



NOBEL PRIZE TO DR. SCHRIEFFER

Dr. J. Robert Schrieffer, Mary Amanda Wood Professor of Physics, has been chosen to receive the Nobel Prize in Physics.

He shares the prize with colleagues Bardeen of Illinois and Cooper of Brown; the three men are responsible for the theory of superconductivity—the phenomenon in which certain metals, alloys and chemical compounds become perfect conductors of electricity at temperatures close to absolute zero.

Dr. Schrieffer, who joined the University in 1962, is the first member of this faculty to win a Nobel award during tenure here. Two alumni won Nobel Prizes this year—Dr. Gerald Edelman (M'54) in Medicine and Dr. Christiansen B. Anfinsen (M.S. '39) in Chemistry. Former faculty members Dr. Haldan K. Hartline and economist Simon Kuznets are past laureates.

Dr. Schrieffer is a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, a Comstock Award recipient of the National Academy of Science, and a holder of honorary degrees from the University of Geneva and the Technische Hochschule in Munich, among his many honors.

He teaches both undergraduate and graduate courses here, and is a member of the University Development Commission and co-chairman with Dr. Britton Chance of the search committee to fill a Harnwell Professorship. With Robert Mundheim, he co-authored the report which helped create the present Afro-American Studies Program.

President Martin Meyerson called Dr. Schrieffer "an extraordinary member of the University community, devoted to excellence not only in his own work but in all aspects of University life. For his stimulation of ideas, for his gift of bringing forth the best in all of us, and now for the unparalleled honor he brings the University, the campus and all its members are deeply grateful to Bob Schrieffer."

Almanac

Volume 19, Number 9

October 24, 1972

Published weekly by the University of Pennsylvania

NEWS IN BRIEF

PAT ELLSBERG: OCTOBER 25

Pat Ellsberg will appear at a coffee on campus Wednesday, October 25 to speak and to show a twenty-minute movie prepared by her husband, Daniel Ellsberg, on the Pentagon Papers. Her appearance in Philadelphia is under the auspices of the Indo-China Peace Campaign.

She will be at the Christian Association's second-floor lounge from 2 to 4 p.m. The coffee is being sponsored by a group of wives of faculty at Penn. Free babysitting will be provided.

A-3 ASSEMBLY: OCTOBER 26

J. Richard Glover and Mia Argenterio, Director and Assistant Director of Training and Staff Development, will be guest speakers at the A-3 Assembly's general meeting on Thursday in the Houston Hall auditorium, 1 p.m. All A-3s are welcome.

HEALTH CARE FOR WOMEN: OCTOBER 26

Dr. Cynthia Cooke of the Obstetrics/Gynecology Department will speak to the Women's Faculty Club on "Health Care Problems of Women" at a luncheon Thursday, October 26 in the Benjamin Franklin Room, Houston Hall. Lunch begins at 11:30 a.m. and is open to prospective as well as present members and their guests. For reservations at \$2.50, contact Dr. Adelaide Delluva, president, at Ext. 7866.

(Continued on page 8)

Opening Wharton's Vance Hall

All members of the University community are invited to the special convocation Saturday at 11 a.m. to mark the opening of Vance Hall, the new home of the Wharton Graduate Division.

The Wharton Faculty will march in academic procession at the special convocation in Irvine Auditorium, following the 10 a.m. dedication ceremony at 37th and Spruce Streets. Convocation speaker will be Donald T. Regan, Chairman of the Board of Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner and Smith. His topic will be the nation's changing needs in business education.

Among other highlights of the dedication day will be a luncheon on College Hall Green following the convocation, and attendance at the Penn-Princeton game on Franklin Field.

Honorary degrees will be awarded at the convocation to Mr. Regan, to Mrs. Wharton Sinkler, widow of a Wharton alumnus, to former Wharton dean Willis J. Winn and to Leonard Davis, for whom the University's Institute of Health Economics is named.

Vance Hall is named for the late Henry T. Vance, a Wharton alumnus who was Chairman of Vance, Sanders & Co. of Boston and a Trustee of the University. Members of his family will take part in the dedication ceremony.

Alumni and students will also participate in the day-long activities that surround the opening of the five-story structure that provides classrooms, study areas, administrative offices and student lounges for the more than 1000 students now enrolled in MBA and other graduate programs at Wharton.

Three research units will also be housed there: the Industrial Research Unit, the Rodney L. White Center for Financial Research, and the Management and Behavioral Science Center. Some offices will be occupied later this month, and the building is expected to be fully occupied by the end of the year.

THE SENATE

From The Chairman:

On Open Expression

On April 26-28 a demonstration occurred in College Hall. That this demonstration violated the Guidelines was certified promptly by the Committee on Open Expression. The Committee's finding was confirmed for many members of the University by the evidence of their own eyes that entrances to College Hall were blockaded, that individuals were refused admittance, that offices were broken into and files removed. Yet on October 6 it was not possible to identify even one individual as having engaged in these illegal activities.

This is no criticism of the Court, which conducted itself impeccably under difficult circumstances (including inexcusable personal attacks) and which reached the only reasonable decision on the evidence offered. Nor is it a criticism of the Presenter, who did what he could with the evidence available to him. Under existing arrangements, the Presenter, who comes into the proceedings some time after the alleged offense, cannot be responsible for the gathering of on-the-scene evidence. Nor does he have subpoena powers or facilities for locating witnesses except to the extent that these come forward voluntarily.

The problem lies rather clearly in the fact that no one has responsibility for a systematic attempt to identify participants and to record precise times and circumstances. Evidence must be gathered in a more or less professional way if it is to stand up in a court which allows legalistic protections to the respondent. In particular, this is clearly necessary in the relatively small minority of cases in which the respondent can afford legal counsel or can enlist the unpaid services of lawyers.

The timing of the respondents' presence in College Hall was critical in the case of October 6, because the Guidelines grant amnesty for such offenses as blocking entrances (though not for offenses involving injury to persons, or destruction of property) to any demonstrators who, *after being informed* that their conduct violates the Guidelines, promptly modify that conduct.

The systematic collection of on-the-scene evidence of Guideline violations must be the responsibility of the Administration. However, it should not be the responsibility of the Vice Provost for Student Affairs or the Dean of Students, since it conflicts directly with the primary duty of these officers to avoid escalation of the demonstration and to work for modifications which will bring the demonstration into conformity with the Guidelines. It is of considerable interest that the only case in which individual demonstrators could be brought to account for Guideline violations was that in which two students physically restrained a faculty member who was attempting to reach his office in College Hall. Because he had the presence of mind to obtain identifications on the spot and because he was willing to undergo the personal inconvenience and unpleasantness of filing a complaint and serving as a witness, it was possible to obtain a conviction.

It is quite clear that under existing administrative procedures the Guidelines are not generally enforceable. In this situation the University has three alternatives open to it. The choice among them should depend on the value judgments of the members of the University.

The first alternative is simply to decide to live with the closing down of some University building once or twice a year. If we feel that this is a relatively minor inconvenience and if we really believe it to be unfair or undesirable for students or

faculty members to be punished for participating in such occupations and if further we are convinced that the frequency and/or destructiveness of these occupations is not likely to increase significantly, then this may be the appropriate choice. In that case, however, I would argue strongly that we should publicly acknowledge the demise of the Guidelines. To continue to go through the motions of enforcing something that is essentially unenforceable involves an unconscionable waste of time and effort and high priced talent. Furthermore, it is a kind of fraud upon the University community to continue to pretend that there is some protection of its freedom to go about its business unimpeded, when in fact no effective protection exists. Finally, to maintain the Guidelines without a clear commitment to effective enforcement leaves us open to the temptation to enforce them selectively (through more vigorous and systematic collection of evidence), if in some future case the campus happens to be out of sympathy with the "cause" ostensibly supported by the illegal demonstration. That would be a kind of hypocrisy profoundly unbecoming to a great University.

The second alternative open to us would acknowledge that a University is not very competent in the business of law enforcement and is temperamentally unsuited to dealing with violence. On these grounds it can then be argued that the University should turn to the civil authorities whenever a demonstration results in more than trivial and shortlived interference with the University's business. This course entails certain risks both of damage to the demonstrators and of escalation of the demonstration in response to the presence of city police on campus. We have been unwilling thus far to accept these risks.

The third alternative would be to modify administrative procedures in such a way that the Guidelines become enforceable. This would be neither easy nor inexpensive. There are a number of possibilities but at least four ingredients probably would be required:

(1) Prompt action by the Committee on Open Expression to determine the legality of the demonstration. (This was done in the most recent case.)

(2) Upon a finding that the Guidelines were being violated the responsible Administrative Officer would promptly so inform the demonstrators, instructing them to modify the demonstration appropriately.

(3) If, within a reasonable period of time (say two hours) the demonstration were not brought into conformity with the Guidelines and this failure were again certified by the COE, then the responsible Administrative Officer would order the demonstration terminated.

(4) At this point no one would be permitted to enter the building (or other site of the demonstration) except with the express approval of the responsible Administrative Officer and for the purpose of persuading the demonstrators to disperse. After a reasonable period of time (say half an hour), all those remaining in the demonstration area (without administrative consent as provided above) would be guilty *prima facie* of Guidelines violation, and an intensive (and undoubtedly expensive) attempt would be made to identify these persons through matriculation cards or through photographs of those refusing to surrender such cards as they leave the area.

If the University community elects this third alternative then it is time for some hard thinking to work out in specific detail an adequate machinery for developing evidence on violations.

OF RECORD



Following is a memorandum from Provost Curtis Reitz to the Deans, Directors and Department Chairmen concerning guidelines during the election period November 1 through 7, 1972.

On September 20, the University Council recommended,

that the President remind the members of the community of their responsibilities regarding the November elections and ask the faculty and students to exercise maximal flexibility in helping one another to express their concerns in this regard.

With the advice of the Steering Committee of Council that the following is consistent with the recommendation of Council, I am requesting that all faculty members observe the following guidelines for the period November 1, 1972 through November 7, 1972:

1. That no examinations be given during this period.
2. That students be allowed to make up work missed during this period.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT'S CONFERENCE

President Meyerson opened this year's first meeting by expressing hope that members would use the Conference as a clearinghouse for debate as well as information. He suggested the Conference meet less often but concentrate on matters of present and future concern.

Around the table, members reported on new educational ventures; budgeting and housekeeping; affirmative action; and University life. Among the reports:

Richard De Gennaro, Director of Libraries, announced that the University, along with colleges using the Union Library Catalogue, is preparing to join forces with the Ohio Colleges Library Center, a computer-cataloguing system.

Noting that the limit of 50 undergraduate students is enrolled in the architecture department, Dean Peter Shephard said he is preparing proposals to strengthen undergraduate offerings in architecture and fine arts.

Vice Provost Humphrey Tonkin spoke of tentative plans for expanding the Summer School program, including the addition of Thematic Studies and a possible exchange of 40 to 50 students with the University of Lancaster (England) during the summer term.

Dean William Stephens said the College and the Annenberg School are working on creation of a theatre major.

In Admissions, Dean Peter Seely said the University will introduce January transfers this year—about 100, added to the 350 who entered this fall with the 1960 freshmen. Athletics Director Fred Shabel described a "need formula" being developed by the NCAA for athletic scholarships, with provisions (on the number of athletes entering in each sport) that may precipitate controversy with the Ivy Group.

Gerald Robinson (Personnel Relations) announced a February Career Conference for Women which will involve over 200 businesses, and a Financial Management Seminar being conducted for campus business administrators now.

Three heads of nonacademic personnel groups reported on concern for interaction among University people as well as on studies their groups are doing on salary and benefit issues. Opening of a Grammateis activity to all personnel was reported by President Marion Pond, along with her group's plans to propose a health care facility for personnel. A-3 Assembly Spokesman Mrs. Margaret Weyand called for greater involvement of staff in early stages of new undertakings, and described studies which show mismatching of job and job classification; she also asked the administration to consider the unsolved problem of employees valued in place but halted at the top of their scales. Administrative Assembly Chairman William Owen reported on plans for additional "Inside Pennsylvania" orientations for administrators, and formation of a study committee on the Economic Status of Administrative Personnel.

Budget and Physical Plant

Dr. John Hobstetter, Associate Provost, announced that the budget analyses of schools have been completed and that the Academic Planning Commission is getting ready to codify the results of a questionnaire (on the effectiveness and quality of programs) sent to deans and department chairmen. Since the Budget Committee has "considerably expedited its approach," he said, the budget for fiscal year 1973-74 may be ready as early as mid-December.

Vice President John Hetherston told of plans to tie the campus together physically, to close and landscape portions of 37th and 39th streets, and to devise a new traffic code to reduce noise and congestion.

Affirmative Action

The University is studying the new federal guidelines on affirmative action, and expects the H.E.W. to resume its review this fall (but not in October as reported in the *Daily Pennsylvanian*, Equal Opportunity Administrator James Robinson said). In response to query from Dr. Nancy Zumwalt, President Meyerson predicted government intervention would accomplish less for women than the University's own goals ought to be. He called the federal government a "thin reed" to lean on, saying there is "a good deal of evidence it is receding" from the Philadelphia Plan and other efforts.

Provost Reitz added that preliminary data show the University doubled its appointment of women to tenured and tenure-accruing positions last year. President Meyerson said the progress was done "without quotas" and that achieving more for women than for minorities reflected a "larger universe to draw upon."

According to Dean Stephens, of 25 College positions filled, ten went to women and two to minority members. He also said the College expects its department chairmen to advertise openings.

University Life

Dean Alice F. Emerson, a non-voting member of the Mendleson Committee (whose preliminary report was published in the October 10 *Almanac*), asked that Conference members seek "some realistic feedback" about the report. Some general questions she presented:

Does the community agree or disagree with the philosophy expressed in Part I of the report? What are the operational possibilities of the suggestions for improving University life set forth in Part II?

Later in the meeting, Vice President Craig Sweeten voiced alumni and visitor's concerns about the atmosphere and "housekeeping" of the campus. He noted that the Development Office wishes to hear from the community on the effectiveness of such projects as the Phoenix Theatre, which alumni helped support.

JOB OPENINGS

BULLETIN #484, October 15

ACCOUNTANT II for business office on campus. Responsible for accounting, preparation of reports on security holdings, income and distribution of investment income.

Qualifications: Knowledge of trust accounting and general accounting experience. Supervisory ability required. *Salary Range:* \$9900-\$14,700

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I for a science area.

Qualifications: Stenography, typing. Three to four years experience necessary. *Salary Range:* \$6100-\$7900

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I Medical.

Qualifications: Accurate typing and shorthand. Figure work. Medical and college background desirable; previous office experience necessary. *Salary Range:* \$6100-\$7900

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I for business office.

Qualifications: Shorthand, excellent typing, MTST desired. Theater-arts background preferred; public relations and managerial duties. *Salary Range:* \$6100-\$7900

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT II Undergraduate business office.

Qualifications: Excellent typing, accounting knowledge. Supervision of large number of employees. College grad preferred, with experience in clerical and supervisory positions. *Salary Range:* \$6700-\$8500

ASSISTANT TO THE DIRECTOR Alumni Annual Giving.

Qualifications: Willingness to travel throughout the country (50% of time). Ability to get along well with people. Ability to speak effectively. Prefer Penn grad. *Salary Range:* Open

DENTAL X-RAY TECHNICIAN to make intraoral and extraoral dental X-ray examinations on clinic patients. Operating X-ray dark room. Evaluating quality of radiographs.

Qualifications: Skill in taking dental X-rays and evaluating radiographs. Training as a dental assistant, dental hygienist or radiology technician would be preferred. *Salary Range:* \$5500-\$7000

ELECTRON MICROSCOPE TECHNICIAN III

Qualifications: Graduation from an approved college or university with a science major or medical technology degree. Must have experience in electron microscope work. *Salary Range:* \$7700-\$10,100

HISTOLOGY TECHNICIAN II familiar with the complex aspects of tissue technology and/or the supervision of such technology.

Qualifications: Graduation from high school. Must be registered as a histological technician by the American Society of Clinical Pathologists. At least two years direct experience. *Salary Range:* \$6400-\$8200

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN I Permanent part-time position (approx. 20 hrs./wk.) Duties: maintenance of laboratories, preparation and stocking of solutions, ordering of laboratory supplies.

Qualifications: Chemical background preferred. Some training in general laboratory techniques. Knowledge of Shilling test. *Salary Range:* \$2.86-\$3.54/hr.

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN III (2) to participate in varied research programs in medical areas of the University.

Qualifications: Graduation from an approved college or university with a science major—preferably in biology, zoology, microbiology, bacteriology or other related fields—with one to two years of chemistry. *Salary Range:* \$7000-\$9100

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN IV (2) for medical research programs.

Qualifications: Graduation from an approved college or university with a science major, including 3 years of college chemistry. Experience in biochemistry research techniques. *Salary Range:* \$7300-\$9400

POSITIONS ANNOUNCED BY THE PROVOST

University Registrar: The University is seeking a replacement for Richard Paumen, who has joined Vice President Paul Gaddis's office as Assistant Vice President for University Information Management Systems. Candidates for Registrar should hold a degree from a recognized college or university (an MBA is desirable) and should have five to seven years' experience in administration, including coordination of computer-related systems. Inquiries should go to the Office of the Provost and Vice President.

Research Assistant (Part Time): For a new position in the Provost's Office, he is seeking a part-time staff member with clear writing ability and with experience in information gathering and analysis. College degree preferred. Inquiries to the Office of the Provost and Vice President.

RESEARCH SPECIALIST II tissue culture technician.

Qualifications: BS degree, with emphasis on microbiology, or past experience in tissue culture. Must furnish references. *Salary Range:* \$9000-\$11,500

RESEARCH SPECIALIST IV to be responsible to a department chairman for provision and maintenance of an electron microscopy service facility for research investigators.

Qualifications: Graduation from a recognized college or university with an appropriate scientific degree; MS or PhD preferred. Skill in preparation of mammalian tissues as well as bacteria and viruses for electron microscopy. Ability to train and supervise students and technicians. At least ten years direct professional-level experience in this specialty. *Salary Range:* \$13,700-\$17,000

SECRETARY I (2) for business and academic areas.

Qualifications: Accurate typing, proficiency in spelling. Some shorthand or dictaphone may be required. *Salary Range:* \$4400-\$5400

SECRETARY II (6) for business, academic and medical areas.

Qualifications: Good accurate typing; shorthand and/or dictaphone. Ability to perform varied duties pertinent to the area; some experience required. *Salary Range:* \$5000-\$6500

SECRETARY III (3) for academic and medical areas.

Qualifications: Interest in working with figures. Excellent typing; shorthand and/or dictaphone. Ability to work with minimum of supervision in performing varied responsibilities. *Salary Range:* \$5500-\$7000

TECHNICAL ASSISTANT for advanced medical research and extensive laboratory technological work.

Qualifications: Master's in science plus 3 to 5 years of experience and supervisory ability. *Salary Range:* \$8500-\$10,900

TECHNICIAN, ASSISTANT CHIEF ELECTROCARDIOGRAPH (EKG) for clinical work related to EKG section. Operation of an electrocardiograph machine and supervision of the work of subordinate EKG technicians.

Qualifications: At least two years of direct experience in the operation of EKG machines. *Salary Range:* \$5000-\$6500

Those interested should contact the Employment Section of the Personnel Services Department (Ext. 7285) for an interview appointment.

PENN TEMPORARIES

The Personnel Office is developing its own temporary services for work on campus. Call Clare Trout, Personnel Office, 130 Franklin Building, Ext. 7287, Monday—Friday after 2 p.m.



FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION RETIREMENT PROGRAM

Because University publications such as the HANDBOOK FOR FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION do not undergo frequent revisions, and because the personnel benefits available to University employees are constantly changing, the University-wide Personnel Benefits Committee would like to utilize the facilities of ALMANAC to describe various major benefits available to the employees of the University. Therefore, it is the intention of the committee to summarize a particular benefit in these pages from time to time in the hope that the summaries will foster a dialogue between University employees and the committee as well as prompt employees to make sure they are taking advantage of the benefits available to them in the most efficient manner possible. If these comments raise questions, be sure to contact the Benefits Office of the University.

The principal retirement program for faculty and administrative personnel of the University is the TIAA-CREF retirement program. TIAA-CREF limits participation in their program to staff members of colleges, universities, independent schools, and other nonprofit and tax-exempt educational and scientific organizations. Presently about 2500 institutions participate.

This program is composed of two sub-programs, namely a fixed dollar annuity program (TIAA) and a variable dollar annuity program (CREF). An individual participating in this program may balance his (and the University's) contributions between TIAA-CREF or may specify that all of his (and the University's) contributions be paid into only one of the sub-programs. Funds contributed to the TIAA sub-program purchase guaranteed amounts of monthly income while the funds contributed to CREF purchase units of income, the value of a unit depending upon the investment performance of the CREF fund which is invested in equities. Once each year, individuals participating in the plan are given the opportunity to change their contribution mix to the sub-programs. (Nationwide about 12 percent of all premium-paying annuity owners participate solely in TIAA and less than 1 percent solely in CREF.) Premiums paid to TIAA since March 1969 have been credited with 7 percent interest.

Last year TIAA-CREF made available to participating institutions a so-called "Transitional Retirement Benefit," which permits participants who retire after June 1, 1972, the option of taking up to 10 percent of his accumulation in one sum at the time he starts to receive annuity income. The University of Pennsylvania has decided to make this benefit available to its retirees pending a favorable tax opinion on the benefit from the IRS. TIAA-CREF estimates that the effect of this benefit on those electing it will be to increase the retirees' first year retirement income by 100 percent and reduce future monthly income by 10 percent.

Eligibility for full participation in the program at the University is determined as follows:

1. Full-time statutory and senior administrative officers:
Immediately upon election or appointment.
2. Full-time administrative staff and professional personnel:
After three or more years of service.
3. Fully-affiliated and fully-salaried members of the instructional and research staffs:
Immediately on appointment to assistant professor or higher.
After three years of service for those who have held the rank of instructor, lecturer or associate.

Participation in TIAA-CREF is required as a condition of accrual or appointment to tenure status.

Individual participant and University contributions to TIAA-CREF are made in accordance with the following schedule:

Percent of Base Salary Contributed		
Age of Participant	by Participant	by University
Under 30	4%	6%
30-40	5%	8%
Over 40	5%	9%

Part-time administrative and professional personnel and partially-affiliated instructional and research staff members may participate in the plan but without University contribution.

Deductions are made from paychecks on a nine-month basis—September through May—even when the salary is paid in twelve monthly installments. Thus, a participant over age 40 with a base salary of \$16,000 would have \$88.88 deducted from his check for each of the nine months. The "Statement of Earnings and Deductions" does not reflect the University's contribution. Both the individual's as well as the University's contributions are immediately and fully vested (i.e., owned by the participant). This does not mean the participant can withdraw the accumulations at his option, rather the accumulations are held in his name by TIAA-CREF until death or retirement. In the event of the participant's death prior to retirement, the full current value of the accumulations is payable to a designated beneficiary.

Overlooked Features

Listed below are several features of the above-described program which are sometimes overlooked but which can be of great benefit to participants.

(1) While there exists a three-year waiting period for certain categories of personnel, this waiting period only applies to University contributions. Newly employed faculty and administration personnel may join the plan immediately even though without University contributions. Participation on this basis can be advantageous from a tax standpoint as noted in item (2) below. (The Personnel Benefits Committee currently has under discussion the advisability of modifying the three-year waiting period.)

(2) An individual's own contributions can be extracted in the form of salary deductions or salary reductions. In the former case contributions are made with after-tax dollars. In the case of reductions an individual has his current taxable income reduced by the amount of the current contribution. This "defers" current income for federal income tax purposes which has the effect of postponing the income tax liability on that money until it is actually received in retirement years. Presumably taxable income will be lower in retirement (and even if it is not the present value of the tax may be less) so a tax savings will be realized. Furthermore, under the salary reduction arrangement, the Internal Revenue Code provides that the entire accumulation paid to a beneficiary as a result of the employee's death escape inclusion in the decedent's estate. This is only partially true if employee contributions are made via salary deductions. This is a valuable alternative and it is hard to visualize a situation where salary reduction approach should not be used.

(3) Every participant has the further option of paying more than 5 percent of his annual salary into the program, thereby deferring even a larger portion of current income from federal income taxation until later years. Participants should seek advice on this matter, however, since the IRS places limits on the amount of annual income that can be deferred for tax purposes.

Robert A. Zelten, Chairman
Personnel Benefits Committee

RESPONSES

Earlier in the year, ALMANAC published a number of documents which invited comment from the University community. Two such responses have been received with the request that they be published: a message from three faculty members to the Trustees Committee on Corporate Responsibility, next column; and a letter to President Meyerson, below, concerning his report in the January 25, 1972, issue. The letter to the President was prepared by Althea K. Hottel, Marian Pepper, Margaret R. Mainwaring, Ione A. Strauss and M. Jane Williams, chairman, as a "composite of the reactions of fifty-five active alumnae" on the Association's Board of Directors.

On "Directions"

TO: President Martin Meyerson
FROM: The Association of Alumnae
DATE: May 1972
SUBJECT: "Directions for the University of Pennsylvania in the Mid-Seventies"

The Association of Alumnae would like to take this opportunity to comment on the excellent document, "Directions for the Mid-Seventies." As a group representative of a large portion of the alumni body, we feel it is incumbent upon us to add what we can to your comprehensive review of the status of the University of Pennsylvania today and support what must be done to assure its excellence in the future. We recognize that drastic changes in all phases of the University programs are necessary now, if the institution is to survive. Because of this necessity, we endorse the plans for the future and the changes suggested in the "Directions" as the best possible choice of the alternatives proposed.

The main reason for submitting this statement is our belief that it will take firm commitment from all elements of the University to make this program work. We are pleased that the administration and faculty are taking the initiative in proposing bold plans for the future. We want Pennsylvania to "flourish as a major center of educational achievement," and we would like to see alumni play an active role in accomplishing this end.

Naturally, one of our primary concerns is for the education of women at Pennsylvania. We feel that the standards of quality in admissions and in academic offerings for women must be maintained and not be lowered. As one specific recommendation, we urge that the College for Women program be given equal emphasis, status, and rate of funding with that of the College if this division is to continue to attract outstanding students.

We support the suggested changes in the academic program, e.g., concentration on selected areas, fusion of graduate and undergraduate programs, thematic colleges and residential projects. The faculty must be responsible for defining academic excellence and in some cases for enlarging their own contribution by teaching more hours and more students; the administration for coordinating the various facets of new and ongoing programs and for securing the required funding. Alumni should also participate—they can provide financial support, but they must be called on to do more than that.

We wish to call attention to a lack of reference to alumni input in the "Directions for the Mid-Seventies." The continuous education project is a fine one, but it is in essence a service for alumni. What we would like to suggest is that alumni should be actively drawn into the forces that will chart the future progress of the University. They should be just as committed as the faculty, the administration, and the students to excellence for Pennsylvania in the '70s.

Can the University further develop a comprehensive rapport with its interested alumni? Could the University utilize all alumni resources, not just the financial ones? Specific suggestions toward these ends are:

1. Several alumni other than alumni trustees might be consulting members of the Development Committee and its sub-

committees. This could help to develop greater alumni commitment to the new plans.

2. Alumni might be represented on other planning committees—especially for the continuous education programs.

3. For informational purposes, University news publications such as the *Almanac* might be made available to interested alumni for a fee. We also urge continued support and enlarged use of *The Pennsylvania Gazette* as a vehicle for reaching all alumni.

4. Alumni could be more involved and better informed in student recruiting and following up on student progress after admission. (This might be especially effective in the case of minority group students and with students who might qualify for early admission.)

5. Alumni might aid in career counseling and placement advising more directly than they have in the past.

6. Alumni might be asked to participate in residential projects—their input could be surprisingly effective.

These are some areas where alumni, both men and women, can make definite contributions. Alumni can help in their own way to aid in the progress of the University without adding significantly to the cost of the program.

We offer this statement to aid in planning for the '70s. Financial resources will be important, but we urge you to utilize a virtually untapped human resource—the alumni of the University of Pennsylvania.

The Association of Alumnae endorses the "Directions for the Mid-Seventies" but urges greater participation by interested alumni in the plan.

Corporate Responsibility

To the Members of the Trustees Committee on Corporate Responsibility:

We found the "Tentative Draft Guideline for Investment in Publicly Held Companies" (as reported in the ALMANAC, May 16, 1972) to be merely a restatement of current policy. We feel that this policy is clearly inadequate.

This is the second time that we have been invited to provide recommendations to the Trustees Committee on Corporate Responsibility. The first time was on April 21, 1971, when we made an oral presentation to you and then left a written report. We were promised at that time that the Committee would respond to our recommendations. In his July 5th letter, Dr. Nason again urged broader representation for decisions which are considered to be important by the University family. To date, we've received no reply. Therefore, we again attach a copy of our original proposal of April 21, 1971.

The actions of the Trustees Committee on Corporate Responsibility in this case are merely a symptom of a more serious problem. This is that the Trustees are not responsive to the "University family." The reasons that difficulties have arisen . . . is not that we have differences among the University family (we do); rather it is that the Trustees do not adequately represent the University family. . .

There would seem to be two possible solutions:

1. To have a Board of Trustees that provides democratic representation to those being governed—students, faculty and other employees, alumni, and the local community. This should help to insure that the collective conscience of the University family is followed.

2. To provide some way to monitor the University family on crucial issues. A practical and low-cost scheme for the latter is contained in our original proposal.

A PROPOSAL FOR THE DETERMINATION OF STOCK PROXY VOTES ON IMPORTANT ISSUES

Objectives

Recent trends indicate that the University, as owners of corporate stock, will be faced with an increasing number of important

issues on proxy votes. The University *cannot avoid making decisions in these situations*. The question is how these decisions are to be made. We feel that it is the obligation of the "owner" of stock to vote. He should not abdicate this responsibility by letting management make these decisions.

We propose that "important" University investment decisions should be made according to the desires of the University constituents. To accomplish this objective, we suggest that the voting policy on important issues should meet 3 criteria:

- (1) There should be *explicit* guidelines.
- (2) The guidelines should be perceived as *fair* by the constituents of the University.
- (3) The guidelines should be *efficient*.

Below, we have outlined a specific policy which we feel meets the criteria of being explicit, fair and efficient. This is only one of many possible solutions. But we feel that this policy represents a great improvement over the *current policy*.

A Specific Policy

After defining what is to be considered as an "important" issue and who are to be considered as the University constituents for investment decisions, we suggest the use of a sample survey as a fair and efficient way to assess University desires. A stock proxy voting procedure is then suggested.

Definition of an Important Issue

An issue may be designated as important by the President of the University, by the Chairman of the Board of Trustees, by the Investment Committee, or by the Committee on Corporate Responsibility.

In addition, an issue may be designated as important upon receipt by the Secretary of the University of a petition from at least one of the constituent groups at the University. This petition must include at least 300 signatures (and addresses) from *any* of the members of the constituent groups.

Definition of Constituent Groups

The constituent groups for stock proxy voting include:

- (1) Alumni (all those who received degrees from the University).
- (2) Faculty (includes all full-time members of professorial rank).
- (3) Administration and staff (all full-time employees of the university other than faculty).
- (4) Students (all full-time students currently enrolled).

The Sample Survey

The Secretary of the University shall be charged with the responsibility of carrying out the survey subject to approval by the Committee on Corporate Responsibility. The following guidelines shall be followed:

- (1) The statement of the issue shall be unbiased and shall include both sides.
- (2) The survey shall be conducted by mail.
- (3) *Systematic samples* of equal size* shall be selected by the Secretary from each of the four constituent groups. There should be at least 50 but no more than 100 people per group. These lists will be confidential.
- (4) There will be one follow-up postcard to try to encourage each member of the sample to respond to the survey. The follow-up shall be sent out 7-10 days after the mailing of the surveys.
- (5) The survey shall end *one month* after the initial mailing.

Stock Proxy Voting Procedure

The shares shall be split according to the percentages of votes favoring each side of the issue. This percentage will be based *only* upon responses which are received.

The results of the voting shall be made available to the University Community and to the press.

J. Scott Armstrong, Leonard Lodish and Robert Nason
Department of Marketing

*Every *n*th name from the list shall be selected.

THE TRUSTEES

CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY

The Trustees of the University approved guidelines for investment in publicly held companies at their Stated Meeting October 13, following the recommendation of their Committee on Corporate Responsibility. They made one alteration in the text that had earlier been submitted to the University community for comment: The last sentence of Section II.A (Page 3, *Almanac* May 16, 1972) was changed from:

Although the Committee expects that the Trustees will primarily exercise the University's shareholder power by voting on proposals submitted to shareholders, it does not rule out informal action which seeks to influence management not to engage in activities or take courses of action which violate the law, frustrate its enforcement or implementation or [offend the collective conscience of the Trustees.]

to read:

Although the Committee expects that the Trustees will primarily exercise the University's shareholder power by voting on proposals submitted to shareholders, it does not rule out informal action which seeks to influence management not to engage in activities or take courses of action which violate the law, frustrate its enforcement or implementation or *in the judgment of the Trustees Committee on Corporate Responsibility is unconscionable*.

After its October 13 meeting—the first since it met in May and published the proposed guidelines in the *Daily Pennsylvanian*, the *Pennsylvania Gazette*, and *Almanac*—the Committee sent the following letter to Professors Armstrong, Lodish and Nason, in response to their communication (opposite):

Your open letter of October 2, 1972, along with your proposal of April 21, 1971, were discussed at the October 13, 1972 meeting of the Trustees Committee on Corporate Responsibility. Particular attention was focused by the Committee on your suggestions regarding (1) representation on the Board of Trustees, and (2) conduct of sample surveys of the desires of the various groups comprising the University community, on and off campus, to be binding on the Trustees as to how stock proxies on "important" issues should be voted.

As to the first of your proposals, the view of the Committee members, after a full discussion of the broadened Trustee representation which you proposed, is that the best interests of the University are served by retaining the present basic structure of the Board. In arriving at this decision, we were guided by the conclusions reached by the Task Force on University Governance regarding proposals for faculty and student service as regular members of the Trustees or its committees. As you know, we have acted affirmatively on the Task Force recommendation regarding the election of Trustees from among the youngest of our alumni. A continuing effort is made to achieve diversity within the present structure in accordance with another of the Task Force recommendations.

As to your second recommendation concerning the voting of proxies for shares owned by the University, it is the view of the members of the Committee, as stated in the Guidelines, that the University is an institution which is peculiarly inhibited in its ability to take collective action. A fixed procedure to determine a majority view or a consensus of the University community on stock proxy issues, as you propose, creates a risk of segmentizing or even polarizing the University community. Moreover, such a survey would commit the Committee to a rigid response and would not permit the latitude to make more indirect responses, such as endeavors to persuade management, as we have done in some cases. Whenever there is an issue on which the Committee considers that further advice is needed, we shall, of course, seek it through appropriate means. The Guidelines are not fixed in regard to consultative or other procedures and a sample survey might well be indicated in the case of a specific issue. As the Committee said from time to time and has reiterated in the Guidelines, the Trustees recognize and welcome the interest of individual members of the University community in helping the Committee to perform its

functions. In some cases, public hearings open to all components of the University community, such as those held by the Committee in connection with its consideration of Campaign GM proposals and the proxies pertaining to Gulf Oil Company's activities in Africa, proved useful. Alternatively, the Committee may seek the views of alumni, faculty, and students through the leadership of their constituent organizations.

To facilitate the expression of views by alumni, faculty, administration, and students, the Committee has arranged to have made available in the Treasurer's office quarterly lists (1) of the portfolio securities held by the University, (2) of questions under consideration by the Committee, and (3) of the disposition by the Committee of the questions considered within the prior twelve-month period.

A summary of the foregoing views of the Committee, particularly those in response to your proposals, was presented to the Trustees at their Stated Meeting on October 13th.

I should like to express the appreciation of the Trustees Committee on Corporate Responsibility for your interest in the development of Guidelines on the appropriate role of the University as an investor and shareholder in publicly held companies. As you know, we gave the tentative draft the broadest exposure in publications circulated to alumni, faculty members, administration, and students, and invited comments on the Guidelines. These Guidelines are always subject to modification and the Committee continues to welcome your views and those of all members of the University community.

Bernard G. Segal, Chairman
Trustees Committee on Corporate Responsibility



NEWS IN BRIEF continued

WHITE HOUSE FELLOWSHIPS

Competition is open to junior faculty, graduate students and young practitioners interested in serving as assistants to a U. S. Cabinet officer or to a senior member of the White House staff for a year. HEW Secretary Elliott Richardson has asked key educators, health professionals and community leaders to recommend candidates, stressing that his office hopes for a greater response among "highly qualified women in education, health and social service."

The deadline for applications is December 1. Candidates may apply on their own or may be nominated by an individual or organization. Forms are available from Bernard Loeffke, Director, President's Commission on White House Fellowships, Room 1308, 1900 E. Street NW, Washington, D. C.

LIKE IT IS: OCTOBER 24

Bulletin columnist Claude Lewis will give his views on the presidential campaign Tuesday, October 24, at 2 p.m. in the Fine Arts Auditorium. The program is entitled "Like It Is: A Perspective on the Election."

"Like It Is" is the name of Lewis's twice-weekly column. He is the author of biographies of Cassius Clay and Adam

Clayton Powell and is a cofounder of Black Perspective, an association for black newspaper writers.

The program, open to the public, is sponsored by the Faculty Tea Club. At a tea in the Faculty Club following the Lewis talk, Mrs. Alfred Gellhorn and Mrs. Arthur E. Humphrey will be hostesses.

WHERE IT'S AT: THE ADMINISTRATION

A recent flood of change-of-address memos may give the impression that administrators have been playing musical offices, but there is someone who knows who's where. In his office in the Franklin Building, Dinesh Dhody, Project Coordinator for the Office of Planning and Design, has all the charts, schedules, and floor plans that show how, like the proverbial ships in the night, various deans, vice provosts, and vice presidents have altered their coordinates.

College Hall

First, the office of the College of Women moved to 117 Logan Hall. This freed space for the office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, Dr. Humphrey Tonkin, now in Room 106 of College Hall (Ext. 6081). Patricia Meyers, Margo Marshall, Richard Beeman, and Martha Ledger, also have their desks in that suite.

Dr. Robert Zemsky, Faculty Assistant to the President and the Provost, has been given Dr. Tonkin's former office in 104 College Hall. His telephone number is 6841.

Dr. James Davis of the American Council of Education, who is taking an academic internship here, has the office formerly occupied by Veronika von Nostitz, who is on leave.

Room 110 (formerly the office of the Vice Provost for Student Affairs) now belongs to Dr. Robert Dripps, Vice President for Health Affairs. His phone number has not changed: Ext. 7231.

Vice President for Management Paul Gaddis and his staff have the former Health Affairs suite in Room 121 (Ext. 4921). He formerly shared space with Dr. John Hobstetter in Room 111. John Foote, formerly in Room 104, is now in Room 111 also.

Logan Hall

Dean Brownlee and the CW staff are not the only new faces here. The Student Employment office has moved from 3609 Locust Walk to occupy Rooms 203 through 206 and 230 and 232. Associated Student Agencies are in Rooms 201 through 204.

Dr. Donald S. Murray, Assistant to the President for Federal Relations, is now in Room 103 Logan Hall, along with the Pahlavi Project. The admissions office has taken over the space they vacated in College Hall.

Locust Walk

Mrs. Justine Rector, Director of the Morgan State-University Cooperative Project, has new offices at 3609 Locust Walk (Ext. 6005). Dr. James Emery's Office of Computing Activities has moved to the first floor of 3609 Locust Walk. (Ext. 5843). The Dean of Students' Office move to 3533 Locust Walk is detailed in *Almanac* September 12, Page 8.

ALMANAC: 515 Franklin Building, Ext. 5274

Editor Karen C. Gaines

Assistant Editor Margaret M. McIlmoyl