without geographical, institutional, or other arbitrary restrictions. If the best qualified person happens to be a current or recent University of Pennsylvania product, he should not be discriminated against because of his institutional affiliation. In plain terms, there should be no arbitrary, inflexible rule against the hiring of the institution's own graduates, but no department should ordinarily draw a majority of its own faculty from among its own graduates.

Nepotism. In its dictionary sense, nepotism means favoritism shown toward nephews or other relatives, especially with respect to governmental patronage. In academe it refers to the employment of close relatives, especially a husband and wife, at the same institution. The practice is considered to be potentially harmful for a number of reasons. Perhaps the most serious objection is that an existing or potential faculty member may use his or her bargaining power to persuade the institution to hire his spouse or other relative whose academic qualifications would not satisfy the normal standards for employment. Another objection is that one relative may be in a position to discriminate in favor of the other relative in terms of rank, salary, assignments, or other conditions of employment. Another threat is that the relatives may bargain as a team for rank and salary, gaining an unwarranted advantage over their colleagues.

Many state and some private institutions are so concerned about these potential abuses that they have hard-and-fast rules against the employment of close relatives. The University of Pennsylvania has no rule against the employment of two or more family members. It does require that each such case have the explicit approval of the Provost's Staff Conference.

The Committee favors a flexible approach on this matter and believes that the present policy provides an adequate safeguard against the potential abuses. The persons involved should satisfy the same academic standards as other faculty members, and the Provost's Staff Conference should make sure that the specific situation created by the employment of the additional family members will not give rise to any problems of the sort cited above.

Treatment of Women. At the present time, excluding the clinical personnel of the Medical School, 7.4 per cent of the faculty holding the rank of assistant professor or above are women. The great

majority of these are assistant professors. According to the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Faculty Women, headed by Dr. Mildred Cohn, the distribution of the women faculty members by rank is as follows: Assistant Professor 60 per cent; Associate Professor 27 per cent; and Professor 13 per cent. This compares to 30 per cent, 26 per cent, and 44 per cent, respectively for male faculty members. Dr. Cohn's Committee feels that this is conclusive proof that women have been discriminated against at the University of Pennsylvania, especially with respect to promotion.

This Committee deems it appropriate to point out that many complex factors may be at work. The disproportionately small percentage of women on the faculty undoubtedly reflects to some extent the limited supply of women with the required academic credentials, and this condition is likely to continue throughout the near future. However, in some departments the ratio of female faculty members to male faculty members is at such variance with the proportion of qualified females in the general discipline that one must seek an explanation other than limited supply of females with acceptable academic credentials. The failure of the women who are hired to move into the higher ranks at the same rate as men suggests that factors other than academic qualifications may have entered into the promotion decision.

This Committee deplores any discrimination that may have occurred in the past. It subscribes to the philosophy that women applying for and holding faculty positions should be judged by the same criteria that are applied to men. Women should be accorded the same treatment as men with respect to all substantive conditions of employment, including rank, compensation, and research opportunities. It follows, therefore, that the Committee would be opposed to any *preferential* treatment of women, or any other special group, even though directed toward the redressing of inequities that may have existed in the past. The Committee would be especially opposed to a quota system or to a presumption that any candidate is superior or inferior by reason of sex alone. Such approaches would almost inevitably lead to a deterioration of faculty standards.

Terminal Promotions. All of the faculty policies and procedures of the University are geared to the notion that all individuals who are granted tenure have the potentiality and have shown promise of reaching the rank of full professor. The University does not operate on the premise that there should be a group of permanent associate professors or even assistant professors. Nonetheless, for various reasons, some faculty members reach retirement without having attained the highest rank in the professorial hierarchy. Technically, such individuals are not entitled to an emeritus status upon retirement, since the only emeritus rank recognized in the University Statutes is that of professor. (Nevertheless, the emeritus title has in the past been bestowed on assistant and associate professors.)

The Committee has considered this problem and recommends that associate professors with long and meritorious service be appointed to the rank of emeritus professor on the effective date of retirement, even though they do not satisfy the usual criteria for promotion. Such a promotion should not be automatic, being reserved only for the most deserving individuals. The Committee also recommends that provision be made for the promotion of an assistant professor to emeritus associate professor at retirement, subject to the same ground rules.

Request for a Promotion Recommendation by an Administrative Officer. The Committee has been made aware of circumstances, fortunately rare, under which a department fails to recommend for promotion a faculty member who by all objective standards is entitled to promotion. This situation could arise because of personality conflicts, jealousy of the other departmental members, ideological differences of a political or non-political nature, and other such reasons. The Committee believes that the answer to this problem lies in giving the dean or the provost authority to request that the department in question initiate a recommendation for promotion. If the department refuses, the dean or provost should then have the authority to place the case, with supporting documents, before the personnel review committee of the school. In all such cases, the department should be given full opportunity to

present its views to the personnel committee at the same time. Thereafter, the case should be handled as if it had originated in the normal manner.

Tenure. The Committee gave lengthy consideration to the question of tenure, exploring its purposes and effects. The Committee found itself sharply divided as to the merits of tenure and consequently makes no recommendation as to its retention or abolition. In recognition of the significance of tenure to the faculty member and to the University, and on the assumption that tenure will continue to be a feature of the personnel system of the University, the Committee offers some recommendations intended to protect the interests of both the faculty member and the University.

The Committee recommends that hereafter each new faculty member be informed in writing when the qualifying period for tenure begins to run and when it expires, resulting in a permanent appointment if the individual is still in the service of the University. This certification should come from the dean of the school but if the Provost Staff Conference or any other review body should take action which would modify the communication from the dean, the review body should inform the faculty member in writing, with a copy to the dean and the departmental chairman. Any recommendations for appointment, reappointment, or promotion that would result in tenure should be given special attention, with full recognition of the consequences, at all levels of personnel review.

In certain instances, a faculty member has been appointed, reappointed, or promoted under circumstances that would normally lead to tenure, but for reasons deemed to be mutually beneficial to the individual and the University, the individual was asked to waive his tenure rights in writing. This is a dangerous practice since the faculty member may later repudiate the waiver. Moreover, there is some question as to whether this practice is sound in principle. The Committee has concluded that waivers of tenure should not be permitted, however laudable the objective may be.

The Committee also considered the issue of tenure for part-time or partially-affiliated faculty members, especially as it relates to females. Recognition of part-time services for tenure purposes would have serious educational and financial implications to the University, especially in the area of the health sciences. Moreover, it could operate to the detriment of the partially-affiliated persons. Under present policy, such individuals can continue their affiliation with the University indefinitely, unconstrained by tenure rules. If a limit were to be placed on the amount of non-tenured partially-affiliated service, many individuals who would otherwise have been retained indefinitely, would have their services terminated for the sole purpose of preventing their attainment of a tenured status. This problem would be exacerbated by the fact that partially-affiliated individuals would frequently not be as highly motivated, nor have the facilities and opportunity, to engage in creative research and other activities so essential to normal academic advancement. The Committee would be opposed to special rules for women or any other special group, although it would see no objections to conditions of generalized application that might make it more feasible for women to engage in academic activities. The Committee has concluded, however, that tenure should be earned only through full-time, or fully affiliated, service to the University.

Finally, the Committee recommends that mechanisms be developed to encourage faculty members who have lost their general effectiveness to retire early or to undertake only those duties commensurate with their diminished capacity.

Departmental Planning For Staff Appointments and Promotions

In the view of the Committee, appointments, reappointments, and promotions ordinarily are best made in the context of an overall plan. Such a plan should in turn be developed on the basis of a periodic review of the composition as well as of the needs of a given department (or other University organization with its own faculty) relative to the composition and needs of other departments. Such a review would not deal with the broader questions of establishing priorities for schools, departments, or other University organizations and activities, which we understand are to be reviewed by the Academic Planning Committee. Instead such planning for appointments, reappointments, and promotions would be con-

centrated on the allocation of resources available for staff in relation to the needs of a given department and to the development and maintenance of strong academic programs in areas which are appropriate for this University.

The alternative to such a program of planning for staff appointments, reappointments, and promotions is the haphazard annual competition for a share of whatever funds are available for this purpose. In the past the principal justification for such requests has been a vacancy in an existing position or the ability of a department to persuade the Administration that another faculty member was needed, together with the availability of a person with the qualifications set forth in the University statement on appointments, reappointments, and promotions. In addition, specific decisions have sometimes been taken at high administrative levels to give special assistance to a weak department in the hope of strengthening it or to a strong department in order to enhance its reputation even further.

In general, however, departmental recommendations for promotions and appointments have not customarily been developed nor reviewed in terms of an overall plan either for the department or for the University. This committee considers such planning to be essential both to the orderly disbursement of limited University resources and to the balanced development of strong programs. A careful and continuing academic evaluation in all departments can extend the impact of limited resources by concentrating support on programs which are strong or innovative or unique or which can justify backing for other reasons. It can spread limited resources by identifying and moving toward the elimination of areas which duplicate work elsewhere in the University or in adjacent schools or which are weak or not essential to Pennsylvania's general aims and standing.

To accomplish these aims, the Committee recommends that there be established within each school a standing committee to be known as the Academic Review Committee or by some other appropriate name. This committee would be responsible for a continuing examination of the various departments and programs of the school to determine their overall quality and effectiveness, including such specific factors as their teaching contribution; their research productivity; their reputation locally, nationally, and internationally; and their usefulness to the school, the University, and the academic community in general. The committee would be appointed by the dean of the school and would submit its recommendations to him. The dean would not be a member of the committee but should be consulted by it and be kept fully informed as to the evolving decisions of the committee. The dean would submit the committee's recommendations to a University Academic Review Committee, attaching any comments of his own that he might deem appropriate. The recommendations of the various school committees would be subject to the approval of the University Academic Review Committee which would coordinate its activities with those of the Academic Planning Committee and other pertinent committees.

Working in concert, these committees would face the heavy task of reassessing the academic priorities of the University. They would have to identify those departments and programs whose needs demand an immediate shift in priorities and those whose needs can await a more systematic scrutiny. Ultimately, the committees would be expected to develop a master plan which could be modified on the basis of the review of departments or programs approximately once every four or five years. In such a review a department would be required to justify its role in the University and to present its own plan for the next period. This would include a request for the number of staff members required to maintain or expand the department's program. It would include a statement of the number of persons who would be in each faculty rank in order to demonstrate either a balance between senior and junior ranks or to explain the reasons for any imbalance. Taking into account the needs of other departments, the academic review committees could accept, modify, or reject a department's particular staff proposals, subject always to review by the Provost's Staff Conference and the President.

When the review of a department has been completed and the multiple-year recommendations of the appropriate academic review committees have been accepted by the department and by the Administration, these recommendations would become part of the

master plan. This would allow a department to develop, maintain, or decrease its faculty with greater certainty than is now possible. Most important, it would relate the size of a department's faculty and the distribution of that faculty by rank to such measurable factors as the excellence of the department or its promise or the demand for its courses by students or the extent to which it serves undergraduate or graduate students. It would provide a continuous process for a rational allocation of the resources available for the support of faculty.

We strongly recommend that the academic review committees be composed entirely of members of the faculty. The University Academic Review Committee should be large enough to include representatives of the principal academic areas within the University and to allow intensive review of departments by subcommittees which do not include any member of the department or generally of the school involved. The Committee should, however, have available to it the expertise of administrative officers, members of overlapping committees, such as the Budget Committee or the Academic Planning Committee, and of members of related departments or of departments in the same fields at other universities. Such persons might serve as ex-officio members of the Academic Review Committee or appear as expert witnesses before it as appropriate in particular instances.

Once a department has been reviewed and its standing under the Master Plan agreed upon, the department would be able to make its recommendations concerning personnel in an orderly fashion for the period until the next review date. New appointments to the faculty could involve the replacement of persons who have retired or who have resigned if authorized by the plan. A new faculty member might hold the same or a lower rank than that of the person formerly in the position, but any increase in rank or payment of a salary higher than that of his predecessor would require approval. A department would not need to fill a position the year following a retirement or resignation since such a requirement could exert pressure on a department to make an inferior appointment in order to hold a position. Such unfilled vacancies would not revert to the school or university pool except that any post not filled within three years from the date it became vacant would be terminated unless an extension was specifically approved. When an opening is filled in this way by a department, the dean or other budget officer would have to be notified in writing which vacancy had been filled. This procedure would not apply to teaching fellows nor to other positions of whatever rank where the appointment is of a temporary nature and does not earn years toward tenure. The department can best determine whether the new faculty member shall continue the specialization of the person he replaces or not and should have the authority to make such a determination.

Between review periods a department would be allowed to fill any positions authorized by the plan, subject to normal review of the individual candidates by the process outlined earlier in this report. All such positions would be filled at the rank approved in the plan and at an initial base salary appropriate for that rank and for the training and experience of the candidate.

During the time between reviews departments would normally be expected to maintain their staffs in accordance with the approved plan. The Committee recognizes, however, that special circumstances may arise which would justify deviation from the established table of staff organization. Requests for any such exception would have to be considered by the school academic review committee and the University committee, with the decision being submitted to the dean and the school personnel committee. The decision would be subject to approval by the President, the Provost, and the Provost's Staff Conference. Whenever adverse action is taken on a request, the department of origin should be informed of the reasons to aid it in its further planning.

The principles articulated in this section should be applicable to any organizational unit within the University that serves the basic function of an academic department whether so designated or not.

ALMANAC: 515 Franklin Building, Ext. 5274
EditorKaren C. Gaines
Assistant EditorAnne M. Geuss