

UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
Summary of the Progress Reports of the Work Teams
May, 1972

There are few earthly things more splendid than a University . . .

*Wherever it exists, the free minds of men, urged on to full and fair enquiry,
may still bring wisdom into human affairs.*

*John Masefield
University of Sheffield—1946*

There are few earthly things more beautiful than a University . . .

*They give young people that close companionship for which youth longs,
and that chance of the endless discussion of themes which are endless,
without which youth would seem a waste of time.*

John Masefield
University of Sheffield—1946

UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Summary of the Progress Reports of the Work Teams*

May, 1972

Preamble

In its brief but intense period of study, the Commission has sensed strong support for President Meyerson's call for a new phase of University Development. At the President's request the University Development Commission has undertaken an independent review of the academic and financial status of the University. The Commission, operating on its own initiative, has laid out lines of inquiry into all aspects of the related questions of academic purpose and University solvency.

Under the stimulus of the Commission's inquiry, the students, faculty and administration have expressed in various ways a set of basic values that may serve us well as a guide in our efforts in development. It is fitting that we, as chairmen, should introduce this Interim Report of the Commission with a distillation of these basic values.

1) The primary dedication of the University must be to teaching and to scholarship, even though it should recognize its opportunities to make other contributions to society.

2) While new emphasis should be placed on excellence in teaching and the development of new educational programs, our strengths in scholarship and research should be maintained. Teaching and research go hand in hand, and remedying our shortcomings in teaching will not be helped by diminishing our strengths in research.

3) Sustained attention to undergraduate education and patterns of residential living is necessary if we are to develop an educational environment appropriate to a great University.

4) The traditional strength of our key professional schools should be matched in more than a few departments in the arts and sciences, undergraduate and graduate as well. Our professional schools have much intellectual vigor to give to the arts and sciences, and the arts and sciences, as the ultimate guardian of scholarship, can be the long-run bulwark of professional school excellence.

*This document represents a summarization by the Commission Chairman and Vice-Chairman of reports received from the various work-team chairmen outlining the progress of their studies and thinking to date. As such, its comments must be considered preliminary and tentative and should not be taken as representing official conclusions or recommendations of the Commission as a whole.

5) While it is desirable for the University to initiate new programs and attract new students and faculty, it has an obligation to its existing students and faculty. We should not dilute our present efforts with new ventures until we are prepared to order our priorities and stand behind our present strengths.

6) Before we can develop new programs and expect others to fund our needs, we must face up to existing weaknesses and reallocate our available funds and resources. This means that a new program must often be a substitute for an old one rather than an addition and it means we must use reallocated funds to start pilot programs which show faith in our own plans.

7) The two criteria of excellence and mission must guide University development. Mission may often be relevant to the practical needs of society; it must always be relevant to academic goals. Excellence cannot be compromised as a criterion in the development of new programs or in the maintenance of existing strengths.

Since the first of March, a dozen work teams made up of faculty and students have been studying possible areas of development for the University. Their charge was to develop ideas for action that could be shaped over the summer into concrete proposals for reallocating present resources and for raising new funds from outside sources. The two Commission Chairmen worked closely with the teams, and in this document, present summaries of the preliminary work-team reports. The Chairmen also digested enormous amounts of information on their own by interviewing Deans and Development Officers, reviewing reports and plans from other Universities, and reading a variety of proposals from individual faculty members, students, and administrators as well as the Academic Planning Committee and the Educational Policy Committee.

Our task now is to synthesize and integrate ideas from these various sources and translate them into specific proposals for action that will follow the spirit of the President's January 1972 proposal to the Trustees and will form the basis for University Development. This interim report is the first step in that task.

—Robert H. Dyson and Eliot Stellar

1. REALLOCATION

Preliminary study by the work team on Reallocation problems has yielded several conclusions.

First, no single program, school, or activity accounts for the budgetary deficit. However, there is an apparent over-commitment by the University in the area of professional schools which will force the University to phase out and/or combine some of its present activities in this area unless Commonwealth subventions, either in the form of contractual arrangements or capitation grants, are forthcoming.

Second, a balanced budget in 1972-73 will be followed by renewed deficits in ensuing years unless determined reallocation decisions are made and made soon.

Third, some things of value may have to be abandoned. In making such decisions the work of the Academic Planning Committee concerning priority ratings for different schools, programs, and departments will have to play a key role.

Fourth, the reallocation of funds will also require cut-backs in non-academic expenditures: administrative bureaucracy, athletics, buildings and grounds, etc.

Fifth, there should be drastic curtailment of new construction, and only the most urgent renovations should be undertaken.

Sixth, at the outset reallocation alone is unlikely to do much more than prevent deficits and provide limited pilot funds for new programs. Over a period of years, however, the new use of such funds could have a considerable impact on University programs.

2. UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

The declining morale of the present undergraduate body and the loss of attractiveness of the University to applicants (as reflected in the size and quality of the applicant pool) indicate most forcefully that the University must re-examine undergraduate education in all its aspects. Part of this re-examination is dealt with under Educational Living Patterns, for these form a significant aspect of the student's experience at Pennsylvania. Part of it is explored in proposals for a program of Endowed Scholarships and Fellowships, designed to attract the very best undergraduates to Pennsylvania and to offer them the most advanced educational experience, possibly leading to a B.A. in three years and an M.A. in four. In addition much of the success of undergraduate education will depend upon Endowed Professorships, especially those directed primarily to teaching.

The work team on Undergraduate Education has focused its attention thus far mainly on educational innovations that have been tried in recent years or have had considerable discussion. For example, one major concept divides the college years into two parts: (1) a beginning year or two in which the student can pick up one of a variety of introductions to advanced education and (2) an advanced year or two in which the student can specialize in a pre-professional experience or a concentrated scholarly experience leading directly to graduate study.

The introductory programs might take such forms as:

(1) Colleges of Thematic Studies, mini-majors, and tutorial terms;

(2) One or more "core" colleges (on, say, the model of the "Great Books" or Honors College proposals) concerned with the Western tradition and with modes and processes of thought;

(3) A Tutorial College, in which several faculty members assume total responsibility for the education of a cohort of students in their first two years;

(4) A Program of Human Studies, or Human Biology in the broadest sense, designed not only for those planning careers in medicine and the health professions but for others as well;

(5) A new form of Honors program for students of precocious talent, to embark on intensive early specialization.

The advanced programs would be designed to give the student an opportunity to work closely with faculty of the professional schools and the graduate schools as well as with the college faculty.

The hope would be to finance several pilot programs with reallocated funds. Once the University determines which programs are the most successful and most attractive, it can develop a major program for outside funding, primarily by foundations, but also alumni and other private donors. Quite naturally, this funding would be integrated with funding plans for endowed scholarships and fellowships, endowed professorships, and educational living patterns.

3. EDUCATIONAL LIVING PATTERNS

For many members of the University a touchstone in their thoughts about the quality of the environment we offer to students, particularly undergraduates, has been the excellent and often cited report of Dean Otto Springer's committee on the student affairs division. In May of 1965 that committee wrote:

The plain truth is that the educational mission of the University cannot be fulfilled in the classroom alone. The intellectual, cultural and social environment outside of the classroom cannot be divorced from what goes on within, and the University should not, if it could, draw its curtain of concern at the classroom door . . . They (the administrators of student affairs) must be charged with nothing less than creating and maintaining a stimulating and enriching cultural and intellectual environment.

The University should compute the time a student spends here in terms of the full days and nights that comprise a semester rather than the number of hours he spends in the classroom and library. With this vision in mind the term "educational living patterns" seems less a piece of jargon, and more an attempt to symbolize forcefully the complexity of ways in which the University is responsible for the students it has enrolled.

We believe that the University of Pennsylvania now possesses a physical plant capable of supporting an educational residence program of quality and distinction. A diversity of imaginative programs are possible in different physical settings. Already the University has made a healthy start with the College House program in the Van Pelt Manor House. We are encouraged by the plans for next year which include a second college house in the Stouffer Triangle, the Harnwell House project for freshmen and sophomores, the International Floor in Harnwell House, an educational program in Hill House, and the Black Cultural Center in Low Rise North. Each of these projects has a strong educational component, and is worthy of the University's support.

At present each project has been funded out of current operating budgets, and capital improvements and alterations in building structures have been financed by special allocation from the President's Office. With the projects currently in operation we believe that we see the beginning of a unique college system at Pennsylvania.

The proper way to support a college system or residential houses, however, is through the raising of endowment for each college. The endowment could cover the cost of alteration to existing facilities, provide a yearly income for the

maintenance of the college program, and might fund such things as:

1. endowed masterships for faculty who reside in college
2. endowed fellowships for graduate fellows who reside in college
3. endowed in-college lecture series
4. lounges
5. libraries and study areas
6. crafts studies

A major additional need is for funds for the renovation of the University's Quadrangle, where the University could house at least four colleges, each college taking in a number of existing dormitory units. Detailed plans for this project will shortly be transmitted to the President and the Board of Trustees.

We believe that the success of our residential operations is tied closely to the quality of the administrative structure that supports these programs. The work team has recently completed an evaluation of the existing structures and has forwarded its recommendations to the President and to the Provost for their consideration.

4. ENDOWED SCHOLARSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS

In his January report President Meyerson commented that

Compared with similar institutions, we have few endowed or regularly supported undergraduate scholarships and graduate fellowships. Because excellent students—as much as colleagues—stimulate good teaching and imaginative research, we propose raising funds to attract to Pennsylvania up to 1,000 Benjamin Franklin Scholars and Fellows (about half of each).

There are a number of different ways to achieve these goals. The following is one of the bolder ones.

It is proposed that there be constituted as the *Honors College* a teaching and scholarly group of Masters (in the ranks of Assistant Professor to Professor) associated with a larger body of Benjamin Franklin Scholars (undergraduates) and Fellows (graduate students) at a ratio not exceeding one Master to ten Scholars and Fellows. The Honors College would have its own physical identity—a place of residence, study and play with its own dining hall.

The first year of a three-year program of study leading to a B.A. or B.S., for all undergraduates in the Honors College, would be compulsory for all entering Scholars. That year would be entirely occupied by a special curriculum. During this mandatory year of special courses taught by Masters of the College, no other courses would be taken. Each scholar would be related to a Master, under whose advice and supervision he would then conduct his studies for the next two years toward the B.A. or four years toward the M.A. Under the rules of the Honors College, after the first year every Scholar would have to elect a highly specialized area of study and follow a program organized around that specialization.

The proposal which might be developed beyond the exploratory stage suggested above would have as its primary objective the creation of one unit of the University in which Masters of their discipline would perform the intensely personal action of transferring their mastery to a small number of highly selected students. This suggestion is predicated on the notion that the delicate kind of knowledge (and perhaps even wisdom) conveyed and/or advanced in a University, is gravely injured by speedy or impersonal methods; that there is no substitute for a living and wise teacher who is master of his discipline, working in close contact with a small number of qualified students.

The plan would be to start a program of this sort on a modest basis with a small number of Masters, Scholars, and

Fellows in residence in a College House. The hope is that existing faculty and resources could be supported by reallocated funds to provide a pilot program as a basis for an extensive fund-raising drive among alumni and foundations. The special feature of this proposal is that it would allow an integrated effort, aimed at endowment funds for scholarships, fellowships, and professorships as well as funds for housing the Honors College.

5. ENDOWED PROFESSORSHIPS

A program of endowed professorships offers the University a unique opportunity to increase its endowment while at the same time strengthening its teaching and research efforts. Certainly endowed chairs can be used to attract new faculty and to support the development of new areas of academic interest. They should also be used, however, to keep our best faculty here at Pennsylvania and to free them to experiment with new approaches to both teaching and research. This freedom can be created in part through a fund that not only pays the chairholder's salary but which also provides resources to support his or her educational and research roles. Such resources, even on a small scale, greatly enhance the productivity of men and women who hold endowed professorships and provide a basis for a dramatic step forward by the University.

Endowed professorships can assume a wide range of forms. Some can be life-time appointments: distinguished professorships that will attract the ablest scholars. Others can be for young faculty at the Assistant Professor level. These might have 3-5 year terms, renewable until tenure is reached. At tenured rank, some can also be for limited terms, allowing different faculty members to be rotated through them. Individual chairs might be linked to specific College classes, passing through the University; one or two might have their subject and purpose reviewed periodically by undergraduates so that their short-term holders can respond to changing interests of the student body. These and other possibilities are under review by the work team.

The Commission with the help of the Academic Planning Committee and the Deans will have to recommend guidelines in the form of a variety of models—including the methods of selection. It will have to recommend those areas in the University in which endowed chairs will do the most good in terms of both promise and need. The Commission will also have to recommend the number of endowed professorships which should be within departments and the number which should be interdisciplinary or University-wide. In addition it must determine the status of existing endowed chairs and seek ways of strengthening them.

In seeking to identify potential sources for endowed professorships the work team must explore the possibility of using existing chairs with limited income as a core to attract sufficient money to make each chair significant in terms of a good salary and small resource fund. Once areas of need and models for new chairs have been identified, the Commission, working with the Development Office, will plan a large-scale fund-raising effort among alumni, private families, industry, and foundations.

6. LIBRARIES

The work team on libraries has presented two sets of recommendations:

1) *Recommendations of an innovative character with the explicit aim, through application of modern technology in this decade, to transform the library system of the University of Pennsylvania into one of the great 'working libraries' of the world.* The term 'working library' in this context stresses

the prompt availability of information wanted by students, both graduate and undergraduate, as well as the ready accessibility of all research materials needed by the working scholar and scientist—whether it be located at Pennsylvania or elsewhere. It also emphasizes close integration of the development of our library holdings with the interests not only of the productive faculty but also of the intellectually curious in our student body, and it insists on the presence of library staff members genuinely competent in special disciplines. As a matter of fact, the library system of the University of Pennsylvania could take a leading role in the development of a 'working library' in this sense of the word, contrary to the archival character of many other libraries; and it could do so by making use of every technical device for rapid bibliographical retrieval at our disposal now or in the near future.

In order to have the libraries of the University of Pennsylvania participate and assist in fostering the evolutionary process, we specifically recommend pursuit of the proposal that a *Library Technology Research and Development Fund* be established. The purpose of this fund would be to provide the library systems group with the financial means to engage in a very practical kind of experimentation and development that will test ideas, concepts, machines, and systems in a working environment.

2) *Recommendations of a more traditional character with the explicit goal of making the library of the University of Pennsylvania by the end of the decade one of the first ten libraries in the nation with respect to the richness of its collections.* This is a goal to be achieved not through broad quantitative coverage but through judicious qualitative selectivity concerning the areas to be built up—and within these areas, concerning the specialties which are to be enriched in particular. In setting priorities of this kind, the sustained quality of our library's holdings in a given field and the proven excellence of the faculty and students interested in that field must be the first among a number of criteria to be taken into careful consideration.

This second set of recommendations concerns the University's *Program of Book Acquisitions* in its library system during the seventies and thereafter. No matter how much supplementary information from elsewhere becomes available through effective application of technological innovations, it stands to reason that all truly great libraries—those which because of age, or wealth, or geographical location or other blessings have already accumulated exceptionally fine collections—must remain conscious of their obligation to strengthen and keep up-to-date the quality of their resources. They must do so not only for the benefit of their present immediate clientele, but for users within a considerable radius and beyond. And an even more cogent reason why large university libraries must continue to enrich their holdings very intensely is that they are connected with a community of scholars and scientists and students who share in the responsibility of separating the significant from the ephemeral, the intrinsically valuable from trash. Though not equally true in all fields, there is a correlation between academic excellence and the quality of library holdings.

7. INTRA-UNIVERSITY COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

One of the commonest forms of innovation and fund-raising for a University is the interdisciplinary center or institute. Often this is most suitable for the solution of practical problems of applied science where the very nature of the practical problem demands knowledge from more than one discipline. More rarely, the interdisciplinary effort is made because new intellectual opportunities arise from the interaction of two or

more areas of knowledge. In its best form, the interdisciplinary group brings hybrid vigor to research and teaching. In its worst form, it is a haven for inadequate academic work, for as long as the mission is of apparent practical importance and as long as the possibility of funding is there, it is difficult for the University to make a negative evaluation and close it down.

In another realm, the interdisciplinary group can bring great strength to traditional departments by bringing in able faculty in neighboring fields, by attracting good students, by helping with teaching, and often by supplying special facilities for research. In such cases, cooperation is the keynote and the interdisciplinary group can be woven into the fabric of the departments to the benefit of all. On the other hand, interdisciplinary groups often are isolated from departments and often compete with them for staff, students, and funds. This is apt to happen when the interdisciplinary group offers its own degree and hires its own staff independently of the departments. Most of the time, this competition is unnecessary and dangerous and can be avoided.

Since interdisciplinary groups are bound to play a big role in future University development, it is important to stress here that we do need to evolve ways of managing them and assessing their contributions, comparable to the way we handle departments. One solution is to have the Vice Provost for Research play the role of the Dean when an interdisciplinary group falls between two schools.

Only when we solve these problems, will we be able to use with full benefit the attractive features of interdisciplinary efforts in University Development.

8. INTER-INSTITUTIONAL COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

Four major areas of inter-institutional cooperation suggest themselves as worthwhile for possible future development: (1) Cooperative programs with greater Delaware Valley institutions of higher learning; (2) Cooperative programs with peer institutions within commuting distance (Columbia, Princeton, Yale, etc.); (3) Cooperative programs nationwide; (4) Cooperative programs abroad. Development within each of these categories could take the form of (1) Inter-Institutional collaboration to form special programs, departments, majors, or special projects not now in existence; (2) Inter-Institutional Affiliation (e.g. Pahlavi, Kanazawa, Morgan State); (3) Inter-Institutional faculty mobility; (4) Inter-Institutional student mobility; and (5) Inter-Institutional program mobility.

The University of Pennsylvania already has a number of cooperative arrangements with other institutions such as Bryn Mawr, Haverford, Swarthmore, Pahlavi, etc. which provide experience and models for improved future programs. A great deal of groundwork has already been laid in the area of study-abroad programs, cooperative domestic programs, and field-work programs, and studies are going forward on foreign programs as well. These efforts must be reviewed during the coming months with an aim to produce recommendations directed explicitly at increasing the educational quality of the University, at stimulating richer faculty and student contact with their counterparts at other institutions, and at reducing unnecessary duplication of facilities and expenses. Individual programs must suggest patterns of contact and cooperation that will serve as a model to fiscally and organizationally entrapped institutions of higher learning throughout America.

9. CONTINUING EDUCATION

Almost every section of the University is engaged in some activity related to continuing education although in an un-

even and often undeveloped fashion. Yet the need for continuing education is growing in response to changing social and economic patterns. The pace of technology and resulting escalation of job requirements, increased leisure time, and changing family patterns are but a few of the complex forces that lead to an increased demand for continuing education.

In this field of endeavor the University with its combination of Arts and Sciences and Professional School expertise has the potential to make a contribution that can be unique and that would not be easily duplicated by other institutions of higher learning in the Delaware Valley area or the Commonwealth. In developing a program or programs in this area the University has the opportunity to look into the possibility of meeting the needs of various groups for modes of higher education not normally included in regular University undergraduate or graduate programs. Already some innovative efforts are in existence, for example, the University Museum's State Outreach Program and the Engineering School's TV program for Valley Forge. In developing such programs the organizational structures involved must provide necessary efficiency, flexibility, and control and the quality of education must be commensurate with the overall University quality.

The work team will be investigating the needs and plans in the areas of medicine, business, and other professional schools. It should also look into baccalaureate education for the older, working person in the Philadelphia community. Its aim will be to come up with a plan that can coordinate disparate efforts into a coherent plan for continuing education, identify methods and policies that would apply generally (e.g., TV, audiovisual aids), and investigate the possibilities of funding from industry, the professions, and the Commonwealth.

10. AUDIOVISUAL RESOURCES

There is every reason to believe that audiovisual systems can have a major impact on the quality of education within the University. Both the teaching and learning aspects of undergraduate and graduate education could be improved and the scope and involvement of the student in the learning process might well be broadened.

Equally important is the potential impact of audiovisual systems on the University's role in the community. Three possible lines of development suggest themselves here: (1) the development of cooperative systems working with the Philadelphia Board of Education and other institutions; (2) augmenting and advancing programs for continuing education and similar services throughout the Delaware Valley and the state; and (3) serving the national interest in the use of audiovisual systems by bringing to the attention of the general public the role of science and technology in modern society.

Although past experience indicates the need for cautious and careful planning so as not to raise undue expectations in the absence of proven success, nevertheless audiovisual resources should be viewed as a potential vital component in future education with an impact on education at least as significant as that of computer systems. With imaginative development the University could play a leading role in the development of such systems as it did in fathering the digital computer. Already the work team has identified twenty-five individuals in the University using audiovisual systems. It is our intent to develop a plan which will integrate these disparate efforts into a coherent resource center and a fundable program.

11. GRADUATE EDUCATION

The work team on Graduate Education is facing the concept of selective excellence by developing criteria for both

the quality and the central academic value of graduate programs. The basic idea is that 1) weak and peripheral programs should be dropped, 2) central programs that are weak should be developed wherever possible, and 3) central programs that are strong should be the candidates for the fullest support, with the promise of being the truly outstanding graduate departments in the country. As such, they will attract the best students, the best faculty, and the best sources of funds.

With a decreasing job market for graduates of Ph.D. programs, the pressure is on to cut back on the number of students supported by various programs. While such cut-backs will bring financial savings, the hope is that decisions can be made that will raise the standard of quality of graduate students in the course of the reduction in numbers. These decisions, of course, would go hand in hand with the decisions about the programs themselves.

Sound methods for the periodic review of graduate programs must be developed if such decisions are to be made on a continuing basis. These reviews, of course, should also include the interdisciplinary programs that contribute to graduate education. Success of the reviews, in turn, depends upon having a single, strong Dean of Arts and Sciences, with the control of undergraduate and graduate budgets as well as control of graduate fellowships.

One of the benefits that could derive from having a strong Dean and a clear concept of selective excellence is that graduate fellowships could be allocated in a more rational and effective way. Also graduate programs could then be better integrated with undergraduate programs, on the one hand, and with postdoctoral programs, on the other.

Difficult as it may be, the University can phase out and pare down academically weak programs and put the resources thus saved behind the more promising and more outstanding ones. In addition, we can build new areas of strength as well as maintain established strength through funds raised for endowed fellowships and professorships, and possibly also through capitation support from the Commonwealth. The University of Pennsylvania is a major source of graduate education in the state, and in some cases, the only source.

12. PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS

Much of the strength of the University of Pennsylvania derives from its professional schools, particularly Law, Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, and Wharton. These schools are generally well-funded, have distinguished faculties, and stand high in the ranks of similar schools at other Universities.

Already some developments in these professional schools are underway. The Law School has a new curriculum and is now ready to embark on a new fund-raising drive to finance educational programs, faculty research, library and endowed chairs. Major projections from Wharton include endowed chairs, a Wharton School in Europe and in Asia, and new degree programs. The Medical School has even more extensive plans. It is getting one new building (Silverstein) and discussing another (Science-Bridge), and important programmatic decisions must be made. A number of new centers are also under consideration in the Medical School: a cardiovascular program, a lung center, a genetics center, and a cancer research center. Furthermore, the Medical School is exploring affiliations with hospitals in three communities in Northeastern Pennsylvania to set up area health centers in which the University will cooperate in health care delivery. In addition, the Medical School and other Health Affairs Schools are working on an ambitious proposal covering three possible areas: (1) a social science-health science curriculum,

(2) Graduate Hospital as a community health-care center, and (3) a program in comparative medicine.

The plans of some other professional schools (Social Work, Nursing, Dental Medicine, and Education) have been reviewed and we will extend our contacts to Fine Arts, Engineering, Annenberg, and the School of Allied Medical Professions. At the present time, none of the plans of any school is far enough along for us to evaluate them for possible integration into an overall development program. This will be one of our primary purposes over the summer.

Cross-cutting the areas of planning and development within each school is the question of the broader relationship of the professional school to the arts and sciences, particularly in relation to undergraduate education. The possibility of using more of the professional school faculty in undergraduate education is being explored. The idea of using our professional school strength to emphasize preprofessional education in the College has also been broached. In addition, much attention is being given to the interface between professional schools and the arts and sciences to identify areas for significant academic interaction and the development of fundable programs, as for example sociology and medicine, economics and business, physical anthropology and dentistry, etc. Some of the best opportunities for fund-raising may lie at such interfaces.

Some of our other professional schools unfortunately, do not have high academic reputations, and some are not well funded. It is often said that these schools dilute the University's academic effort. Some argue, on the other hand, that the practical and social missions of these schools are so important that the University should stand behind them because of its obligation to the community and to the Commonwealth. One form of this argument is that these professional schools could strengthen themselves and develop greater academic standing if they had more money. Another view is that the University should "contract" the schools to the state and continue only those schools for which the state is willing to pay. A third view is that in its quest for selective excellence, the University should close those schools which it believes cannot achieve academic excellence.

Clearly, the University must decide upon its priorities and therefore decide what it can support. The findings of the Academic Planning Committee will be important here. These choices, however, are so fundamental and so far-reaching in their influence on the University that only the President, with the best advice the Commission can give, can make the final recommendation. Reallocation of funds, distribution of endowed chairs, efforts in continuing education, and many other development plans will depend on this decision.

Conclusions

1. *Reallocation of funds* is a major necessity. We must abandon weak or unjustifiable programs and activities. The funds saved should be used to balance the budget and hopefully provide seed money for pilot developments.

2. *Undergraduate education* is of great concern. We must attract better students and bring more of the University's faculty and resources to bear upon their education. This will require some new educational programs and better integration with graduate and professional studies.

3. *Educational living arrangements* are essential for an excellent undergraduate experience. We should expand our efforts to develop a variety of houses and colleges to meet the diverse needs of students and faculty.

4. *Endowed scholarships and fellowships* provide one basis for excellence at the undergraduate and graduate levels. An

expanded program of Benjamin Franklin Scholars and Fellows and other possible premium scholarship programs offer a specific and attractive area for fund-raising.

5. *Endowed professorships* should be developed for various ranks and for various terms to strengthen teaching and scholarship. These professorships would provide a major way to improve programs and departments throughout the University.

6. *Library development* is absolutely essential to maintain our academic excellence. This must involve thoughtful application of modern technology for information retrieval as well as cultivation of traditional resources.

7. The Commission has preliminary reports from work teams concerned with *cooperative intra-university programs, cooperative inter-university ventures, continuing education, and use of audiovisual techniques* and will be pursuing these possibilities for development over the summer.

8. *Graduate education* must continue to enjoy the strong support of the University, and we must have a sufficient core of strong academic departments. Both endowed fellowships and capitation support from the state must be sought to maintain and improve this unique contribution of the University.

9. *Professional schools* provide a traditional strength at Pennsylvania. They may offer major foci for development and fund-raising because of the practical value of their research, teaching, and service programs. Without distorting the balance between the Arts and Sciences and the Professional Schools, we should find our strongest opportunity for fund-raising here.

Postscript

This interim report is a first exploration of possibilities for University Development. Already our effort has contributed significantly to a wave of critical self-examination and a new emphasis on long-range planning. Already we are pulling together ideas that we are anxious to pursue over the summer and develop in greater practical detail.

Always our aim must be for concrete plans of action rather than comforting plans for further study. We must recommend hard-headed decisions for reallocation of funds and resources and we must do this soon. We must work closely with the Development Office and carry out effective plans for large scale fund raising.

Throughout these efforts, we have enjoyed warm and exciting interactions with our colleagues among the students, faculty and administration. We are counting on this interaction to continue as we work along, for we need the feedback, the criticism, and the support that the University community has to offer.

In all that we have learned thus far in our work, one thing stands out above everything else: success in development inevitably boils down to supporting good people and giving them the opportunity to fulfill their highest goals. This means strong efforts to bring in the best students, to get behind the best of our faculty, and to provide the best academic leadership in our administration.

Robert H. Dyson
Eliot Stellar

There are few things more enduring than a University . . .

*To be a member of one of these great societies
must ever be a glad distinction.*

John Masefield
University of Sheffield—1946

APPENDIX

1. University Development Commission:

(a) Members: Robert H. Dyson, Jr. (Chairman); Eliot Stellar (Vice-Chairman); Renee C. Fox; Britton Harris; Arthur E. Humphrey; William Keller; Julius Margolis; Robert W. Nason; Michael Neiditch; Ruth Ann Price; Phillip Rieff; Burton S. Rosner; Barbara Ruch; J. Robert Schrieffer; Otto Springer; Carol A. Weiss; John Wideman; Bernard Wolfman; Michael Zuckerman.

(b) Ex-Officio Members: Henry J. Abraham (Chairman of the Senate), Ralph D. Amado (Chairman, Educational Policy Committee of the University Council); Henry M. Chance II (Chairman, Trustees' Committee on Long Range Policy); Jean B. Crockett (Chairman-elect of the Senate); John W. Eckman (Chairman, Trustees' Committee on University Development); Carl Kaysen (Chairman, Trustees' Committee on Educational Policy of the Trustees); Lawrence R. Klein (Chairman, Academic Planning Committee of the University Council).

(c) Secretary: William G. Owen.

(d) Staff Liaison: Robert M. Zemsky.

(e) Staff Officer: Ronald Hicks.

2. Work Team Membership:

(a) Chairmen:

(1) Reallocation and Funding Problems: Burton S. Rosner and Otto Springer.

(2) Undergraduate Education: Michael Zuckerman and William Keller.

(3) Educational Living Patterns: Michael Neiditch and Ruth Anne Price.

(4) Endowed Fellowships and Scholarships: Phillip Rieff.

(5) Endowed Professorships: Julius Margolis.

(6) Libraries: Otto Springer.

(7) Intra-University Cooperative Programs: Britton Harris.

(8) Inter-Institutional Cooperative Programs: Barbara Ruch.

(9) Continuing Education: Robert W. Nason.

(10) Audiovisual Resources: Arthur E. Humphrey.

(11) Graduate Education: J. Robert Schrieffer.

(12) Professional Schools: Renee C. Fox and Carol A. Weiss.

(13) University Directions and Image: Robert W. Nason and Philip Rieff.

(b) In addition to Commission members, the following people have taken part in the work of the teams either as members or consultants: Roger Allen; Fred Bass; Samuel D. Bedrosian; Richard Beeman; Joseph Bordogna; Frank Bowman; Jean Brownlee; Eugenio Calabi; John W. Carr; Peter Conn; W. A. Copeland; Ambrose Davis; Phillip DeLacy; Richard S. Dunn; Robert D. Eilers; James J. Ferguson; Charlotte Fiechter; Eric Fisher; Louis B. Flexner; Aaron D. Freedman; George Gerbner; Ward H. Goodenough; Jack Guttentag; Frederic Harper; Van A. Harvey; Virginia Henderson; Allan Hofmann; Dell Hymes; Laureine Knight; Richard Lambert; Herbert S. Levine; John F. Lubin; Robert MacDonald; Patricia Meyers; Ervin Miller; Hiroshi Miyaji; Donald Murray; Eugene R. Nixon; Daniel J. O'Kane; Lee Peachey; Daniel D. Perlmutter; Yvonne Perry; Jerome Rauch; W. Allyn Rickett; Kenneth Rothe; Clyde deL. Ryals; Thomas Schutte; Richard F. Schwartz; James Shada; Richard Solomon; Andrew Sullivan; Humphrey Tonkin; E. C. van Merkensteijn; Henry Wells; Oliver P. Williams; James Yarnall; Robert Zemsky.

We have also received useful advice, assistance, and comments from a number of people not listed here.

(c) The Senate Advisory Committee has designated the following members for liaison with the work teams: Jean Crockett (Graduate Programs); Irwin Friend (Endowed Professorships); Louis Girifalco (Undergraduate Programs); Peter Nowell (Professional Education); David White (Reallocation).