

Q & A

Page 2

NEWS IN BRIEF

FINDING MR. GADDIS...

Paul O. Gaddis, the new Vice President for Management, has his office in Room 111 College Hall. His telephone extension is 6004, and Mrs. Charlotte Settimi is his secretary for the time being.

...MR. HETHERSTON...

John C. Hetherston, Vice President for Facilities Management and Construction, has moved to 700 Franklin Building along with Joseph Looby, Assistant to the Vice President, and Administrative Assistant Mrs. Virginia Scherfel. Their telephone extensions remain 7240 and 7241.

...AND AFRO-AMERICAN STUDIES

The Afro-American Studies Program has set up offices in the House of the Family, 3914 Locust Walk. Dr. John Wide-man, Director, and Mrs. Mildred Savage are located there. Their extension is 6976.

SUSAN SONTAG SPEAKS

Susan Sontag, the critic and novelist turned filmmaker, will talk about her art Monday, March 6, at 8:15 p.m. in the auditorium of the Fine Arts Building.

The free lecture is sponsored by the Adolf and Felicia Leon Lecture Series, the Institute of Contemporary Art, the Department of Art History, and the Philomathean Society.

Miss Sontag, author of *The Benefactor* and *Death Kit*, recently turned to film writing and directing for "Duet for Cannibals" and "Brother Carl." Her critical essays have appeared in the *New York Review of Books*, *Film Quarterly*, *Commentary*, *The New York Times* and others. Among her publications are two collections, *Styles of Radical Wills*, and *Against Interpretation*, which was nominated for the National Book Award. Miss Sontag has also taught at Harvard, Columbia and Sarah Lawrence.

MASK AND WIG FOR THE JACKSON FAMILY

On Wednesday, March 15, the Mask & Wig Club will give a special benefit performance of their original musical, "Now Listen Hear" for Francis Jackson and his family.

Franny Jackson is a University painting foreman of 25 years' service, who has been hospitalized for several months since he suffered a virus that caused paralysis from the waist down. Just before Christmas, the home he shared with his wife and six children was destroyed by fire.

Tickets for the benefit are \$5 orchestra and \$4.50 balcony. They can be ordered from the Performing Arts Office at

(Continued on Page 8)

IN THIS ISSUE

- *President's Response to Senate Questions*
- COUNCIL: *Reports of the Subcommittees on Residence and Support Services; Open Letter to Faculty*
- DEATHS • CORRECTIONS: *Social Work; Early Years*

Almanac

Volume 18, Number 24

February 29, 1972

Published weekly by the University of Pennsylvania

SAC MAY ADD MEMBERS TO COMMISSION

At its special meeting Wednesday, the Senate authorized the Senate Advisory Committee to nominate members to the University Development Commission "... after being satisfied with conditions under which these serve."

Chairman Henry Abraham said that SAC will consider the nominations at its regular meeting Wednesday, March 1.

The nomination issue was the second major item in a meeting called to hear President Martin Meyerson's answers to the nine questions posed by a SAC Subcommittee on Academic Priorities, made up of Drs. Jean Crockett, Louis Girifalco and Paul Taubman. More than 300 faculty members attended, some adding questions from the floor. (Excerpts from the Q-and-A session start on Page 2 of this issue.)

The resolution authorizing SAC to nominate members to the Commission was passed under a stopped clock. Debate centered on whether or not the Senate could or should participate in the Commission without prior clarification of the charge, which the Subcommittee said permitted "... a considerable range of interpretation as to the extent of the Commission's involvement in the formulation of academic policy."

An early version of the motion, defeated on the floor, called for authorizing SAC to "add five or more members to be added to the University Development Commission, provided that the Senate Advisory Committee is satisfied that there is no infringement on the responsibility of the effective Faculties of the University, the Academic Planning Committee, the University Council, or the entire Faculty through the mechanism of the Faculty Senate for advising the President as to the educational merit of the overall program developed as well as its individual components."

In other Senate business, Dr. Abraham announced that SAC has adopted a "statement of practice" in which the Steering Committee is to ensure that SAC is informed of committee reports "that may affect educational policy and other faculty interests" before they go to Council for action. SAC will set up internal review procedures, and may elect to make no recommendations; to propose alternate resolutions; or to request postponement of action to allow full Senate debate on some questions.

He also said that SAC has agreed at least temporarily to meet periodically with the President to exchange ideas and to further understanding; but that the issue of holding regular joint meetings with him will be brought before the full Senate April 19th.

Questions and Answers on University Priorities

Chairman-Elect Dr. Jean Crockett asked President Martin Meyerson most of the nine questions framed by the Subcommittee on Academic Priorities (Almanac February 22). As time grew short, some of the formal questions were telescoped or skipped over, and others came from the floor in response to the President's replies.

DR. CROCKETT: *Question 1 reads, "The proposed priorities in your progress report to the Trustees suggest some shift in the present balance between Graduate Arts and Sciences and undergraduate education. Could you give us an indication of the magnitude of the shift which you envisage, either in terms of number of students or in terms of allocation of resources or both?"*

I'd like to preface the first question by several assertions, the first of which is that we cannot continue financially as we have. We can raise tuition some, but not for very long without losing our best students. We hopefully could persuade our Commonwealth that it ought to be more generous to us, but we can't expect any very significant increases from that source. We hope the national administration in Washington will exhibit a kind of vision of higher education that is still to be demonstrated. But because of real hesitation in all these matters, my colleagues in administration and I are convinced that it is essential that we raise the most substantial amounts of private money that our University has ever raised and that perhaps other universities have ever raised.

We are not going to raise these substantial resources on the basis of the deficit that we have. Though it may be somewhat more modest than other institutions', it is substantial and the funds will not be raised on that negative basis.

They will be raised because of our recognition as a Faculty that we have tremendous strengths and that we cannot rest content with those strengths; that we have got to build on them wherever we find them. . . .

In doing so, we have to use the greatest kind of caution . . . None of us have that prescience to say that field A shall never be supported on the grounds that its day is past. Nor do I think we can say with such clarity that field B is on the wave of the future and only it ought to be supported. Nevertheless choices do have to be made . . . They're difficult choices, painful choices, only going to be made well with fullest involvement of the Faculty.

Now, I believe the drafter of Question 1 was reading some matter into the Progress Report that at least we failed to see and did not intend. I was most taken aback at the call to this meeting, which says the Report "proposes significant new directions in educational policy with substantial reallocation of resources from the Ph.D. program to the graduate/professional and undergraduate programs." That is not stated in the Report. That might happen. But if it happens it will take place because of a series of supply and demand forces over which we have no control, but insofar as any of our controls are available to us, that is not the intention in any way and I assume not the intention of any of us. I'd like to assert further that the dichotomy between undergraduate programs and graduate ones is one that we hope over time will be so mitigated that often we will not be able to tell the difference. The Provost and I have been urging that we develop a "continental path" where able students would take advanced work from the very beginning days as undergraduates. . . .

There are those Cassandras who say that graduate education has had it—that there are no jobs for Ph.D.'s so we might as well [give up]. But those who say this do us a disservice. It's like the assertion years ago that there was no need for more engineers: it frightened students away, creating problems in our economy and in our society.

None of this is to say we don't have the most severe challenges before us in undergraduate education. We are trying to encourage every first year student to have a chance to work intimately with a regular member of the faculty. You can say to encourage these opportunities obviously means a redistribution of resources.

Sometimes, but not always. Let's also remember that our biggest aim is to increase our resource base. Everything that is in this Progress Report is predicated on the notion of increasing that resource base.

Let me also point out that if we provided each of our freshmen an opportunity to work intimately in a seminar there is very little to suggest that this need result in far higher costs for the university. It may be that there are two very vital kinds of educational experiences. One, the lecture hall with all the economies that it provides when done on a large scale; and two, the seminar, the discussion opportunity, the symposium where a relatively small group of students work closely with faculty. These two paths may suggest that our real economies ought to be in those areas that provide neither the scale that is advantageous nor the intimacy of the seminars.

DR. CROCKETT: *Do I understand then that you do not particularly anticipate any decrease in the number of graduate students, but that they would be somewhat differently distributed among graduate groups?*

What I said is that if there is a reduction, it is apt to be their own responses to a very foolish clamor for removal of students from graduate programs.

DR. FRANCINE FRANKEL: *Do I understand then you do not actually have a plan for the redistribution of resources between graduate and undergraduate education?*

Our aim is to reinforce both, recognizing linkages between the two. There is a great deal of difference between resources and attention. We've tried to analyze who teaches whom. There is an error in our ways when the overwhelming proportion of full professors teach graduate students and the undergraduates are taught in descending rank order by our various instructional ranks.

The appeal here has to be very largely to our consciences . . . There is a real problem of redistribution of attention, but not redistribution of resources.

DR. VON VORYS: *Do you plan to reduce the existing number of graduate groups?*

No. One day a daily paper carried a report that we would have one quarter the graduate programs we had before. This is not what any of us have been saying. What I have been saying is that to achieve a further level of distinction, we ought to have somewhere between 12 and 15 programs at the threshold of such distinction that they are truly of a world class. I can use an illustration: I have only limited affection for the American Council on Education's reviews of graduate programs. Nevertheless, this is one way in which our peers measure us. I think sometimes they may have myopia . . . But last time around there were only three fields in which our peers regarded us as in the top five in the country. We ought to have a dozen or 15, as does Harvard, as does Yale, as does Princeton, as does Stanford, as does Berkeley, as does Michigan, as does Chicago and as do . . . Cal Tech and MIT.

A very large number of those in this room have their terminal degrees from this university, but most do not. I think one of the great achievements of President Harnwell, with Dave Goddard and the Provosts before him, was to draw on the talents of the entire nation and on the world. But I want those other institutions to draw equally on our talents. I'd like you each to think, now and later: how many of your students now have regular faculty positions at the institutions from which you got your terminal professional or doctorate degrees?

This is the kind of shift we have got to make. We ought to aspire to that position where Harvard will choose as many of our Ph.D.'s for tenured members of the faculty as we do theirs.

We are not going to achieve that by spreading our resources so evenly that we reduce all of our graduate programs to mediocrity. This is where the problem of selectivity comes in.

The kinds of suggested priorities that appear in the Progress Report are more than anything a mirror of what we have done

within in our University—less a reflection of a willful administration, and much more a reflection (inadvertently) of what we have done over a period of 25 years as we have redistributed resources. Resources always get distributed and redistributed. The budget is always an instrument of change. What we are trying to do is move it from inadvertence into the scrutiny of the faculty and our entire community. If you examine what has happened over the years, the shifts have been phenomenal.

DR. CROCKETT: *Question 3 reads, "Could you specify in some detail the mechanisms to be used in determining where excellence currently exists in the University and the related question of which graduate programs are to be strongly supported? What role do you envisage for the Academic Planning Committee? . . . the University Development Commission? . . . the use of expert consulting teams drawn from our peer Universities?"*

You may know that some time ago Curtis Reitz and I called on our Academic Planning Committee Chairman, our Educational Policy Committee Chairman and others to urge that we need a constant assessment of our strengths and possibilities much in the fashion of the Educational Survey of the 1960's. The Academic Planning Committee is trying to develop a set of weighted criteria for assessing the relative achievements/excellences of our schools, our departments, our programs. John Hobstetter as you know is our Associate Provost in this area. He is working very closely as is Curtis Reitz with Academic Planning and with Educational Policy. The kinds of results that come from this will obviously be widely circulated and reviewed. They must be. It is extremely important that every Dean and every Faculty play a central role in that constant assessment.

We also have to turn for guidance to others, as the question suggests: the use of expert consulting teams. We very much need that kind of help. . . .

This leaves the University Development Commission . . . We see it as a very important supplement to the other deliberate bodies of the University and in no way a means to supplant them. We see it as a principle device for translating educational patterns, educational priorities into a set of coherent proposals for the raising of the most substantial kind of new income, the most substantial kind of endowment we have ever had. This is only going to happen if we find the Trustees, the faculty and the administration faculty working in considerable unison.

This is the view we see of the Development Commission. But let me put in a very important modifier here. The choice of the term Commission is not unintended. The Commission in the Anglo-Saxon world has a certain life, a certain vitality, a certain role of its own . . . It should not be dependent on the curbs that any of us would set upon it. It is conceivable that many of us may not be pleased with what an independent Commission may observe. But we felt, we believe wisely, that it was this kind of aid that we needed—as a supplement to other activities and in part a goad to them . . . If we are to change our financial future we need much more specific guidance than we have had and we need it very soon.

I think you should also know that the Commission, in its initial charge, has been given a life between now and October 1972 when the Trustees have their fall meeting, with a notion that its future will depend very much on what happens between now and then. So that this is not a standing body of our University.

DR. CROCKETT: *Question 6 reads, "What procedures and mechanisms will be used for selecting those programs most deserving of support from among the new programs which have been or will be proposed? (etc.)"*

Having been properly chided [in discussion of brevity by Professor R. E. Davies], I would like to comment that I think I have perhaps answered that question.

CURTIS REITZ: Part of that obviously relates to the excessive attractiveness of proposals that are new. It is true, unfortunately, that in terms of foundation sources, it is very difficult to persuade them to support existing programs that are described in terms of business-as-usual. Their image of themselves is an image of innovators. The challenge to us is to be able to define with sufficient integrity and enthusiasm a program, whether it be present or new, such that it can attract the kind of support it needs and deserves. Ultimately this turns on the drive, energy, initiative of the faculty concerned with that program.

DR. HALPERN: *I am wondering whether one gets more, or less, money from foundations for the social sciences by saying you are going to neglect the humanities and the physical sciences. I am wondering whether people from the physical sciences and humanities who go to Washington and raise their money will now have greater difficulties in doing so because they will be asked "your own University doesn't think you're worth supporting?" I am wondering whether any university can neglect graduate mathematics in favor of the performing arts and still be a great university.*

On your last question, no. No distinguished university can exist without great strength in mathematics. It would be unthinkable that we would have a great university without great strength in the physical sciences.

I gather you are reading somehow into the deliberations of these days that the social sciences are to be favored, that the humanities are not to be, and I'm somewhat puzzled; but let me point out that we have over the last quarter century put our chips in the scientific area in the life sciences. We have done this budgetarily, we have done this in terms of our ability to attract substantial resources from those Washington agencies; this has been our pattern and more than anything we have put a mirror to ourselves. I'm surprised that more don't realize that the areas being mentioned as ones of strength are essentially ones where for over 25 years we have put our strengths.

I don't happen to be a great lover of programs that by-pass traditional fields on the grounds they're not socially relevant. All of our disciplines are socially relevant because they are intellectually relevant. But in a field such as urban studies, consciously or not we have built up the greatest collection of talent in the United States. We have certain choices before us. Do we make this effort in law? In engineering? In a great variety of fields, in Wharton, in the College and elsewhere? Do we make this additive? Do we reduce it? Do we alter it?

I think the Physics Department is a department that is engaged precisely in the kind of selectivity that we ought to achieve within a major university, where more and more strength is going toward a number of problems that are on the cutting edge of physics, where I think we will have very great achievements in the years ahead. This does not mean that the massive resources have to be made available to physics that have been and are being made available to the life sciences.

DR. CROCKETT: *Question 5 reads: "Will the principle of selective excellence be applied to undergraduate as well as graduate programs?" The concern here is whether or not we can have excellence in an undergraduate program without excellence in graduate programs.*

No.

DR. CROCKETT: *Question 9 reads, "Do you envisage the curtailment of departmental autonomy and if so, in what respect?"*

Those of you who know my writing know that I believe one of the great contributions of American universities is in the development of departments. But it is a rather recent one. It was only a hundred years ago this month that a Department of Science was established here (the medical school had had chairs of a scientific character). Departments are relatively new on the scene. They have changed in the past and they will change in the future as they have impetus to change.

And I am not particularly fond of the term 'interdisciplinary.' What we are proposing is to create certain bonds between disciplines . . . the departments may alter as they have to, link as they have to.

But we are also seeking a balance of departmental strengths with collegial strengths. A department needs wide latitude, but a school itself needs extensive areas in which to operate and make choices.

DR. RUTMAN: *I find nothing in this report concerning affirmative action and equal opportunity, though these certainly have an interrelationship with the development of the University.*

They are not mentioned for two reasons. One is that we are dealing with this in a variety of other fashions.

The other is that something else is the case, and since I see that the Chairman wishes to get on with other matters I will use this as my concluding comment. (Continued on Page 4)

I essentially see us as an elite institution—elite not in our social origins but in our intellectual aspirations, hopes and achievements. And with that as a departure point, I would hope it would be the responsibility of each of us through our somewhat autonomous departments and through our schools and colleges, but even more through our own interventions, to see to it that we attract to our University those ablest women, those ablest blacks and other minority group members, whom we should welcome here and whom we should regard by every criterion in the same fashion as we regard other potential colleagues. So that I may be saying there is virtue in being a woman, there is virtue in being black, but also that in a University such as ours, by attracting colleagues of this kind, at the highest levels of capacity we could set a model for what the rest of the country can achieve. They will not achieve it soon, but with us as a guidepost, let them proceed from there.

And this would be my general hope about all of the matters about which we have been talking.

DR. CALLEN: [After outlining procedural concerns on the Commission and on evaluation] *It seems to me there is a very real view held by members of the faculty and by external agencies which is detrimental to the University . . . First, in the section of the Report on the Educational Opportunities Fund there is a list of seven priority categories . . . all of them socially relevant in some way . . . That may not have meant that you intend to give priority to the socially relevant areas and not to the physical sciences and humanities, but if that is not what was meant, it would be a very great service indeed if you would see fit to clarify. . . .*

Also in this listing a decision as to quality is inferred. Those not listed are at a great disadvantage in trying to attract new faculty, when it is public knowledge or public impression that the departments are not valued. And members of the omitted departments are being given offers; when they are called by the presidents of other universities who pledge full support for their disciplines, there is a very great danger we will lose faculty.

What I am asserting is that if we cannot be in such a situation as to have equal resources for all areas, choices have to be made. Selections have to be made. This does not mean that we eliminate programs, but that consciously within the University we put our resources in certain directions rather than others. I am in no way suggesting that the ultimate wisdom exists in this Report. The aim of this Report is to stimulate precisely these deliberations rather than terminate them. But you cannot at one and the same time say that on the one hand we will be selective and on the other hand that no harm will come of course to others who are not so selected. Even with a resource base that means that no field will receive less support—and this would certainly be desirable—if we follow the path of selectivity [and increase resources] there are some fields that will have more support. I'm maintaining that this is precisely what has happened; that whether we are pleased or not the physical sciences have not received such support. Maybe this ought properly to be reversed.

But [what you mention] is indeed one of the real dangers of opening very discussion to public purview. And yet we have set up that very machinery . . . And I would like to suggest it is not wrong to have it; it is most desirable to have it; but occasionally there may be some hurtful consequences by unknowing people. . . .

But I would like to have Dr. Callen's response to the proposition: How can you be selective and, at the same time, not?

DR. CALLEN: *I am sorry that the areas of selectivity have been broached by the President or suggested by the President, in no matter how preliminary a fashion that may have been. I would welcome the opportunity to COMPETE. The very fact that such a list has been made can be self-effectuating. Those departments omitted from the first guess WILL BECOME weak, because faculty will leave if they have been told they have already lost the race. I do not object to the principle of selectivity, but I deplore the fact that some initial list has been published. I wish the President would see fit to state that that list is very, very tentative, that no decision has been made . . . and that physical sciences and humanities have just as much of a chance as others. . . .*

MR. MEYERSON: No decisions have been made.

I would hope that in the light of these discussions the Academic Planning Committee and Educational Policy Committee would feel the more encouraged to advise the administration on the kind of

selective pattern that they believe most appropriate to our University . . . My first contact with the Academic Planning Committee . . . was a most interesting one. It had started its work and it had proposed the addition of a department! This was at a time when the financial difficulties were already coming before us.

I think it is wonderful to be in a situation where additions can be made. But as we proceed to put ourselves in that financial situation, we have selections to make. There is a very easy route: We can provide equivalence to all parts of the existing University; and I would venture to say that that would be a path of intellectual doom for us.

Or we can make some hard choices. The hardest choices are the ones we are talking about now. And they have got to come from Academic Planning, they have got to come from our key deliberative groups. *Nothing that has been stated is in any way a decision.* (And I don't take such decisions, by the way, to our governing board. That is not the nature of governing boards. These are matters for the faculty and their administrative colleagues to decide, not for Boards of Trustees.)

DR. RIEBER: . . . *My concern is that this University may not have a policy. That concern springs from certain historical observations: After World War II, foundations and government took a strong interest in certain area programs. For reasons not altogether clear, this University did not participate to the fullest extent of its ability in competition for that money. Thus in a number of those areas where we have great intellectual talent and tremendous personal achievement, we did not acquire the large library resources others collected in those years, and other resources were neglected. And still we can point to half a dozen of the greatest MEN in the field. The tragedy lies in the fact that we did not go for the money when the money was available. We did not have a policy to go for that money, when it would not have been at the expense of the English Department or the History Department or Physics. It only meant recognizing that the world was changing. . . .*

I have nothing against competition, but I would not like to see a cat and dog fight, I would not like to see interest groups struggling over the budget. Rather I would like to see a group of colleagues, such as are now represented on the commission, sit down and work out a RATIONAL approach to how we can supplement and strengthen those areas where we are not only nationally visible but also where we have an opportunity to draw funds from foundations and government. I do not think that this Report, tentative as it is, is aimed at my department or at the Physics Department or the English Department. It is simply saying, gentlemen, if we wish to compete in OTHER areas where the money is and the interest is, we had better get on with it.

At my last meeting with the Senate Advisory Committee I indicated that I felt they were approaching these matters from a Malthusian point of view, as though this was poor starving world where what went to one was necessarily denied to another. That's partly the case, but our whole aim is to seek new opportunities . . . A positive element rather than the negative one that so many of these questions in the ALMANAC appear to reflect.

We have no God-given pattern here; it is going to alter in many ways. But much more importantly, how do we proceed to develop some kind of policy that will enable us to take advantage of opportunities we lose again and again?

I would like to suggest that 12 to 15 truly superlative departments will have a halo effect on all the others. They will have the greatest impact. I [am familiar with certain universities] and they are highly overrated institutions. But one of the reasons they are so highly overrated is because they have achieved a kind of eminence in a very considerable slice of intellectual and professional activity. And all of this rubs off on all the others. We need the same.

EDITOR'S NOTE: *The foregoing excerpts from the Senate proceedings of February 23 were taken from a hurried transcription of the Senate's tapes, which are on file with Secretary Alan Kors.*

Please note that the President's remarks concerning the call to meeting (page 2) were directed at a Senate memorandum's interpretation of his Report, not at an ALMANAC interpretation as reported in the Daily Pennsylvanian, February 24. ALMANAC carried the Senate's meeting notice on February 15, as submitted by the Chairman-Elect.

THE COUNCIL

REPORTS ON RESIDENCE, SUPPORT SERVICES

The University Council Committee on Student Affairs has received reports from its Subcommittees on Supportive Agencies and on Residential Life. The Student Affairs Committee has agreed to use these reports as a basis upon which they will make final recommendations to the University Council.

Although the subcommittee reports may bear little or no resemblance to the final report to be issued, the Committee feels it best to make these reports public, so as to avoid speculation or misinterpretation of their content or the manner in which they are being treated.

—Eric Wolf, Chairman

REPORT OF THE RESIDENTIAL LIFE SUBCOMMITTEE TO THE STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

December 1971

It is an exciting time for residential life at the University of Pennsylvania. With the creation of a new residential complex occupying most of the western segment of the campus, and with clean, modern and attractive physical facilities to work with, the University is finally in a position to offer a student residential living program commensurate with the size and prestige of the institution. It is a time when University goals of long standing can finally be achieved.

Now that "Superblock" is in its second year of existence and almost all of the University's planned residential units are fully operative, an identifiable pattern of student reaction begins to emerge. Following a period of almost open hostility when the buildings were first opened and residents had to cope with uncompleted structures, the dirt and obstacles of continuing construction and the seemingly endless "bugs" of the new facilities, things are just now settling down to a comfortable routine. The buildings themselves no longer command the full attention of the residents and staff, and thoughts now can turn to the establishment of "life" within them.

As the buildings were in the process of construction, much consideration was given to discerning what type of living situation the current breed of college student was seeking and would accept. Statistics showed an increase in the number of students turning to non-University housing in recent years, and it was felt that this indicated more than just a dissatisfaction with the physical facilities offered by the University. Many interpreted this to mean that a large proportion of the students were opposed to limiting their horizons to the campus, that they desired a greater exposure to and interaction with the surrounding community. Moreover, it was felt that students definitely resented the intrusion of the University into their private lives; they wanted a place to which they could retreat after classes and pursue their personal interests away from the watchful guidance of the traditionally paternalistic University. It was in response to both of these observations that the existing pattern for the new hi-rise buildings was established. In large part they were to function as commercial apartment buildings where students could enjoy a high degree of personal freedom and privacy. To satisfy the desire to community exposure, many of the "resource people" in the hi-rises were drawn from the surrounding "real world," including many nonacademic types such as physicians, attorneys, administrators and city planners. These people provide an opportunity for students to interact with people they would not normally meet in a strictly university setting, people who have different viewpoints and who can, in

some sense, serve as "role models". Of course, these staff members—many of whom are married—also perform the more traditional functions of crisis-management, counseling, problem-referral and generally providing a liaison between the students and the Residential Life Office. Based on personal knowledge and on information from our various sources, the Subcommittee feels strongly that the program of providing such resource people has worked extremely well and merits being continued and developed further.

Ending the Isolation

Now a new trend seems to be emerging. Students are beginning to turn from the personal "isolationism" which was sensed by many two years ago and are cautiously seeking increased group involvement. Academics too, it seems, are coming more to the fore. Consistent with both of these developments, there is a desire for greater student-faculty interaction—in part, perhaps, to make up for the increasing impersonality in an institution which grows larger and more populous every year. For seminars and other small classes, there is wide interest in holding classes in the residences, where a more relaxed and informal setting allows for easy, two-way interchange between the instructor and his students. Many programs of this sort were instituted during the past year. Further, as class sizes grow, it appears that most meaningful contact with the faculty as individuals will have to take place outside of the classroom setting. There has been much talk of combined "living-learning" projects, where students and faculty who share common academic interests can live and study together as a group. One such program, the Experimental College has progressed through the planning stage but, as yet, has not been implemented.

The past year has seen, however, the birth of several block-occupancy or "house" projects. [These may well be a natural concomitant of the decline in fraternity and sorority involvement. In a large university, small closely-knit sub-groups can serve a valuable function as bases from which students may enter into a broader range of contacts.] Some of these programs, such as Van Pelt College House, are strongly intellectual in their focus, while others, such as Rivendell in Hi-Rise East and Community House in the Freshman Quad, emphasize social interaction and group participation.

While it has not yet been established that all of these programs will merit a "permanent" status, it seems clear that they will continue to draw strong student interest and support for at least the next several years. The Residential Life Office quite regularly receives inquiries and requests concerning proposed new house projects. Perhaps the decade of the 1970's will stand out in retrospect as the period in which a whole new pattern of college education and living was born—a pattern making the college experience broader, richer and more meaningful. Most certainly it is desirable—and perhaps even crucial from the "survival" standpoint—that the University of Pennsylvania be in the forefront of this development.

We of the Residential Life Subcommittee strongly feel that the potentials mentioned above should be given maximum opportunity of being realized. This requires a strong and flexible structure for residential programming, backed by a smoothly functioning residential housing operation which can assure that the physical aspects of University living are as pleasant as possible. The focus of the comments and recommendations which follow is the bringing together of these two elements—residential operations and programming—as a well-integrated team, capable of supporting the growth and development of a new era in student living at Penn.

(Continued on Page 6)

RESIDENTIAL LIFE (Continued)

Recommendations for Program

1. The freshman year is a crucial one in setting the tone of the student's university experience. It is our impression that the Community House program in the Quad is very worthwhile. We recommend that this type of program be extended. Thus, in combination with the programs proposed and already operating in Hill House, all resident freshmen will receive the full benefits of the improved counseling and program activities.

2. It is increasingly clear that the resource people play a key "front line" role. Part of this role is their being the first person a student may turn to for many different kinds of counseling help, vocational, academic, and personal. It is therefore vital that the resource people know as much as possible about the counseling services of the University and that this be emphasized as part of their formal training. It is also crucial that the highest possible level of expertise be fostered in the group of resource people as a whole. Therefore the University must retain good, experienced resource people for as long as possible. To avoid the loss of these people, the University must offer them a place to live for 12 months of the year. Many of the present resource people are young professionals or faculty members. They cannot be expected to move from their apartments in the dormitories and find a new place to live every summer. Further it would appear that the security advantages of having responsible people in the buildings during the summer would outweigh the low real cost to the University of having them remain in their apartments.

3. Regular procedures should be established to evaluate the role and performance of resource people and the success or failure of all residential programs. There should also be regular ways of organizing ideas for new and innovative residential programs and for evaluating program proposals from all sources. (Many of the current programs such as College House and Rivendell were originally proposed by students and faculty members.)

4. Special attention should be given to the development of programs which integrate academic and residential experiences. This year the University has such things as the College House faculty-student discussion program and a large number of courses which are having their class meetings in residence buildings. More can be done in this area and it is too important to leave to chance. The incentives for faculty involvement in such programs should be re-examined. For example, having desirable living quarters available for faculty in residence might make a difference. Uninterrupted, 12-month occupancy is also necessary here, as in the case of the resource people.

5. To do justice to residential programming, this function needs additional staff at the top. The program director should be given an assistant for staff development and one for program development. The assistant for staff would help with the recruitment, training, evaluation, and retention of resource people. This person should be thoroughly familiar with the counseling resources of the university. He or she would also assume much of the director's present responsibility in crisis referral situations, which appear to constitute a considerable drain on the time of the director. The assistant for programming would have a major role in the types of program development and evaluation which we discuss in points 3 and 4 above.

Recommendations for Operations

1. We are horrified by the present physical condition of many of the buildings in the Quad. Any further postponement of major renovations there would be a gross example of being penny-wise and pound-foolish.

2. Routine maintenance or janitorial work and repairs in University residence buildings are now provided by the University's Building and Grounds Department. Maintenance is done on a fixed contract basis, repairs on a charge-per-job basis. The budget and personnel of B & G are entirely separate from the Residence Division. We find it hard to believe that the present relationship is the optimal one. The effectiveness of building operation would be improved if the maintenance personnel were more directly responsible to the building managers and if the building managers had greater latitude in arranging and paying for needed repairs on a competitive basis.

3. The operations office should continue to routinize its activities now that the recent residential building program is essentially complete. We suggest that the organization and operations of this office might be a good topic for an MBA class study project. This would be a further example of the type of use of University resources represented by the management seminar which Dr. Russell Ackoff now conducts for senior administrators of the University. We have the impression that the computer operations of the residence office continue to be a problem; strengthening the computer programming staff might be advisable.

Recommendations With Implications For Both Operations and Program

1. We suggest that a regular system for student participation in planning and operations be established. This might take the form of a representative group of students who could serve both as a grievance committee where students could take unresolved complaints about residence problems and also as a sounding board for student reaction to new policies. For example, if this year's policy on pets had been discussed with such a group, it could have been presented in a better way to all students. We assume that the \$80 pet fee represents an estimate of the actual average cost of having a pet in the buildings. This, however, was not made adequately clear to students. We believe that poor communications in other cases have led to similar misunderstanding of policies and the reasons for them.

2. The physical state of the fraternities now seems to the place where a separate assistant dean and supporting staff for fraternity affairs is unjustified. The University could not only save money but also improve efficiency by handling the operations aspect of fraternities through the residence operations office and the program aspects through the program staff.

3. We see no reason why the lines of budget and authority for Hill Hall should differ from those for other buildings. Current differences result from historical factors which are no longer relevant. Greater efficiency in the future will come from a uniform system of operation.

4. The room retention policy should be restated to make clear that retention is a privilege and not an absolute right. This is necessary for flexibility in arranging various types of residential programs. There have already been cases in the past, as in the Quad in the spring in 1971, when absolute right of retention has not existed. Obviously the number of people affected in any one year would be very small. Guidelines should be established so that anyone displaced would be given the most nearly equivalent unit.

5. We have given considerable thought to the role of the building manager, especially in the high-rises. This person must be sensitive to both operations and program concerns. We have been told that the present "double boss" system is working well. We note however that this does violate a standard management principle of each person reporting to only one supervisor. As openings for building managers develop in the future, the job description should be changed to require the manager to live in the building and to have a demonstrated willingness to acquire skills in both the operations and program areas. To insure this, representatives of both operations and program should participate in the hiring process. Any person hired should be acceptable to both divisions. With these changes in the building manager's job description, the present post of assistant manager would become unnecessary and could be abolished.

Residential Life Subcommittee: Dr. Charles Thrall, *Sociology, Chairman*; Dr. Burton Rosner, *Psychology*; Dr. Daniel Rie, *Finance*; Arnold Rosoff (B. Law), Ivy Fenton (CW '73), Richard Delaney (C '74), Steven Fadem (WH '72).

The Graduate Student Association cordially invites faculty members of the University to the Grad Happy Hour each Friday from 4 to 7 p.m. at the Christian Association.

—George Tower, GSA

OPEN LETTER TO THE FACULTY

For many years now there has been a need—and a sometime plan—for a house system that would help make of Penn a community of scholars in the full sense of the phrase.

There are modest beginnings now, notable among them the residential experiment called College House or Van Pelt Manor House. There are more undergraduates who need and want such programs, and there is room now in the hi-rises for new programs to be created.

A group of graduate and professional students have before the Vice Provost for Student Affairs a proposal to grant year-round living quarters and modest activities funds to perhaps three or four full-time faculty members next year to start subject houses or subject floors. These might be something like Middlebury's Language Houses (but hopefully in a far wider range of disciplines) where several students and a faculty member with staff aid would live and work.

We would like to hear from interested faculty members as soon as possible in the hope that a Faculty-in-Residence program might be designed and funded in time to begin in the Fall.

—Jim Cocroft, Teaching Assistant,
Political Science (7641); EV 2-5127

REPORT OF THE SUPPORTIVE AGENCIES SUBCOMMITTEE

December 1971

Students at the University today are finding an increasing need for guidance, vocational, educational, academic, and psychological. The University must respond to these new demands, as it is its responsibility to supply the supportive structures that the student needs to make his education a meaningful experience. Counseling is really seeking advice in some form and it is part of today's college experience. The student is not looking for the University to play an *in loco parentis* role, but he is looking for a warm personal involvement with someone that will take the time to try to understand his problems and anxieties.

Many students are made to feel ill at ease by the present supportive system. It does not treat the student as a whole, whose problems may not be compartmentalized. Many of the counseling services are separated and many students are unsure as to which type of counseling to seek. Too many of the problems that students face today are interdisciplinary and could involve all of the services, such as black, vocational, pre-law and psychiatric counseling. The University must come up with a flexible system with which to meet this need. Such a system will need participants from all areas in the University. Above all, the major emphasis of counseling must be placed on those areas in which students are mostly involved: in the classroom and the residences.

The University should utilize all of its resources, faculty, graduate students, and alumni, to aid it in vocational advising and work-study programs. It is both necessary and desirable for establishing a supportive community environment.

The Supportive Agencies Subcommittee has also recognized a need for the supportive agencies of the University to make stronger efforts in reaching students who live off-campus.

In the Student Affairs Division there is an obvious need for greater coordination between what is now the Dean of Students Office and the Residential Life Office. There must be active interaction between the resource people and all of the advising

facilities in the University. The following proposals do not include recommendations for structural change; however, such change may be necessary and desirable to implement these statements of policy and priority.

Recommendations

I.

1. There should be, and there must be, increased faculty participation in the advising functions of the Student Affairs Division. This participation may be facilitated by providing incentives such as reduced teaching loads, and promotional consideration for such participation.

2. There should be a voluntary seminar program, run by the Student Affairs division to help acquaint interested faculty with the advising activity.

3. There should be increased emphasis placed on the utilization of graduate students in various capacities. In a voluntary capacity these students could be used for advising in their areas of specialty. Qualified students should be given the opportunity to receive academic credit for participation in the advising program.

4. Undergraduate students should be encouraged to participate in the advising area, as is currently the case with SCUE advising.

5. Coordination of these activities should be handled by the Director of Counseling (see below).

II.

1. There should be a central advising facility. This facility should be a resource, drawing upon all of the University's advising programs. This facility should serve as the referral mechanism. In order to do this, the facility must be available to students 24 hours a day. This facility must be staffed by trained and competent personnel.

2. The advising facility should include psychological counseling, vocational advising, pre-law and pre-med advising, effective coordination of referrals for academic advising and HUP psychiatric service.

3. The University Placement Service should be directly a part of the advising center.

4. There must be increased coordination between those services that are directly related to the advising facility and those outside of it. This can be done through coordination meetings, held at least once a month.

5. Emphasis must also be placed on the involvement of Residential Life personnel in the advising programs.

6. In order to implement these recommendations there must be a Director of Counseling. This person should be responsible for the establishment and maintenance of the central advising facility. He should be responsible for coordinating all advising programs and establishing seminar programs for faculty participants, and in-service training programs for residential life personnel. This person must be a competent administrator with sufficient training in the counseling area.

7. There should be a centralization of services offered by the central advising center. As many of its services as possible should be located in one area.

III.

1. Graduate Student activities should be coordinated and supervised by the Director of Student Activities, as is currently the procedure with undergraduate students.

2. The Freshman Drop-Add period should be extended by one week so that these students will be able to avail themselves of the academic advising programs.

3. Departmental pre-major activities should be encouraged. These activities should not be confined to purely academic activities. They should also be aimed at increasing overall interaction between faculty and students.

Supportive Agencies Subcommittee: Edward Hill (C '74), Chairman; Col. Faris Kirkland, Military Science; Mrs. Caren Blazey, CW Assistant Dean; Gretchen Wood, English; Michael Squires (Wh '74), Gerry Campbell (C '74), Mark Ridner (GSE); Ray Hawkins (GSAS).

DEATHS

ALMANAC has received notice of the deaths of the following members of the University family:

DR. LEON H. COLLINS JR. (February 11 at 72), Medical School alumnus and Assistant Professor in the School of Dental Medicine prior to retirement in 1969. Memorial contributions may be made to The Parkinsonism Research Fund of the University of Pennsylvania.

DR. R. JOHN GOULD (January 22 at 42), Instructor in Radiology in the School of Medicine. An alumnus of the University, he was on the board of the Delaware County Medical Society and a staff member of Pennsylvania Medical College.

FRANCES HOUSTON (January 24 at 80), Medical Librarian Emerita since 1967. She was medical librarian in School of Medicine for 49 years and continued as executive secretary of the University's Medical Alumni Association following her retirement.

DR. S. LEON ISRAEL (December 23 at 65), a Medical School alumnus and Emeritus Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology. He was a former president of the American Gynecological Society, director of American Board of Obstetricians and Gynecologists and editor of the magazine *Gynecology and Obstetrics*.

MRS. MONOLITA C. KASSNER (December 11 at 54), cleaner in Buildings and Grounds Dept.

MRS. VIOLA MCCOLLUM (December 22 at 64), janitress in Buildings and Grounds.

MRS. MARY MUNERA (January 3 at 55), secretary in Gastroenterological Section, School of Medicine.

DR. GEORGE W. PATTERSON III (January 10 at 59), Associate Professor of Electrical Engineering. He received his doctorate at the University and had been on the faculty for 22 years.

DR. WILBUR C. PLUMBER (December 5 at 82), a University alumnus and Emeritus Professor. He served on faculty for 39 years before his 1960 retirement.

BENNIE RICHARDS (January 18 at 55), laboratory utility man in the Medical School.

MICHAEL J. SHEEHAN (December 21 at 48), electrical operators helper in Buildings and Grounds Dept.

DR. R. H. SHRYOCK (January 30 at 78), University alumnus and Emeritus Professor of History. A nationally known medical and science historian, he had served at times as president of the International Association of University Professors; the History of Science Society; and the American Association for the History of Medicine. He was author of numerous books including *The University of Pennsylvania Faculty, A Study in American Higher Education*.

DR. EDWARD STEINFELD (January 4 at 81), a Medical School alumnus and Professor Emeritus of clinical medicine in the Graduate School of Medicine. He was a diplomate of the American Board of Internal Medicine and a fellow of the College of Physicians of Philadelphia; he was elected to the society of Sigma Chi for his research in chemotherapy of pneumonia, fungus diseases of the lung and Hodgkin's disease.

DR. MAX M. STRUMIA (January 13 at 75), an alumnus of the Medical School and Emeritus Professor in Pathology. A plasma research expert, he established one of the nation's first blood banks; he discovered that plasma could be frozen and stored for later use in transfusions.

NEWS IN BRIEF (Continued from Page 1)

Annenberg Center (Ext. 5828); the Mask & Wig Club (WA 3-4229); or from Mrs. Walters at the Alumni Relations Desk in the Information Center on the First Floor of the Franklin Building.

Show time is 8:30 p.m. at the Mask & Wig Club, 310 South Quince Street. There are 200 orchestra tickets and 40 balcony tickets available on a first-come, first serve basis, Producer Steve Goff said.

UNIVERSITY SYMPHONY MARCH 3

A concert by the University Symphony Orchestra, conducted by Eugene Narmour, will be held Friday, March 3, at 8:30 p.m. in Room 200 College Hall.

Sponsored by the Department of Music, the performance will include Rossini's Overture to the *Barber of Seville*; Schumann's Symphony No. 3; and Ravel's *Alborada del Gracioso*. It is open to the public free.

COMPUTER TIME AVAILABLE

The University Committee on Computing recently approved a proposal for the establishment of special computer project numbers that provide for free execution of any WATFIV job of two seconds or less for each school and/or department at the University. All expenditures against these special project numbers will be charged against the University allocation for academic computing.

A second proposal approved by the committee, on an experimental basis, provides for limiting all classroom computer projects to 1000 lines of printed output and 100 cards of punched output; miscellaneous charges for all these projects for classroom use will be charged against the pseudo dollar allocation rather than as a real charge against the department budget.

Anyone needing additional information about the special project numbers should contact his or her Dean's designate for allocation of computing funds, or the department head, according to Jim Guertin of the Computer Center.

CORRECTIONS

ADD TO SOCIAL WORK COMMITTEE

Eleanor Ryder, Associate Professor of Social Work, was inadvertently omitted from the list of Consultative Committee members for a new Dean for the School of Social Work carried in the February 15 ALMANAC.

THE EARLY YEARS'

Dr. Richard Sherman of the Office of the Secretary offers the following correction of an editor's note in "The Early Years," Page 2 of the January 25 issue:

In the summary at the beginning of the article, the statement is made that "the University . . . moved to Ninth and Chestnut in 1844". Although it is not explicitly stated in the article, the University actually moved to that location at a much earlier date, to wit, in 1802. The year 1844 represents the date when the old College building was razed. During the period between 1802 and 1844, the Academy, which was still controlled by the University, continued to hold classes in the old building. The important point, however, is that the College, and hence the University, left its original campus at the very beginning of the nineteenth century, although it continued to own the property until 1877.

| |
|---|
| ALMANAC: 515 Franklin Building, Ext. 5274 |
| Editor Karen C. Gaines |
| Assistant Editor Anne M. Geuss |