



*The Seashell and the Clergyman (1928)
and 26 Other Films by Women . . . Page 8*

HONORS

LINDBACK AWARDS

Awards for distinguished teaching during the 1971-72 academic year, made possible by funds presented annually to the University by the Christian R. and Mary F. Lindback Foundation, have been presented to eight faculty members.

Candidates for the awards are nominated by faculty and students, and screened by a faculty-student committee on the basis of their teaching and scholarship, as well as interviews with other faculty and students. Final selection is made by the Provost's Staff Conference. The 1972 recipients are:

Dr. Roger M. A. Allen, Assistant Professor of Arabic;

Dr. Richard C. Bartholomew, Assistant Professor of Veterinary Medicine;

Dr. Martin Goldberg, Professor of Medicine and Chief of the Renalelectrolyte Section at HUP;

Dr. William F. Hamilton, Assistant Professor of Community Medicine and Assistant Professor of Industry;

Eugene Michels, Assistant Professor of Physical Therapy;

Dr. Arnold J. Rawson, Professor of Pathology;

Dr. Ingrid L. Waldron, Assistant Professor of Biology; and

Dr. Michael Zuckerman, Associate Professor of History.

NATIONAL ACADEMY

Dr. George B. Koelle, Chairman and Elmer Holmes Bobst Professor of Pharmacology at the School of Medicine, has been elected to the National Academy of Sciences.

Dr. Koelle is widely known for his research on cholinesterase and the anticholinesterase drugs. (The enzyme cholinesterase is involved in transmission of nerve impulses.) Dr. Koelle has served as Chairman of Pharmacology at Pennsylvania since 1957.

He is presently in Switzerland where he received an honorary doctor of medicine degree from the University of Zurich on April 29.

HONORARY DEGREES TO FACULTY

Dr. Henry J. Abraham will receive the honorary degree Doctor of Humane Letters from Kenyon College, at the 1972 Commencement of his alma mater. He is cited as a memorable teacher, powerful advocate for religious and racial freedom, and wise and careful educational statesman.

(Continued on Page 8)

IN THIS ISSUE

- *A Time for Restoration (Meyerson)*
- SENATE: *New Resolution on Sit-in; Revised Report on Reorganization*
- LETTERS • COUNCIL: *ROTC Action Reaffirmed*
- JUDICIARY • *Alumni Weekend* • NEWS IN BRIEF

Almanac

Volume 18, Number 34

May 9, 1972

Published weekly by the University of Pennsylvania

Dean of Engineering: Arthur Humphrey

Dr. Arthur E. Humphrey, Director and Professor of the University of Pennsylvania's School of Chemical Engineering, has been named Dean of Engineering and Applied Science effective July 1, President Martin Meyerson announced after last week's Trustees meetings.

Dr. Humphrey will succeed Dr. Carl C. Chambers, Vice-President for Engineering Affairs, who will resume his teaching career after 23 years of service as an academic administrator.

Dr. Humphrey, a microbiologist as well as engineer, joined Pennsylvania's faculty as an Assistant Professor of Chemical Engineering in 1953 and was named Director of the School in 1961. Internationally known for his scholarship and research, Dr. Humphrey has concentrated on three major areas in recent years—the bioengineering problems of producing single cell protein food and feed to alleviate malnutrition and mass hunger, application of immobilized enzymes to industrial waste and medical problems, and use of oxygen-enriched air in waste water treatment systems. He is currently co-principal investigator with Dr. Kendall Pye, Assistant Professor of Biochemistry, of an Enzyme Engineering project supported by the National Science Foundation. This project is aimed at utilizing enzymes solving waste treatment problems.

"We are enthusiastic about the enlightening leadership which Dr. Humphrey will bring in the future development of engineering and applied science," said University Provost Curtis R. Reitz. "For a university to make significant contributions to the solution of processing societal problems, it must have a strong engineering component, capable of interfacing with and actively participating in behavioral, urban and environmental problems. Dean Humphrey will be instrumental in leading his colleagues in the exciting challenge of working with other faculty members outside engineering, particularly in social and health-related sciences. He will exemplify not only the concern, but a strong desire to focus engineering reason, rigor and relevance on emerging societal problems."

Dr. Humphrey was born in Moscow, Idaho, and took his B.S. in Chemical Engineering from the University of Idaho

(Continued on Page 2)

in 1948 and his master's there in 1950. He was awarded his Ph.D. in chemical engineering by Columbia University in 1953 and in 1959 he received a master of science degree in food technology from Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

He is the author of more than 80 scientific articles and of the textbook, *Biochemical Engineering*. In addition to consulting with major health and waste treatment oriented industries, he is also a member of United Nations Protein Advisory Group, and is on the Engineering Advisory Board of the National Science Foundation.

From the President:

A Time for Restoration

May 3, 1972

Last week we had barricades at the University of Pennsylvania, a court order to end the barricades, and a judicial process invoked on the campus.

The barricades are down now, but the worst of what they stood for can remain with us for a long time if we do not consciously look at what has happened to us, and guard against overreacting to these events.

What worries me most is the acrimony which almost always follows from campus disturbances. Groups splinter. They accuse each other of poor behavior or intentions. Some seek harsh punishments; others shrug off all violations as being of small consequence. Everyone wonders why someone else did not act: where were the faculty who might have calmed angry students? Where were other students? Why did administrators not move faster? Why not slower?

That our University in the turmoil of this spring has avoided the violence and related excesses of some other campuses is compounded of fortune and hard work by dedicated members of our community. Nevertheless the frail instruments of campus democracy—our 'bill of rights', the Guidelines; and our device for policy deliberations, the faculty-student University Council—have been tarnished, the one by violation and the other by being by-passed.

Our rudimentary judicial system is highly vulnerable. Imperfect as these instruments may be, they are superior to those of most other institutions and they represent gains for self-governance which were long fought for. We must preserve them now: change them in the future if need be, but preserve them.

This message is hardly a plea for forgiving and forgetting. Rather, this is a plea for joint effort by all faculty, by students of various persuasions and by administrators at all levels to devote themselves to restoring and reinforcing our instruments for self-governance.

We are moving ahead to critical decisions about learning here and how to enhance it in our academic decisions and our financial planning. We are trying to improve our University so that even more than before it will be an institution that will both teach and listen to its students, that will value and be able to reward the wisdom and judgment of its faculty and that will grow in scholarship and resources.

This cannot be done over barricades, not over physical ones and not over the spiritual ones that threaten to remain if we indulge in bitterness. I am saddened by the events of last week, and at the distrust that can be read in them, and by the impatience with the rule of reason that they seem to express. But we cannot let that one week color our whole perception of the University of Pennsylvania—not at the expense of our future. We have a long and rewarding future ahead through determined efforts by all of us.

—Martin Meyerson

THE SENATE

TEXT OF NEW RESOLUTION ON SIT-IN

The Senate Advisory Committee at its regular meeting of May 3, 1972, determined that its previously circulated resolution of April 28 regarding the College Hall "sit-in" was not a valid resolution of the whole committee because of the inadequacy of notice of the meeting of April 28.

The Committee on May 3 resolved to affirm its deep concern over the apparent violations of the Guidelines during the sit-in, and to urge prompt judicial enforcement of the Guidelines against all violators. At the same time it specifically recognizes that the determination of guilt and the setting of penalties must be the province of bodies duly constituted under the Guidelines. The Committee thought it particularly unfortunate that the April 28 statement urged that specific penalties be imposed on persons found to have violated the Guidelines.

PASSED: 15-2 with 1 abstention.

LETTERS

DOUBLE STANDARDS

Double standards are always intriguing, and we have been treated to a beauty in the Senate Advisory Committee (SAC) resolution of April 28 on the recent occupation of College Hall. In its energetic pursuit of the enforcement of certain rules, the SAC's first reaction (ALMANAC May 2) now withdrawn (above), was to run roughshod over other rules on local adjudication processes as well as more fundamental norms of traditional jurisprudence (that findings of guilt and the imposition of penalties should follow the judicial proceeding).

It seems to me equally illustrative of the double standard that the SAC has not seen fit even to raise a question about the action by Professor Henry Abraham, on April 5, in ordering Professor Thornton off the podium at a meeting of the Faculty Senate for employing the word "disgusting" in his remarks. This incredible act of censorship would appear to violate principles of free speech, and should have aroused the ire of vigorous believers in Open Expression. The total silence on this subject on the part of the forces of law and order naturally raises this question: Is there even an awareness of an open expression issue by these forces, where the gorer of the ox is one of their own?

The linguistic double standard implicit in the SAC statement of April 28 is also of interest. Thornton ruled out of order for "disgusting"; but the SAC document referring to "outrages," "intolerable" actions that are "perpetrated" (not merely carried out) by the parties found guilty *ex ante*.

One wonders whether Thornton would have gotten away with using "outrages" in his remarks. One wonders also about value systems that generate such emotion—and such ungenerous eagerness to impose severe penalties—in response to crimes that are clearly less than first order.

It is all to the good that the SAC has withdrawn its initial resolution; that initial action, however, bodes ill for SAC's role in the lagging process of reducing tensions and unifying the University community.

—Edward S. Herman, Professor of Finance

WHEREABOUTS OF THE FACULTY

President Meyerson's article, "A Time for Restoration" in the *Daily Pennsylvanian* May 4 (left) contains the rhetorical question, "Where were the faculty who might have calmed angry students?"

Well, a dozen or more were behind the barricades doing just that. I entered College Hall about 2 p.m. on Thursday and spent

(Continued on Page 7)

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Reorganization of the Faculty

(A Senate Report Revised May, 1972)

The Ad Hoc Committee worked throughout the year to develop proposals for the consideration of the Senate and the Administration. Much of the work of the Committee was conducted through two subcommittees, one on the General Organization of the Faculty and one on Special Organizational Problems.*

Throughout its deliberations, the Ad Hoc Committee generally recognized that the organization of the faculty should be dictated by the functions that the faculties should serve. As would be expected, there was disagreement on these matters, principally on the organization that would best serve certain desired functions. Since multiple functions need to be carried out by the faculty, there is no simple pattern which serves each of the functions equally well.

Although many issues concerning the general organization of the faculty seem critical, perhaps three are especially troublesome:

1. The organization of the faculties involved in conducting Ph.D. programs;
2. The organization of the Arts and Sciences; and
3. The structure by which major faculty units (principally schools) relate to the administration of the University, particularly to the office of the Provost.

In considering these and other issues, there is the related consideration that structure must also be influenced by personalities holding major positions and the way that these individuals will utilize a structure. Thus, it is highly important in considering the third issue mentioned above, to note that the scope of work assumed by the current Provost and the relationship between the Provost and the President is perhaps substantially different from that of other administrations at this University. This is reflected in part by the fact that much of the work of the two positions in the key offices of President and Provost is now combined in what might be described as "Offices of the President." This factor, plus the strong feeling that the number of divisions now reporting directly to the Provost is so large that he cannot give adequate attention to the various faculty groupings and divisions, has influenced the Committee. At the same time, structure often outlives the tenure of those holding administrative positions, so the organizational proposals must be considered in that light.

—Robert Eilers, Chairman

I. Departments

Within a University there exists a tension between two organizational principles: (1) by disciplines and aggregations of related disciplines and (2) by the degree programs offered to our students, which generally involve a cross-sectional slicing across disciplines. Some provision must be made for organizational ties which will permit the effective coordination of faculty efforts in both dimensions.

Because we perceive our academic strength as flowing largely from the mutual stimulation and mutual criticism produced by close interaction of faculty with similar disciplinary interests and competence, and because the departmental structure is far more effective in reinforcing such interaction than any alternative we can envisage, we recommend that:

1. *Departments should be retained as the basic units of faculty organization. The structure should not produce any separation of graduate and undergraduate program responsibility at the department/unit level.*

Frequently, however, the growth of knowledge may proceed along lines not readily encompassed within traditional academic

departments. Mechanisms are needed to permit research and teaching programs in such new areas to be undertaken on an experimental basis. Three problems arise in this connection.

First, there will ordinarily be at any given time many more new directions of knowledge than the University has the resources to explore, and some principle of choice must be invoked. We suggest that the selection should be based primarily on the academic interests of present faculty members with established competency in existing disciplines. The availability of external financial support, while it will certainly operate as a factor in generating faculty interest, should not be a predominant consideration. Even if funding is available, we would be opposed to bringing in a high proportion of outsiders to staff an experimental program which generates little interest among the existing faculty.

Since innovation is inherently a risky process, there will be some failures as well as some successes in experimental programs. The second problem which concerns us is the development of effective periodic evaluation of programs which lie outside the purview of traditional departments and effective procedures for terminating any unsuccessful ventures after a reasonable trial period. We cannot permit these to be a continuing drain on our resources.

The third problem relates to the possibility of appointment, potentially leading to tenure, of personnel useful to the experimental program but not acceptable to any existing department. We are deeply concerned over the prospect of a proliferation of tenured faculty not attached to any department.

Historically, the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences has served as a primary channel for interdisciplinary innovation by facilitating the development of interdepartmental and inter-School graduate groups. We believe that the interactions thus generated have not only been highly productive academically but also have been a significant unifying force across the University. Since innovation in the directions of knowledge is very likely to occur first at the level of the Ph.D. program, we believe that such graduate groups must remain an extremely important mechanism for providing flexibility and encouraging experimentation. However, since such groups are not the direct responsibility of any budgetary unit, they have suffered sometimes from a lack of adequate resources and sometimes from a lack of adequate quality control. We shall propose below measures which should be taken to ameliorate these shortcomings.

Where an interdisciplinary program is strongly oriented toward undergraduate or graduate/professional teaching, the graduate group mechanism is not appropriate. An alternative device, for which there are prototypes within the Wharton School, is the Interdisciplinary Unit. Such Units should be considered as an experimental and temporary phase of development. After an appropriate trial period, they should either be incorporated into an existing department, achieve independent departmental status, or be phased out. We recommend that:

2. *When a School establishes an interdisciplinary unit with undergraduate or graduate/professional teaching responsibilities, the work of this unit shall be subject to periodic review, at intervals not to exceed five years, by an appropriate faculty committee of the School (perhaps the Committee on Instruction), which may recommend termination, continuation or departmental status for the program. Such review may be initiated at any time by the Dean. Every effort should be made to avoid new appointments which may lead to tenure, except under the auspices of an existing department. If, in extraordinary circumstances, such an appointment is considered essential to a unit's purposes, this appointment and subsequent promotion and tenure decisions must be approved, like all others, by the school's Personnel Committee, which (in the absence of favorable action by an established department) should ask the advice of an ad hoc committee of its*

*The membership of the Subcommittees was as follows: Subcommittee on General Organization of the Faculty: Britton Harris, Murray Murphey, Charles Rosenberg, David Solomons, Jean Crockett, Chairman; Subcommittee on Special Organizational Problems: Gordon Keith, Lee Peachey, Burton Rosner, Paul Taubman, Reid Warren, Murray Murphey, Chairman.

own choosing, perhaps including outside experts. We do not recommend that the establishment of interdisciplinary units be permitted except under the auspices of a school or college.

The Committee considered 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 student 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. (Problems 1, 2 and 4 will be dealt with in a later section of this report.)

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 Committee 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 obviously it is 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, we recommend that:

3. 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 Committee 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 3 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 3. 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 recommend that:

4. 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.

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 recommend that:

5. 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.

II. Faculty Organization: Undergraduate Education

We do not recommend the integration of undergraduate education at the University as proposed by the Task Force. On this question, we find ourselves in substantial agreement with the conclusions of the Committee on the Organization of the College Faculty as expressed in the following excerpts from their report:

In the opinion of the committee, the merging of all undergraduate teachers into one faculty would make diversification and experimentation much more difficult, if not impossible. . . . The placing of all undergraduate education under a single dean and in a single faculty would result in an unwieldy unit, unadministerable without the interposition of second-level associate deans and various subdivisions. . . . Moreover, experience with the College Faculty shows that it is difficult enough to engage the entire faculty in an active role in decision-making with regard to matters of educational policy; increasing the size and diversity of the faculty could only compound the difficulties, and very likely result in a fragmentation into cliques and interest groups.

In addition to the above considerations, we feel that the unification of the undergraduate professional schools with the College would be a step backward in our efforts to provide multiple program options to undergraduates in order to serve better the divergent needs of students with divergent interests and purposes. The specific requirements of the students who enter college with strong motivation toward a particular professional career are well served by the existing structure. We doubt that such students would be equally well served or equally eager to come to the University under the integrated structure proposed by the Task Force.

Finally, the prestige of our undergraduate professional schools and the loyalty of their alumni provide a source of strength to the University which we should not sacrifice without compelling reason.

With respect to the College for Women, we recommend its continuance for the present. In some important respects, the students in this school are better served than their counterparts elsewhere; and while we earnestly hope for University-wide improvement in these areas, we recommend that the College for Women be continued until there are very clear indications that this hope will be realized. In view of the demonstrated ability of CW as an administrative unit, a number of long-run possibilities bear further investigation. For example, the College for Women might be incorporated in the College as a separate administrative unit with responsibilities, not for women students specifically, but for the advising system generally and for the development of program options in response to student needs and interests.

The structure of the University tends to focus attention on the excellence of individual departments, and this is judged primarily by the quality of instruction offered to their majors, both graduate and undergraduate, and by the research contributions of the departmental faculty. However, the undergraduate educational program cuts across departments and, to a considerable extent, across schools; and too little faculty and administrative attention has been focused on whether this cross-sectional slice is cohesive and satisfying. Even in excellent departments the large introductory courses in which a majority of students are non-majors may be slighted in the allocation of departmental resources in favor of the advanced courses which are closer to the center of departmental interest. Yet these introductory courses compose a very large part of the student's educational experience in his first two years and are essential to provide him with the skills relevant to his advanced work and with the breadth of exposure to a variety of disciplines which is the criterion of a liberal education.

We therefore see a need for a high-level administrator who will be charged, as his primary concern, with evaluation of the

overall educational experience provided to the student by the various undergraduate degree programs and with recommendations for improvement. It is our hope that the new Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies will fill this need.

We further see a need to focus faculty attention on the overall quality of the student's educational experience within the various undergraduate degree programs. To this end, we endorse the proposal of the Committee on the Organization of the College Faculty for a Council on Undergraduate Education and recommend that:

6. A Council or Board of Undergraduate Education should be established, 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*). This body should be advisory to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies.

Several of the problems mentioned earlier as affecting departments in one school that teach a significant number of students enrolled in a different school might appropriately be discussed and resolved by this body. This would include problems (1), (2) and (4) which involve issues of autonomy of the separate faculties in decisions affecting requirements, accreditation and standards. The resolution of three kinds of problems through the proposed Council will not impinge inappropriately on the autonomy of the separate faculties in our view.

Among the specific questions to which this Council or Board might address itself are the following:

a. How the tools which are basic to advanced study in a variety of areas may best be taught. Basic economics is such a tool for most business disciplines, basic physics is similarly related to much engineering, while certain areas of mathematics and statistics underlie advanced work in all the sciences.

b. Evaluation of undergraduate education programs which cross departmental and school boundaries.

c. Recommendations as to the manner in which admissions standards should vary among schools. For example, minimum mathematical scores required in Wharton and Engineering should probably be higher than for the College, while relatively higher verbal scores should probably be required in the College. Other less quantitative criteria should perhaps receive differing weights depending on the school to which the student is applying.

d. The problems which may arise from wide differences in grading standards among the departments as well as among schools.

e. The problems which may arise from differences among schools in graduation requirements.

f. Recommendations on such matters as the timing of the student's choice of major and policies regarding the admission of transfer students.

g. The implications for undergraduate education of such matters as: changes in the University calendar; class scheduling practices and procedures (e.g., the length of the class period); submatriculation arrangements.

h. The problems of restructuring and revitalizing the process of academic advising.

i. The problems concerning access of departments in one school to students in another.

III. Faculty Organization: Graduate and Professional Education and Research

The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences has performed two very useful functions in bringing together faculty members with overlapping interests and areas of competence from the various undergraduate and graduate/professional schools of the University and in facilitating experimentation with innovative interdisciplinary approaches. Mechanisms for accomplishing these functions should be preserved and if possible strengthened.

Under existing arrangements, however, it has not been possible for the Dean of the Graduate School to maintain adequate quality control over the various graduate groups or to speak with a sufficiently powerful voice in the interests of the Ph.D. program as a whole and the University has suffered significantly as a result. In the absence of budgetary authority over the graduate groups, we do not see how he can fulfill these highly important responsibilities effectively. However, to give him such authority would confuse the administrative structure in a way which

appears unacceptable to us, would tend to undermine the effectiveness of the deans of colleges and schools with faculty members who participate in the Ph.D. program, and would run counter to very strong feelings as to the importance of maintaining the closest possible relationship between graduate and undergraduate teaching within a discipline. For similar reasons the Committee has rejected proposals under which all Ph.D. programs would be placed under the purview of a Dean of Arts and Sciences, since this would dichotomize departments with Ph.D. programs in all schools other than the College.

We further find the present separation of admissions decisions and quality control responsibilities for graduate groups from budgetary authority and control over promotions and tenure for graduate group members to be administratively unworkable.

With these considerations in mind, we recommend that:

7. Graduate groups should be retained, subject to certain review and monitoring procedures.

8. The Dean of any School or College with budgetary responsibility for faculty members participating in graduate groups should be given clear responsibility for the performance of all graduate groups consisting solely or primarily of faculty members affiliated with that School, and he should have authority to review the admissions decisions of such groups. Where a large number of graduate groups are involved, as in the College, the appointment of an Associate Dean for Graduate Affairs to oversee these groups will undoubtedly be appropriate.

9. The position of Vice Provost or Associate Provost for Graduate Studies and Research should be created and should operate in a staff relationship to the Provost. This administrator should have responsibility for maintaining a general overview of all Ph.D. and subsidiary programs, with particular concern for inter-School graduate groups not subject to the review of any dean. He should participate in the formulation of research policy and be responsible for its execution. He should maintain a general overview of the research centers and institutes of the University, with particular concern for those that span more than one school or college. He should review the academic budgets of all schools with faculty members participating in the Ph.D. program and make recommendations thereon to the Provost, with particular reference to the number of admissions to Ph.D. programs expected by each school.

10. The Faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences should continue as a separate organizational entity, in order to preserve its role in facilitating interdisciplinary innovation and in fostering interaction among the faculty members from different schools who are involved in the Ph.D. program. The Vice or Associate Provost for Graduate Studies and Research should serve as the Dean of this Faculty. All Ph.D. degrees should continue to be awarded on the recommendation of this Faculty, which (in the interests of limiting variability in quality among graduate groups budgeted through different schools) will maintain a final review over admissions standards.

11. A Council or Board of Graduate Studies should be established, to be advisory to the Vice or Associate Provost and to consist of representatives of the Graduate Faculty elected on a constituency basis. The responsibilities of this body inter alia should be:

a. To conduct periodic in-depth review of all graduate groups, with particular concern for those not subject to the review of a dean.

b. To advise the Associate Provost on admissions policies and the allocation of fellowships and scholarships.

c. To advise the Associate Provost on the creation of new graduate groups and termination of existing ones.

Members of the Council of Graduate Studies should be given reduced teaching loads because of the extent and importance of the responsibilities of the Council.

It is expected that the Graduate Faculty may wish to form various types of subgroupings for various purposes. One natural grouping would be according to the School through which each graduate group is budgeted. Smaller aggregates of graduate groups with substantially overlapping areas of interest and competence may be appropriate for approval of curriculum, especially when

there is a significant amount of cross-registration of students of one group in the courses offered by another. These aggregates would not necessarily be mutually exclusive and might well cross school boundaries. The formation of these aggregates should be approved by the Council on Graduate Studies.

We recommend further that:

12. The Associate Provost should have a budget to be used as required to provide clerical services for inter-School graduate groups and to reimburse the Dean of one School for services provided by faculty members of that School to inter-School graduate groups. He should facilitate inter-School budgetary transfers in cases where graduate groups budgeted in one School make significant demands on the faculty of graduate groups budgeted in another.

IV. Faculty of Arts and Sciences

In order to strengthen the area of Arts and Sciences within the University and to achieve greater unification there, we recommend that:

13. A faculty of Arts and Sciences should be established, to be presided over by a Dean. This faculty should include the faculties of the College, the College for Women and the departments now budgeted through the GSAS. The latter departments should be combined for interim purposes into a College or Division of Interdisciplinary Studies in Arts and Sciences. The faculty members of departments budgeted in other schools of the University may be invited by the Faculty of Arts and Sciences to join that Faculty.

All activities of the College, College for Women and the Division of Interdisciplinary Studies should come under the purview of the Dean of Arts and Sciences. Each of these schools, however, should be allowed to maintain—at least for the present—separate budgets, curriculum committees and personnel committees, among others.

While the eventual merger of the College, the College for Women and the departments now budgeted through the GSAS is desired, it is not proposed at present.

A search committee for the Dean of Arts and Sciences shall contain nominees of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences selected by their own procedures. The President may designate a number of search committee members up to the number nominated by this Faculty. Students will be added according to procedures stipulated in the bylaws of the University Council for consultative committees for academic administrators above the level of Dean of an individual school.

V. Relationship of the Faculties to the Office of the Provost

The Committee deliberated extensively concerning various organizational arrangements for schools to relate to the Office of the Provost. There was general agreement that the schools now under the purview of the Vice President for Medical Affairs should continue in that relationship. The Committee was aware that the Search Committee to Recommend Candidates for the Vice President of Medical Affairs was also charged with the responsibility of reviewing the structure of the Medical Affairs Division, and the Ad Hoc Committee felt that final recommendations concerning the organizational structure within Medical Affairs should come from the Search Committee.

Apart from the Medical Affairs Division and the proposed Faculty (and Dean) of Arts and Sciences, the Committee decided, after substantial deliberation, that other schools within the University should continue to report directly to the Provost.

Henry Abraham
Herbert Callen
Jean Crockett
John deCani
James Freedman
Harold Ginsberg
Louis Girifalco
Britton Harris
Alan Kors
Phoebe Leboy*
Albert Lloyd

Robert Mundheim
Murray Murphey*
Paul Rozin
Lawson Soulsby
Paul Taubman
Roger Walmsley
Reid Warren*
Saul Winegrad
Bernard Wolfman
Arnold Rosoff, Secretary
Robert Eilers, Chairman

*Resigned prior to the completion of the Committee's final report.

LETTERS CONTINUED FROM PAGE 2

most of the time there until noon on Friday. Not one faculty member that I heard speak condoned the barricades. They all spoke strongly and urgently for a legal sit-in within the Guidelines. Although the faculty voices were not able to convince the demonstrators to remove the barricades permanently (they came down half-way once!), the faculty surely had an important effect in determining that the entrances would not be defended even by the small minority who kept announcing their intention to fight to prevent the entry of the Sheriff's marshals.

At about 9:30 on Thursday night some of a large crowd of students tried to break into College Hall behind an American flag, but were dissuaded by a campus guard who was there. The situation was resolved by arranging a discussion between 12 of the outsiders and 12 of the demonstrators. This took place from 10 p.m. until 12:30 a.m. on Friday in Provost Reitz' office. I was asked by both sides to mediate this, and very interesting it was to see two initially hostile groups start to understand and even convert each other by peaceful persuasion. The groups intermingled and sat on the floor. Robert's rules were followed. No damage was done. All cigarette ashes were removed and the meeting ended with good will and handshakes. It was a very educational experience. I believe that this and other discussions together with the good will and good sense of the vast majority of the students present helped develop the rock-festival atmosphere that kept all the demonstrators in College Hall 200 for the serving of the injunction, and led to a peaceful transition to the legal sit-in that followed.

It is a tragedy that the widespread frustration and anger evoked by President Nixon's speech were dissipated so futilely because the Guidelines were broken. Instead of a University-wide surge of protest against the war, as occurred at the Moratorium Assembly in the Palestra on October 15, 1969, we now have internal strife to decide who shall do what and with which and to whom.

Let us work for understanding, restitution, and where possible, forgiveness.

—R. E. Davies, Benjamin Franklin Professor
of Molecular Biology

THE COUNCIL

ROTC ACTION REAFFIRMED

At a special meeting May 3, Council reaffirmed its earlier action and, after hearing Provost Curtis Reitz' report on negotiations with the Defense Department, approved the handling to date. The vote was 28-18.

RESOLVED, That the Council reaffirm its previous action taken relating to ROTC December 8, 1971, and that it approve the general direction of the negotiations of the Provost and Vice President, as explained at this meeting, to implement the December 8 resolution.

In an oral report Mr. Reitz said local discussions have been held between ROTC units and some deans and departments, in the direction of ensuring the December 8 resolution's provision that "credit toward a degree is given only for such courses as are offered under the auspices of an established civilian academic department, approved in the usual manner . . . and taught by a regularly appointed member of the department involved, who may be either a civilian or a member of the military service." (ALMANAC December 14, 1971.)

He said the meetings have been directed toward seeing that military instructors are subject to normal University appointment procedures and that no courses be undertaken specifically to fill military requirements. "We are trying to develop a relationship in which the University would be a kind of 'host' to permit military services to conduct courses and programs so that students may participate, but without the military's becoming an agency of the University," he explained. Officer education would be done essentially in outside pro-

grams but with linkages to academic units, and the linkages subject to normal University procedures. "We have no assurance that the services are willing to enter into such relationships with a University," Mr. Reitz added. He said he had not entered into formal negotiations over a written document.

JUDICIAL SYSTEM

PREPARATIONS FOR HEARINGS

The University Judicial System, which devoted last week to the receipt and collation of complaints related to the occupation of College Hall April 27-28, was expected to hold an investigative hearing Monday; to deliver charge letters today (Tuesday) to those named in complaints; and to begin hearings three days after issuance of the letters.

Dr. Richard M. Sherman, Judicial Administrator of the System, said all procedures are being carried out under the rules adopted by Council October 14, 1970, as amended March 10, 1971. They appeared in ALMANAC March 31, 1971.

The System provides a Primary Court for hearing student cases, with appeal to a University Court. It also allows the University Court *original* jurisdiction in some cases. As described in the March 10, 1971, Council action:

1. There shall be one court of *university-wide jurisdiction* to be known as the University Court. It shall have *appellate* jurisdiction over the Primary Court and independent graduate or professional school primary courts. In addition, it shall have *original* jurisdiction in all cases involving faculty or administrators, and all cases involving students from different primary court jurisdictions.

2. A judicial pool for the University Court shall consist of 10 students (5 graduate and 5 undergraduate), 8 faculty and 4 administrators. The members of the pool shall be designated by the Steering Committee upon the recommendation of the Committee on Committees. The Committee on Committees shall solicit student nominations from each appropriate constituency which shall be more than the number of judicial pool positions for that constituency, and faculty and administrator nominations from appropriate bodies.

3. The Committee on Committees shall also nominate, and the Steering Committee approve, a President Judge. In addition to overseeing operations of the Court, the President Judge shall convene a panel from members of the judicial pool for each case. Each panel shall consist of the President Judge or his designee, 4 students (2 graduate and 2 undergraduate), 3 faculty, and 1 administrator, any six of whom shall constitute a quorum. The President Judge, or his designee, shall serve as chairman of the panel and shall vote only to break a tie.

C. The *final court of appeal* shall be the person of the President of the University, or in his absence, the Provost.

D. Where an accused has been acquitted, there shall be no appeal. In all cases on appeal from a lower court, findings of fact shall not be reconsidered. Review shall be limited to the extent of guilt, degree of punishment, and procedural error.

* * *

Sanctions were also spelled out in that Council action:

Where a panel judges an accused guilty, the following sanctions may be imposed: warning (reprimand), probation, term suspension (not longer than two years), or indefinite suspension (not less than two years).

In addition, financial restitution, within a period fixed by the panel, may be required in all instances involving financial damage.

Substantive punishments, such as withdrawal of privileges (e.g., use of certain facilities in part or in whole) may also be imposed in all instances involving misuse of such facilities.

Enforcement of sanctions shall be the responsibility of the appropriate deans and/or administrators.

HONORS CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

Dr. Lester W. Burket, Dean and Professor of Oral Medicine, will receive an honorary doctorate from Georgetown University at its May 20 Commencement, where he will also give the Commencement Address. In a letter advising Dean Burket of his selection he was cited for the fine leadership he has given in his profession at the University of Pennsylvania.

HONORS IN BRIEF

Dr. John Paul Brady, Professor of Psychiatry, is the recipient of this year's Strecker Award, presented annually by the Institute of Pennsylvania Hospital in recognition of outstanding contributions in the field of psychiatric care and treatment.

Dr. Otto Albrecht, Emeritus Professor of Music, has been elected a Fellow of the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York.

Donald M. Stewart, Executive Assistant to the President, has been elected to the Board of Trustees of his undergraduate college, Grinnell College in Grinnell, Iowa.

Dr. Dorothy Baethke, Chairman and Professor of Physical Therapy, was awarded the first Annual Achievement Award of the Pennsylvania Physical Therapy Association.

Dr. Ruth J. Dean, Medieval Bibliographer, has been elected Vice President of the Mediaeval Academy and Dr. William Roach, Professor of Romance Languages, named Clerk of the organization.

NEWS IN BRIEF

FILMS BY WOMEN 1928-1971: STARTING MAY 25

A wide variety of films made by women between 1928 and 1971 will be shown in a series running five consecutive Thursday evenings beginning May 25 in Annenberg Auditorium.

The 27 films, ranging from three to 105 minutes in length, include works by Germaine Dulac, Leontine Sagan, Marie Menken, Shirley Clarke, Storm DeHirsch, Maya Deren, Vera Chytilova, Joyce Wieland, Agnes Varda, Gunvor Nelson, Julia Reichert, and Madeline Anderson.

The series was conceived by Sandra Grilikhes, Annenberg Head Librarian, to show the creative strength of individual women in the film industry. It is also viewed as an important beginning look at images created by women: of themselves, of men, of society.

Open to the public, admission is \$1 for each performance.

A-3 ASSEMBLY ELECTION

The A-3 Assembly will hold its first election to choose a three-member Steering Committee on Thursday, May 18. Voting is open to all A-3 employees regardless of other University organizational affiliations.

Nominees are: Mary Emore, Anthropology Dept., Museum; Mrs. Berniece Jordan, Marketing Dept., Wharton School; Joseph Kane, Radiation Safety Office, Towne Bldg.; Mary Purnell, Development Dept.; and Mrs. Margaret Weyand, Information Center.

Voting must be done in person and at any of the following places:

12 noon-12:45	Room 100, Law School
1 p.m.- 1:45	Houston Hall Auditorium
5 p.m.- 5:30	Lecture Room B, Vet School

For further information, call Mrs. Gloria Tarbuck, Ext. 5742, or Virginia Hill, Ext. 6171.

alumni weekend

FRIDAY, MAY 19

1:00 p.m.

Locust Walk luncheon. Reports by the University's two new young alumni Trustees—Arthur Larrabee, L'70, and Charles Krause, C'69. In front of Dietrich Hall between 36th and 37th Streets. Sherry will be poured at 12:30 p.m. Rain location: Fine Arts Building, 34th and Walnut Streets.

Exhibits and Open Houses at the University Museum, Wistar Institute, and the Pennsylvania Bookstore. Special attention is called to two exhibits in the Library—the Class of 1947 Twenty-Fifth Reunion Display and entries in the first Alumni Amateur Photography Contest.

Swimming and Ice Skating. Sheerr Pool in the Gimbel Gym will be open Friday and Saturday. Bring your own suits. Ice skating in the Class of 1923 Rink, Friday from 2:00 to 4:30 p.m. and from 8:30 to 10:30 p.m. Skates may be rented.

2:30 p.m.

Seminar—China: From Empire to Revolution, a discussion by Dr. W. Allyn Rickett, associate chairman of the Department of Oriental Studies. Fine Arts Building.

5:00 p.m.

Reception at the new Stouffer Triangle, 37th and Spruce Streets.

6:00 p.m.

Theater Buffet Supper for Pennsylvanians and their guests at the Stouffer Triangle.

8:00 p.m.

"Paint the Red Town," the 1972 show of the Pennsylvania Glee Club. Discount tickets for alumni and their friends. Zellerbach Theater in the new Annenberg Center, 37th and Walnut Streets.

9:00 p.m.

The Senior Class Party, where alumni are welcome . . . hot dogs, beer and rock band. The Junior Balcony, Dormitories, 37th and Spruce Streets. Rain location: Houston Hall, Grill Room.

SATURDAY, MAY 20

9:30 a.m.

Coffee hour sponsored by the Association of Alumnae in honor of the Class of 1922 Alumnae. All alumni and their guests welcome. Stiteler Hall, 37th Street between Walnut Street and Locust Walk.

10:15 a.m.

Campus bus tours departing every half hour throughout the day from the corner of 37th Street and Locust Walk.

10:30 a.m.

Seminar with Dr. Daniel Hoffman, professor of English, noted poet and author of *Poe, Poe, Poe, Poe, Poe, Poe, Poe, Poe*. Stiteler Hall.

11:00 a.m.

Alumni day gathering at the Dormitory Quads. Class Tents . . . displays . . . performances by Glee Club, Mask & Wig, Band, Pennsyngers . . . Children's Corner with free ice cream and entertainment.

12:00 noon

Picnic luncheon in the Dormitory Quads.

2:00 p.m.

Parade of classes accompanied by marching bands and reviewed by President Meyerson.

4:00 p.m.

Crew race. Pennsylvania vs. Northeastern for the Burk Cup. Shuttle buses leave the campus at 3:00 p.m. for the Schuylkill River.

For information: Ext. 7811

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