



Antiques
And
Events . . .
Page 5

NEWS IN BRIEF

BLACK RESIDENCE CENTER

Vice Provosts John A. Russell Jr. and Humphrey Tonkin jointly announced Thursday that the Black Residence Center project proposed by black students and faculty will go forward. Residence will be open to all freshmen and sophomores, under the criteria quoted in the italic note on Page 7. Educational and academic programs, including seminars and library, will be open to the entire University regardless of race.

Patrick Coles, Assistant Professor of History, and Burney Hollis, a Morgan State College Assistant Professor who will be a teaching fellow in English here next year, are in the faculty residential component. A nonresident faculty master is still to be chosen. Applications close today for the Center, and the screening committee will report out tomorrow.

HEW RETURNS TO CAMPUS

The U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare expects to resume its compliance review of the University on or about May 1 and has asked for the University's Affirmative Action Compliance Program by April 21. A draft of the program is in preparation, based on the preliminary draft circulated in January and on comments received since from individuals, departments, schools and organizations.

AAUP CHAPTER NOMINATIONS

The following persons have been nominated for positions on the Executive Board of the University's Chapter of the American Association of University Professors: Phillip DeLacy, President; Ralph D. Amado, Vice President; Brian F. Chellas, Secretary; Ann R. Miller, Treasurer; Benjamin F. Hammond, W. Allyn Rickett, and Ronald C. Rosbottom, Members for 1972-1974.

The following Members will continue to serve next year: James O. Freedman and Louise Shoemaker, Past Presidents; Lawrence R. Klein and R. L. Widmann, Chairmen of Committees Z and W, respectively; Adelaide M. Delluva, Marvin L. Sachs, and Robert Summers.

Balloting will take place at the annual membership luncheon, Wednesday, April 19, at 12:15 in the Faculty Club.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS

Vice President Paul O. Gaddis will speak at the Administrative Assembly's annual membership meeting, 1 p.m. today, Room 200 College Hall. Also on the agenda are a salary survey report by Manuel Doxer and the report of the out-

(Continued on Page 8)

IN THIS ISSUE

- COUNCIL: Agenda for April 12 • LETTERS
- SENATE: *Black Residence Proposal; Mail Ballot Report of the Subcommittee on Special Organizational Problems*
- CUE REPORT: *Reinforcement and Change in Undergraduate Education*
- COMMISSION: *Current Agenda* • OF RECORD: *Plans*
- *Black Faculty and Administrators* • DO SOMETHING

Almanac

Volume 18, Number 30

April 11, 1972

Published weekly by the University of Pennsylvania

FOUR NEW THEMATIC PROGRAMS LINK COLLEGE, CW, WHARTON & ENGINEERING

Under a three-year, \$356,000 grant from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, the University will start four new thematic studies programs for freshmen and sophomores this fall, drawing on resources of the Wharton School and the Schools of Engineering as well as on the College and College for Women.

Enrollment will be open to students in all of the undergraduate schools of the University.

Like the three sequences in the College of Thematic Studies that started in January within the College, the new thematic programs will focus on problems and themes rather than on specific academic disciplines. They draw heavily on the special expertise of senior faculty in business and technological areas.

"For far too long we have assumed that general education is the exclusive province of the humanities and the pure sciences," President Martin Meyerson said. "Now, building upon the great talents of the Wharton School and the Engineering Schools, we will make available for up to 150 undergraduates experiences that relate the knowledge and insights of technology and management to man's past, present and future. Our new thematic colleges will enable students and teachers alike to build bridges between our professions and liberal arts on the one hand and important issues facing our world on the other." The four themes will be:

- *Energy*, a one-semester program for 25 students to examine the energy crisis facing our society. A short introductory course, three seminars and a three-week field trip will be conducted by the faculty of Pennsylvania's Schools of Engineering, of the Departments of Geology, City Planning, Economics and Operations Research, and of the Fels Center for Government. Focal point for the college will be the University's National Center for Energy Management and Power.

- *Systems-Coordinated Problem Solving*, a strong area at the University since 1954 when the Moore School of Electrical Engineering organized its graduate program in systems. An introductory course and a course studying industrial and

(Continued on Page 2)

THEMATIC PROGRAM (Continued)

economic systems will be given in the first semester. Second semester will consist of a choice between "Regional Planning Systems," or "Biological and Social Systems."

- *The Culture of Industry and Business*, a college aimed at bridging the gap between business and the social sciences and humanities. 60 students will choose three seminars on subjects ranging from "The Folklore of the American Business Institutions," to "Public Policy and Business in the 70's." Faculty will come from the Wharton School, the Graduate School of Education and the departments of the College of Arts and Sciences.

- *Transportation*, a program where 25 students will take a hard look at a current problem in transportation. For the first semester, the problem will be the highway vs. mass transit in metropolitan areas. It will be approached by a four-week introductory course, small four-week seminars and finally three weeks devoted to problem-solving.

All four colleges will make extensive use of visiting lecturers, communal meals, and other activities outside the traditional classroom situation. Professors will team-teach in the colleges of Energy Management and Transportation. In Energy Management, students and faculty members will go on an extended field trip, visiting major energy facilities and also talking with businessmen and legislators. The Transportation college will have an unusual orientation—a curriculum culminating in the solution of a single major problem.

"The program will provide our students with the ability to integrate the various components of their education," said Dr. Humphrey Tonkin, Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Studies. "The standard undergraduate curriculum requires that students take courses in several different fields simultaneously. It is only right that we occasionally build this interdisciplinary experience into coherent programs."

Initiative to Scholarship

The program speaks directly to the large number of students on today's campuses who are not yet committed to a single academic discipline, Dr. Tonkin said. These small colleges focused on sophisticated study of society's problems are designed to involve students in genuine learning and provide them with the initiative to pursue their own academic interests.

"This is also the beginning of a trend to bring leading scholars on the faculty into the early stages of undergraduate education," Dr. Tonkin added. "It is a necessary step to improve undergraduate education and to insure the continuation of scholarly work in universities at a time when the demand for graduate instruction is diminishing."

Deans and curriculum committees will be watching these experiments closely as they develop. The Business Culture program may provide a model for the future freshman and sophomore curriculum at the Wharton School, Dr. Tonkin suggested. If the Transportation sequence generates enough student interest, it could become a department of its own. "All of these programs suggest the possibility of creating undergraduate major programs around groups of students instead of having the students participate in permanent major programs," Dr. Tonkin concluded.

The three existing thematic studies programs now provide 200 undergraduates the opportunity to focus their studies on one of three topics: *The Ancient World*, *Science and Social Change*, or *Some Versions of Utopia*. Within his chosen topic each student has selected two seminars from the ten offered and also carries an additional unit of independent study. Students in each topic have films, general lectures and discussions with visiting scholars.

THE COUNCIL

APRIL 12 AGENDA

The agenda for the meeting on Wednesday, April 12, at 4:00 p.m. in the Furness Building will include action on the Conflict of Interest Committee report (30 minutes); action on an Educational Policy Committee report on the honor board (30 minutes); report of the Development Commission (20 minutes); action on a proposed bylaws change (5 minutes); and discussion of a Student Affairs Committee report on the Division of Student Affairs.

THE SENATE

BLACK RESIDENCE PROPOSAL

At the special Senate meeting April 5 called to discuss a motion opposing the establishment of any "racial or religious criteria for residence in any University-operated housing unit or subdivision thereof," a substitute motion introduced by Professor Howard Lesnick of the Law School was carried 82-71. Its text reads as follows:

The University Senate, while commending the Administration for committing serious efforts to maximizing the educational opportunities of black students, is concerned lest the means chosen to carry out this commitment create undue risks of perpetuating racial divisions. The Senate notes that the proposed black residence center has been tentatively approved by the Administration as an experiment, for a one-year term, and that a thorough evaluation of its operation and prospects will be undertaken prior to consideration of any proposal for its extension. The Chairman is authorized and directed to request the Provost to appoint Senate representatives to the committee which will perform the evaluation. The Chairman is further authorized and directed to appoint an ad hoc committee of the Senate, which shall have the following responsibilities: (a) to remain informed regarding the operation and effects of the proposed center; (b) to consider the overall questions of educational policy raised by it; (c) to report to the Senate, not later than March 1, 1973, with respect to the foregoing matters and any other related issues thought appropriate to be presented at that time. It is the sense of the Senate that the Senate representatives appointed to the Administration's evaluation committee be chosen from among the members of the ad hoc committee.

MAIL BALLOTS

Written ballots were mailed April 3 to Senate members for the 1972-73 election, and should be returned by April 18. Any member who has not received the ballot should call Miss Penny Burdon at Ext. 6943.—Alan Kors

LETTERS

DUPLICATION

The reprinting of a letter by R. E. Davies marks another occasion in which the ALMANAC has duplicated information already published in the *Daily Pennsylvanian*. I hope that the editors will not continue to honor such a policy as it violates the widely held principle that journal space is too costly and too important to waste repeating already published information. Exceptions may be made in certain instances where the significance and necessity of repeating the material are obvious. I submit that the letter of the Benjamin Franklin Professor of Molecular Biology does not qualify as such.

—Benjamin F. Hammond, Professor of Microbiology

THE SENATE

FROM THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON REORGANIZATION OF THE FACULTY: *Last week's ALMANAC contained an initial report concerning the deliberations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Reorganization of the Faculty, and included was a subcommittee report concerning the general organization of the faculty. Following hereafter are a series of recommendations concerning special organizational problems. The proposals were presented to the parent committee by a Subcommittee chaired by Dr. Murray Murphey and whose members were Drs. Gordon Keith, Lee Peachey, Burton Rosner, Paul Taubman and Reid Warren. The recommendations were acted upon favorably by the Ad Hoc Committee after making minor changes (which are incorporated in the material which follows).*

—Robert D. Eilers

Report of the Subcommittee on Special Organizational Problems

The Subcommittee has been asked to consider a set of problems which arise when a significant portion of the students taught by a department are enrolled in a school other than that in which the department is budgeted. These problems have arisen particularly in respect to the social science departments in the Wharton School and the basic science departments in the medical school, but they are not limited to these special areas, and the attempts of the Task Force to deal with them, which are embodied in Recommendations 28, 29, and 30, are stated in general terms so as to cover any such situation. It will be helpful to specify in some detail what the problems are, and then proceed to the Subcommittee's recommendations.

It seems to us that the following eight problems have to be considered:

(1) A department may wish to teach courses to students from a school other than that in which it is budgeted, but the other school may refuse to permit this;

(2) Where a department offers a major which contains students from different schools and the requirements of the two schools differ (e.g. the number of courses required for graduation differs between Wharton and the College), this may create difficulties for the students involved;

(3) If the department devotes a significant portion of its resources to teaching outside the school in which it is budgeted, it may fail to render adequate service to its own school;

(4) A department which teaches many students outside its own school may not conform in that outside teaching to the standards of its own school;

(5) A department teaching a significant portion of its students in another school may have inadequate influence upon decisions in that other school which affect its interests;

(6) A school which has a significant number of its students taught by a department in another school may not be able to exert sufficient influence upon that department to insure that the instruction offered its students is adequate;

(7) A department which does a significant portion of its teaching outside its own school may not receive adequate financial support from its school;

(8) A department which teaches a large portion of students outside its own school may believe that it ought to be located in some other school.

We are persuaded that several of these problems can be adequately handled through existing officers and structures. Thus in the case of (3), we believe that the budgetary power which the dean of the school has is quite sufficient to insure that the departments of that school will in fact render adequate service to it. Similarly, in the case of (6), the control which a school has over the courses and programs offered within it—a control exercised usually through its committee on instruction—would seem to be perfectly adequate to insure that outside departments which wish to teach in that school will have to meet its standards. These problems therefore require no further consideration here.

Problem (5) points to an important difficulty which often arises, and to which the Task Force addressed itself in Recommendation 30. The Task Force's proposal was:

We recommend that any faculty group which is located in one school and which as a normal part of its academic function regularly teaches a substantial number of courses to a significant number of students in another school, such courses being accepted in partial fulfillment of degree requirements by the second school, should have representation proportional to its weighted contribution when educational decisions affecting those students are made.

We agree with the substance of this recommendation, but we believe that a distinction ought to be made between courses which are part of a major offered by the outside department and so-called service courses which are not related to any such major. With respect to the former, we endorse the Task Force's position, but we do not believe that this principle should be extended to service courses, since if it were the outside department would in some cases acquire undue influence over the school (e.g. where all students in a given school are required to take some elementary course offered by an outside department). Hence we propose the adoption of the following revised recommendation:

Recommendation I. *We recommend that any faculty group which is located in one school and which as a normal part of its academic function offers a major which enrolls a significant number of students from another school should have adequate and regular representation in the faculty and committees of that school.*

Problems (1), (2), and (4) involve issues of the autonomy of the separate faculties in decisions affecting requirements, accreditation, and standards. It is well known that there are differences in these matters among the various schools in the University, and it is obvious that so long as the separate faculties maintain their autonomy such differences are certain to occur. Whatever the difficulties which these differences create, we believe that the autonomy of the separate faculties is a fundamental principle which ought to be maintained. At the same time, we believe that many of these differences can be eliminated, or mitigated, by consultation among reasonable men. Procedures have recently been instituted which involve the exchange of minutes between curriculum committees of different schools, and plans are being discussed for each such committee to have representatives on the others. Such procedures will certainly mitigate the seriousness of difficulties in this area. Nevertheless, it seems to us that some procedure should exist for dealing with problems which cannot be resolved in this fashion. The newly created office of Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Education provides an officer whose function is to coordinate the various undergraduate programs, and we believe that a standing committee advisory to him would form an appropriate body for the discussion and resolution of such problems. We note that the Crockett Subcommittee in its report endorses the following recommendation from the college faculty:

The Committee recommends the establishment of a Council on Undergraduate Education, consisting of several elected faculty members representing each school offering undergraduate programs, as well as the Dean, Assistant Dean or other administrative officer responsible for undergraduate programs in each school (ex officio).

The Crockett Subcommittee recommends that this Council be advisory to the Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Education, and it seems clear that such a Council would be the appropriate body to take up and seek to resolve questions of the sort involved in (1), (2), and (4). Therefore

Recommendation II. *We recommend the establishment of the Council on Undergraduate Education as proposed by the Crockett Subcommittee.*

Recommendation III. *We recommend that when problems arise concerning differences in requirements or standards in the separate schools or concerning the access of departments in one school to students in another, such problems should be referred to the Council on Undergraduate Education, which, together with the Vice-Provost, should seek to bring about their resolution.*

Problem (8) is the problem of the relocation of departments. The Task Force dealt with this problem in its Recommendations 28 and 29. These are

28. We recommend that where a department has teaching responsibilities in more than one school of the University, it be located for administrative and budgetary purposes in the school responsible for the degree programs that are most important to it.

29. We recommend that issues of departmental affiliation arising out of the principle stated in Recommendation 28 be resolved by the University Council for advice to the President and Trustees.

With respect to Recommendation 28, we find ourselves opposed to the position of the Task Force. First, Recommendation 28 is extremely vague. It is not clear what "most important" means, who is to determine what is "most important", or how the determination is to be made. Second, "importance" in a number of interpretations might be highly unstable. Thus if "the degree programs that are most important" means "the degree for which the largest number of students is enrolled", relatively trivial fluctuations might lead to frequent and largely pointless shifts of the department from school to school. Third, certain interpretations of "most important" could impose upon a department a mechanical decision procedure requiring moves on the part of departments which are happy in their present situations and have no desire to

move. Our Subcommittee believes that the location of a department in a school ought not to be disturbed unless the department indicates that it does wish to make a change. If by democratic procedures the department determines that it does wish to make such a change, then it is obviously desirable that the change should be endorsed by the dean and faculty of the school in which the department is located, the dean and faculty of the school to which the department wishes to move, and the Provost, and the concurrence of all of these should be sufficient to effect the move. In the event that all of these cannot agree, we believe that the concurrence of the department, the dean and faculty of the school to which the department wishes to move, and the Provost should be sufficient to effect the move. Therefore

Recommendation IV. *We recommend that any department which has by democratic procedures determined that it wishes to move from the school in which it is located to another school, and which has obtained the approval for this move of the dean and faculty of the school to which it wishes to move, and of the Provost, should be permitted to make this move. If a department which elects to change its School affiliation has been performing essential roles for the School in which it was initially located, the Provost should negotiate suitable arrangements for the continuing fulfillment of that need.*

Our Subcommittee unanimously rejects Recommendation 29 of the Task Force. We do not believe that the University Council is in any respect an appropriate body to consider problems of this nature. We also do not believe that a review procedure beyond that specified in our Recommendation IV is necessary or desirable.

It remains to deal with problem (7). A department which feels that it is improperly treated by the administration of the school in which it is located has it seems to us two options: it can request the University administration to change the administration of the school, or it can ask to leave the school and move elsewhere. The second option is already covered in our Recommendation IV. Should it be the opinion of the University administration that the department should not move and should it also appear that the administration of the school is inadequately supporting the department, we find it inconceivable that the administration of the school would not be corrected or changed by the Provost and/or President. We do not believe therefore that (7) poses a problem which cannot be dealt with through existing procedures or those we have proposed.

A further problem, not considered above, arises when two departments overlap so substantially in their activities that the redundancy is wasteful. We are in general not opposed to some overlap. We regard some competition among departments as healthy and as an important safeguard against complacency and shoddy performance. We are also well aware that what constitutes overlap depends very much upon who judges. Thus, the celebrated multiplicity of departments offering statistics is viewed by some people as overlap while others believe that the statistical methods relevant in different fields are so various that there is in fact little overlap. Nevertheless, we recognize that cases of overlap can occur which lead to genuine waste and that some procedure is necessary to deal with this situation. We propose the following:

Recommendation V. *Whenever a department believes that it is being substantially overlapped by another, it should be able to appeal the issue to its dean, if both departments are in one school or the Provost if they are in different schools. This officer should then appoint an ad hoc committee composed of the chairmen of both departments involved, and three other senior faculty members who are members of neither department and have no vested interest involved in the outcome, one of whom should be named chairman of the committee. This committee should determine the facts of the case and seek to arbitrate the dispute and, if no other settlement is possible, recommend the necessary action to the administrative officer in question.*

Murray Murphey, Chairman
Gordon Keith
Lee Peachey

Burton Rosner
Paul Taubman
Reid Warren



SPECIAL EVENTS IN THE ANTIQUES SHOW

Chinese antiquities will be the focus of this year's University Hospital Antiques Show and Sale, the annual HUP benefit running April 18-22 at the 103rd Engineers Armory, 33rd Street north of Market. It is open 12 noon to 10 p.m. Tuesday through Friday, and 10 a.m. to 8 p.m., Saturday, with a \$2.50 admission fee. Special events are:

Mystery House Tours

Thursday, April 20 and Friday, April 21. Visits to old and new houses—see unusual architecture and interesting interiors. Private bus with experienced guides—Morning Tours will leave 29th Street exit of 30th St. Station at 10:00 A.M.—Return to Armory at 12:45 P.M. *Thursday afternoon only:* Bus will leave Armory at 1:30 P.M. and return, via 30th St. Station at 4:30. \$10.00 (including admission to Show). *Reserved seats only.*

Supper at the Show

Thursday, April 20, 5:30 to 9:30 P.M. \$10.00 (including gourmet supper and admission to Show).

Gallery Tours

Wednesday, April 19, Thursday, April 20 and Friday, April 21 at 10:30 A.M. Guided tours of the Show in small groups to point out and discuss highlights of the exhibits. Capacity limited. Reservations necessary. \$5.00 (including admission to Show).

Refreshments

Bamboo Court Luncheons: Tuesday through Friday—12 Noon to 2 P.M. \$4.00. Please reserve.

Eagle Coffee House: Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday—12 Noon to 9:30 P.M.; Thursday—12 Noon to 5 P.M.; Saturday—10:00 A.M. to 2:30 only.

Parking

University Garage on South Street, east of University Museum. Shuttle bus to and from Armory April 18 through April 21—12 Noon to 5:30; April 22—10 A.M. to 3 P.M.

Catalogue

Antiques Show Catalogue \$3.00 (by mail \$3.75).

For Information telephone (215) MI 2-7001

UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL ANTIQUES SHOW

Name

Address

Mystery Tours @ \$10.00

☐ Thursday A.M. ☐ Thursday P.M.
☐ Friday A.M.

Supper at the Show @ \$10.00

Check preferred dinner hour

6:30 ☐ 7:15 ☐ 8:00 ☐

Gallery Tours @ \$5.00

☐ Wednesday ☐ Thursday ☐ Friday

Bamboo Court Luncheons @ \$4.00

☐ Tuesday ☐ Wednesday
☐ Thursday ☐ Friday

☐ Antiques Show Catalogue @ \$3.75

Enclosed is check for

\$

Please make checks payable to:

The University Hospital Antiques Show

829 Waverly Road, Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania 19010

THE COMMISSION

THE CURRENT AGENDA

March 1972

The President has asked the University Development Commission to advise him on a major policy decision regarding University financing: namely, should the President ask the Trustees to authorize and support major fund-raising efforts with the aim of raising perhaps hundreds of millions of dollars in the next decade toward University operations and endowment? If the answer to this question is yes, the President further asks the Commission to describe what some of the major proposals involving educational innovation, research, teaching and service should be, how much such proposals would cost, and what impact they might be expected to have on the University as a whole.

The Commission in its effort to deal with these questions sees a work schedule for the remainder of the year divided into three parts: (1) present to May 30: the identification of planning proposals in various stages of completion in different sectors of the University along with the opinions of faculty and administration as to possible priorities among these proposals. At the same time the Commission will review the current financial problems of the University with a view to understanding the long-run implications of funding proposals and to evaluating realistically the possibility of any significant reallocation money becoming available to support proposals. A progress report to the President for presentation to the Trustees meeting in early May will conclude this phase. (2) June-September: further evaluation and refinement of proposals in terms of completeness of description and rationale, supporting data, cost analysis (including space requirements and long-range support implications), and the examination of feasibility in relation to possible funding sources. It is expected that the Commission will work closely with Mr. Hetherston's office on space-cost implications and with Mr. Sweeten's office on funding possibilities. A summary report will be delivered to the President for his use at the Trustees meeting in October. (3) October-December: further refinement of proposals combined with faculty review aiming at the presentation of the final recommendations to the President in time for the January Trustees meeting.

In pursuit of this schedule and the goals set for the Commission, the Commission has turned at once to the faculty and administration for advice and help in identifying all current planning proposals, new ideas, and possible sources of funds for major programs. In developing this information the Commission is already working closely with the chairmen of the Academic Planning Committee and the Educational Policy Committee of the Council and is currently arranging for liaison with the Senate Committee on Academic Priorities. The Commission has already planned a joint meeting with the two Council committees to discuss with them the nature of the progress report to be delivered in May to the President. Both the Senate Committee and the Academic Planning Committee are reviewing the President's own set of proposals of last January and their comments will be taken into consideration by the Commission when they become available. The Commission will rely heavily on the work of the Academic Planning Committee in establishing criteria for the measurement of academic excellence where such criteria may be necessary for completing the rationale of a proposal.

Continued on Page 6

COMMISSION AGENDA (Continued)

In the meantime, in order to move ahead with the gathering of necessary data for review and with the identification of various models for the development of such things as endowed professorships, the Commission has established a number of work teams in major subject areas of importance to its deliberations. The chairmen of these work teams have been asked to consult those within and outside of the University who may be able to give useful information. In most cases it is expected that a small work team of knowledgeable faculty will assist the chairmen on an *ad hoc*, non-voting basis. At the same time the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Commission have been gradually meeting with the various Deans and Administrative Officers of the University in an effort to learn more directly of their thinking in relation to planning proposals and fund-raising. Information received by the Commission office from throughout the University is being analyzed and sent along to the relevant work teams. When sufficient data have been gathered and organized the Commission as a whole will discuss the proposals in terms of feasibility and impact. In the end the collective group of proposals will be reviewed in terms of total cost and major directions represented with a view to maintaining an overall balance in the University between traditional strengths and new directions.

The work teams, their chairmen and their immediate objectives are as follow:

Cooperative Programs within the University: Britton Harris

To survey the past experience (good and bad) within the University in relation to interdisciplinary programs; to identify areas of future growth where interdisciplinary programs are or could be planned to meet an existing need or create a future strength; to examine the problem of balance between teaching and research in existing programs; to develop at least one proposal as a trial case.

Cooperative Programs with other Institutions: Barbara Ruch

To review our existing programs to see what our experience has been as an existing model and to identify other existing proposals or possibilities for cooperation with either local institutions or more distant Universities, for foreign cooperation, and for library and other technical systems cooperation.

Educational Living Programs: Michael Neiditch and Ruth Ann Price

To review the many proposals which currently exist in an effort to identify those with sufficient educational content to significantly improve the educational experience of undergraduates at this University and which offer possibilities for funding.

Endowed Fellowships: Phillip Rieff

To review our own experience with various fellowship programs and to examine programs elsewhere in an effort to develop models which might be appropriate for funding at Pennsylvania.

Endowed Professorships: Julius Margolis

To identify the existing structure of endowed professorships at Pennsylvania and to review our experience with them in terms of strengths and weaknesses; to obtain comparative information and additional models from outside sources with an aim to describing a number of possible models for use at Pennsylvania. This study is especially important as the availability of funding in this area looks promising.

Graduate Programs: J. Robert Schrieffer

To identify planning proposals aimed at increased excellence and to examine existing strengths in support of these proposals; to examine the balance between undergraduate and graduate education and between graduate education and research in the proposals.

OF RECORD



UNIVERSITY PLANS

Following is the text of a statement by the Office of Planning and Design, published in response to inquiries raised at the President's Conference of March 23.

The University of Pennsylvania's Urban Renewal Plan and Institutional Development District Plan are matters of public record on file at the Redevelopment Authority and City Planning Commission available for inspection on request. Anyone having questions about the University's development plans is encouraged to inquire at the Office of Planning and Design, Room 748 Franklin Building, Ext. 5831.

Library Technology and Improvement: Otto Springer

To examine existing opportunities for selective strengthening of the library holdings and selective development of instant bibliographical retrieval and other technological innovations.

Professional Education: Renee Fox and Carol Weiss

To identify innovative programs for broader and deeper educational perspectives by professional schools and to explore the nature of the concept of professional education at Pennsylvania; to identify current problem areas and seek proposals for improvement in these areas.

Reallocation Problems: Burton S. Rosner and Otto Springer

To examine the balance between academic and non-academic sectors of the University to see if the available endowment is currently used efficiently in comparison with other comparable institutions and to determine whether or not there is any realistic probability of significant savings for reallocation which seems doubtful under present circumstances. (The question of reallocation between departments within given sectors of the University is not of immediate concern here.) This work team has the full cooperation of the business administrators of the University.

University Direction and Image: Robert W. Nason and Phillip Rieff

The aim of this team will be to stimulate the thinking of the Commission on major issues by formulating viewpoints and by monitoring the developing proposals to ascertain their relationship to the University's general direction and overall image.

Undergraduate Programs: Michael Zuckerman and William Keller

To collect and review a variety of innovative programs existing or proposed which aim at improving the educational experience of the undergraduate at this University and which are sound enough academically to offer the possibility of obtaining financial support.

Other areas have been suggested. Computer programs will be reported through the work team on Cooperative Programs within the University (Harris). A. Humphrey will probably take over the area of audiovisual technology or Continuing Education when he returns at the end of the month. Other suggested areas are University City Environment, University Services (Health, etc.), Research activity, etc. In so far as such subjects relate to funding they will be reviewed as the work teams come to them or else separate studies will have to be made. The Commission will try to deal with all legitimate concerns as it proceeds subject to its ability to do so and the clear relation of the subject to possible funding programs.

The Commission welcomes further suggestions as to its activities and consultants (both within and outside the University) for its various concerns. It would appreciate having its attention called to any major funding areas which it has overlooked. In its efforts it hopes to incorporate the planning already done by the faculty wherever possible since final implementation of its recommendations will be the responsibility of the Development Office working with the Deans and faculty. The only successful course lies through this kind of broad cooperation aimed at the improvement of the conditions of the University as a whole.

—Robert H. Dyson, Jr.

BLACK FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATORS' POSITION ON RESIDENCE CENTER PROPOSAL

In the wake of demonstrations last week by black students urging administrative action on the Black Residence Center proposal, a little-known campus organization called the Black Faculty and Administrators came forward with the statement below, issued at a press conference April 3.

The BFA was organized about a year ago by some 40 black men and women in faculty and administrative posts here. Spokesmen at the press conference were Professors Bernard Anderson, William Meek and John Wideman, and administrators William Adams (Admissions), Conrad Jones and Thomasina Reed (Student Affairs) and James H. Robinson (Equal Opportunity).

At the special meeting discussed in Item 3 below, the Senate did not pass the resolution referred to here, but adopted a substitute motion which appears on Page 2 of this issue. During debate, the Black Residence Proposal's author, Cathy Barlow, added to the discussion some criteria for admission that she said could conceivably include white students if the white students' needs would be met by the program there. "The Residence Center is designed for freshmen and sophomores who have a particular interest in and commitment to the black culture and a particular need for the educational and supportive services which the environment of the Center would provide," she said. "In screening applicants this interest, commitment and need would be the decisive factors."

In recent weeks, the University community has been subjected to much confusion and uncertainty regarding the proposed Black Residence and Cultural Center. The proposal, adopted with modifications, by the administration, has been severely criticized and excoriated by some members of the University faculty, the local community, and some representatives of the local press. Because of the critical importance of the residence proposal to the growth and development of academic excellence at the University, and because of the need to allay the fear and apprehensions of those both within and outside the University community, the BFA would like to clarify some basic issues with respect to the residence center proposal.

1. This proposal is necessary in order to ease the process of acclimating Black Students to the predominantly White University environment. For many Black undergraduates, the college experience is a new and frightening experience fraught with serious challenges and responsibilities. Some, perhaps most, Black undergraduates came to their experience from communities in which racial integration is a hope, but not a reality. Very often these students find the predominantly White University environment emotionally foreboding. The result is that academic promise and academic performance on the part of Black undergraduates go unfulfilled for no reason other than the emotional trauma associated with becoming oriented to the new University experience. Despite the efforts of Black Faculty and Administrators, and the help of a few interested White colleagues, the problems of Black undergraduate adjustment to the University have in recent years been unrelieved, with the result that academic performance has not reached the level expected in view of the students' potential.

One of the major factors responsible for this condition is the Black student's feeling of alienation from the faculty, administration, and the academic program. The student sees little that is inherently motivational from his point of view: there are far too few Black faculty members, far too few Black administrators, and at the present time, far too few courses and cultural offerings which relate directly to the Black experience. University policies developed within the past two years and currently in the process of development promise to relieve some of these problems by increasing the number of Black professionals and administrators, and by inaugurating an Afro-American studies program. These policies, however, have not yet produced significant change, and are unlikely under any circumstances to bear fruit within five to seven years. In the meantime, alternative and supplementary measures are required to meet the serious problem outlined above—of course remaining within the limits of available University resources and capabilities. We view the proposed Black Residence

and Cultural Center as one such measure, and we are convinced that its benefits to the entire University community will far outweigh any costs involved in its implementation.

2. Most of the apprehensions raised by the proposal rest in the fear that by creating the Black Residence Center, the University will contribute to the segregation of students on the basis of race. We must admit that this fear was also the cause of some concern to most members of the BFA. We are committed irrevocably to the ultimate goal of a fully integrated society in which racial identity is an irrelevant criterion for participation and for the enjoyment of benefits and acceptance of responsibilities. A close reading of the proposal, however, has convinced us that the Black Residence Center would in no way conflict with the attainment of that goal. In fact, the provisions of the proposal can hasten the attainment of meaningful racial integration here at the University of Pennsylvania. Segregation is forced separation which dehumanizes and degrades the spirit; it is immoral, unlawful, and unjust. On the other hand, a voluntary plan for Blacks to come together for academic and cultural enrichment is in the highest tradition of morality, and will strengthen rather than weaken the human spirit. Moreover, a voluntary organized plan for racial pluralism on the University campus would do no more than use the existing de facto racial separation as a positive and progressive force to hasten the day when racial identity will not be important.

The very modest proposal, if implemented in its present form, would leave 80 to 90 percent of the Black undergraduates in racially integrated living facilities. It is our belief, however, that these students will also benefit from the Center through its cultural and academic offerings, and through its very presence as proof of the University's commitment to excellence among Black undergraduates. Further, because all cultural and academic affairs offered by the Center will be open to all members of the University community, both Black and White, the Center will contribute to the enrichment of the academic and cultural experience for a wide spectrum of the University family.

3. We are deeply disappointed by the leadership of the Faculty Senate in organizing a special meeting on Wednesday, April 5, that has been interpreted by many faculty as a veiled attempt to undermine the proposed Black Residence and Cultural Center. It is clear that most of those in the University Senate who suggested the resolution have not read the proposal and are reacting negatively to that which they do not fully understand. It would seem both logical and equitable, that if clarity and understanding were the goals to be sought, the Senate leadership would call a meeting on the proposal itself rather than on a resolution that is so vague and general that almost no one could disagree with its expression. In fact, the resolution, as worded, does no more than reiterate what is already firmly established as University policy. It seems unnecessary, therefore, to prevail upon the precious time and energies of our faculty to debate an issue that ostensibly was settled long ago, and has represented the standard for University operation for many years.

If the Senate's impending action is a veiled attack upon the residence proposal, we believe such action would represent a glaring breach of responsibility on the part of the University faculty. Despite the University's attempt to grapple with the terribly difficult problem of increasing the Black undergraduate enrollment, at no time has the University Senate come forward with a coherent set of recommendations or advice to the administration to assist in the resolution of such problems. It is strange, and deeply regrettable, that the Senate would now marshal its resources to put down a modest proposal, developed by the students themselves to improve their academic performance and to increase their contribution to the life of the University.

While our hearts are heavy at the action of the Senate leadership, our responsibility is clear. That responsibility is to inform the University community as to the real nature of the proposal for residential life, and to make all members of the University family aware of the positive benefits contained in the proposal for the enrichment of University life for all of us.

DO SOMETHING

"THE PLOUGH AND THE STARS": FOCUS OF SERIES

Feelings ran so high in Dublin when "The Plough and the Stars" was first presented that a riot erupted on opening night at the Abbey Theatre. Today Sean O'Casey's masterpiece still burns with issues as critical as they were in that harried time of "the Troubles."

To examine these issues, such as the responsibility for armed struggle, the illusions that make men fight and die, and the realization that there is no way to step aside, the Annenberg Center offers a series of panel discussions and films in conjunction with its upcoming production of "The Plough and the Stars", running April 18 through 29, with previews April 15 and 17. The play is directed by Thomas Gruenewald at the Zellerbach Theatre.

Related films to be shown in the Studio Theatre at Annenberg Center are:

<i>The Playboy of the Western World</i>	April 20 4 p.m.
<i>The Plough and the Stars</i>	April 21 4 p.m.
<i>The Battle of Algiers</i>	April 25 4 p.m.
<i>Shame</i>	April 27 4 p.m.
<i>Open City</i>	April 28 4 p.m.

At 10 p.m. April 22, following a performance of "The Plough and the Stars" in the Zellerbach Theatre, a panel discussion will center on problems in producing the drama. Participants include Thomas Gruenewald, and Professors Gerald Weales, Joel Conarroe, and Enoch Brater. A second discussion, "Who is Responsible?", will be held at 10 p.m. April 28 at Zellerbach. Larry Gross, Assistant Professor of Communications, will moderate and Dean George Gerbner and Professors Philip Pochoda and Lt. Col. Faris R. Kirkland will participate.

Admission to "The Plough and the Stars" is free to holders of University ID cards; \$1 for students and staff of other educational institutions, and \$3 for the general public. All other events are free and open to the general public. For information and reservations, call 594-6791.

CHAMBER MUSIC: APRIL 14

The Philomathean Society and the Campus Performance Society will present a chamber music concert on Friday, April 14, at 8:30 p.m. in the Philomathean Art Gallery, 4th floor, College Hall.

The program, which includes Beethoven's Sonata for violoncello and piano No. 3 in A, and Dvorak's Trio in B flat Major for violin, violoncello and piano, Opus 21, will be performed by Judith Hyman, violin; Roger Bernstein, cello; and Owen Lewis, piano.

PRE-COLUMBIAN ART AT THE MUSEUM

Over 300 pieces from the pre-Columbian civilizations of Puerto Rico, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, the Lesser Antilles, and the coastal cultures from which they originated are on display through May 31 at the University Museum.

Assembled under the direction of Elizabeth K. Easby and Dr. Alfred Kidder II, curator of the American Section, the exhibit is open to the public Tuesdays through Saturdays, 10 a.m. to 5 p.m., and Sundays, 1 to 5.

A highlight of the exhibit is a reconstruction of a gold-filled grave that was excavated in Panama by the Museum in 1940. J. Alden Mason, then curator of the Museum's American Section, discovered the grave at Cocle, Panama, replete with gold breast and back plates, intricately worked gold ornaments and whale's-tooth ivory carvings with gold inlay.

NEWS IN BRIEF (Continued)

going chairman, Gerald Robinson. Elections will be held for officers including a 1972-73 chairman, the Chairman-Elect Gene Abel having left the University. Candidates are: for 1972-73 Chairman: Norman Fink and William Owen; for Chairman-Elect: John P. Butler III and Mrs. Alice F. Emerson; for Secretary-Elect: James L. Malone and Mrs. Gloria K. Olmstead.

Three members of the present board will be reelected from six candidates: Alfred F. Beers, Manuel Doxer, Mrs. Karen C. Gaines, Anthony G. Merritt, William G. Owen and James H. Robinson; and three new members will be elected to three-year terms from seven candidates: Richard L. Corrigan, Charles F. Farrell, Mrs. Virginia K. Henderson, John R. Kershner, Donald J. McAleer, Mrs. Barbara B. Oliver, Dr. Paul F. Shrode. Voting will be at the meeting only.

A-3 ASSEMBLY NOMINATIONS

Nominations for spokesman will be made at the A-3 Assembly meeting Thursday, April 20, at 1 p.m. in Room 100 Law School.

A REGIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM FOR A NEARBY TOWN

A joint committee representing the community of Hazleton, Pa., and the University has been formed and has endorsed plans to develop a regional comprehensive health care program for the Hazleton area. Announcement of the committee was made simultaneously on April 6 by Dr. Edgar L. Dessen, of Hazleton, chairman, and Dr. Alfred Gellhorn, Dean and Director of the University's Medical Center.

According to Dean Gellhorn, the proposed new program marks the University's first major commitment outside its urban campus neighborhood.

As the program develops, the University will make available to the Hazleton community its expertise in many areas of health care. These could include the resources of the Department of Community Medicine, the Wharton School's Leonard Davis Institute for Health Economics and the Management and Behavioral Sciences Center. The University will also assist in the education and training of various types of health manpower.

When fully operational, the program, said Dean Gellhorn, could be a model for improving health care delivery in outlying areas of the Commonwealth. It is also expected that the program will offer medical students the opportunity for realistic clinical experience in regional health care delivery.

Representing the University on the committee are Dr. Aaron D. Freedman, Associate Dean of the School of Medicine and Dr. Stanley J. Brody, Associate Professor of Social Planning and Psychiatry.

ICA GOES TO THE SOUTH SEAS

The Institute of Contemporary Art is sponsoring a three-week tour of the South Seas for members and guests April 28 through May 21. Beginning with a preflight tour of the Los Angeles County Museum, the ICA will concentrate on art and anthropology in the South Seas: Tahiti, New Zealand, Australia, and the Fiji Islands.

The cost will be \$2375, including a deductible \$300 contribution to the Institute. For details of the tour and for reservations contact ICA Director Suzanne Delehanty at 115 Fine Arts Building.

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