

Almanac

Volume 19, Number 15

December 12, 1972

Published weekly by the University of Pennsylvania

IN THIS ISSUE

- COMMISSION: *Summary of Work Team Reports*
- *Financial Context of Higher Education* (Johnstone)
- FOR COMMENT: *Grievance Mechanism-Nonacademic*
- OF RECORD: *A-1 Hiring Review; Implementing the Code of Academic Integrity*
- NEWS IN BRIEF • *More on Tuition Remission*
- *Six Dialogues* (Donaldson-Evans, Stebbins)
- COUNCIL: *Committee Nominations for 1973-74*

BENEFIT OPTIONS: CHOOSE BY DECEMBER 22

The Personnel Office has sent a letter of detailed instructions to all full-time, fully-affiliated and fully-salaried personnel eligible for the new benefit options in University-paid group health and life insurance (*Almanac* December 5.)

It encloses a form which must be returned by December 22. University payment of premiums begins with the January payroll. *Anyone who does not return the form will automatically have his or her present medical coverage (Blue Cross-Blue Shield, Major Medical) converted to University-paid; the employee remains responsible for group life insurance premiums.*

If an employee carries no health insurance and does not return the form, there will be no action. Eligible employees may enroll for health insurance by coming to the Personnel Office and filling out an application by December 22.

If you have not received the letter of instructions and believe you are eligible for these benefits, please call the Personnel Benefits Office immediately at Ext. 7282.

NOTE: See page 14 for additional information on the tuition remission benefit now extended to A-3 and A-4 staff.

Whereas the draft report of the Development Commission singles out one area, Intercollegiate Athletics, which is to be exempted from the principles which are to be applied to all academic sectors of the University, and

Whereas no documentation is offered by the Commission for its recommendation in this area, other than a "fear" and a reference to a survey whose precise methods, authors, and findings are unavailable to us,

Therefore be it resolved that the Council finds the draft report unacceptable in its present form in its exemption of Intercollegiate Athletics from the cost-cutting requirements which it proposes for all academic programs, and further

It is resolved that the Council ask the Commission either to document completely, publicly and in great detail the basis of its fears, or else include the D.I.A. in its recommendations on the same basis as all other activities of the University.

Commission Chairman Robert H. Dyson reemphasized the inaccuracy of off-campus news reports about the Commission (see page 3). Other corrections and clarifications that emerged:

- The sentence in Reallocation Recommendation #18, "As long as faculty are fully informed, these recommendations satisfy AAUP guidelines" (*Almanac* 12/5 p. 6) is incorrect.

- Funds listed as "net alumni annual giving" in Reallocation Table I (12/5 p. 2) represent *unrestricted annual giving only*. (The \$1,567,000 listed there for fiscal 1972, for example, is only a portion of the \$22,013,798 total subscriptions, gifts and bequests that year. Of these, 20% came from living alumni and 5% from alumni bequests. Friends of the University account for 36%, friends' bequests 15%, foundations 17% and corporations 7%. —Ed)

- Reallocation Tables 3 and 4 (12/5 p. 3) show program costs for fiscal years ending 1971 and ending 1972; the figures thus are not at variance with Budget Analysis Table I (12/5 p. 7), showing projected program costs 1972-73.

- The draft report now in the hands of Council, the schools and departments, is the condensation by chairman and co-chairman of longer documents on file at the Museum. The Commission will make available to each school the complete file of background documents. (A summary of the draft report made by the News Bureau starts on page 2.)

COUNCIL

Action on Development Commission

Council acted formally on the Development Commission's timetable and on its athletics recommendation at the special meeting Wednesday. The Commission's draft continues on the Council agenda tomorrow.

A heavy voice-vote majority passed Sol Worth's resolution to make the January 11 presentation to the Trustees a *draft* instead of a final report:

It is the sense of the Council that the excellent draft report of the Development Commission requires extensive discussion, debate and research by the entire University Community. The 21-day timetable provided—from December 1 to 22—for discussion, analysis and comment from the University community before a final report is submitted to the Trustees on January 11 leaves no time for either thoughtful comment by the Community or thoughtful analysis of that comment by the Commission.

Be it resolved that the Council urges the Commission to submit its report as a draft report, and that it not submit a final report until the entire community including the Trustees have had ample time for discussion and comment.

The vote was 26-23 in favor of Dr. Herbert Wilf's motion on athletics:

Whereas a general belt-tightening at the University will be accepted only if all sectors participate equally, and

Affirmative Action Plan

Elements of the University's Affirmative Action Plan are being released separately to the University community as they are adopted or proposed, Dr. Bruce Johnstone, Executive Assistant to the President, said this week.

The pieces so far:

Maternity Leave: full text OF RECORD *Almanac* December 5.

A-1 Hiring: summary *Almanac* 11/7, full text this issue.

Grievance Mechanism for Nonacademic Personnel: full text FOR COMMENT this issue.

Rough drafts of an affirmative action grievance mechanism for academic personnel have been sent to the heads of the Senate Advisory Committee, the Faculty Affairs Committee
(Continued on Page 16)

SUMMARY

Draft Reports of the Commission Work Teams

TO: MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY
FROM: ROBERT H. DYSON, JR. AND ELIOT STELLAR
RE: DRAFT OF THE UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION'S WORK TEAM REPORTS

The University Development Commission has now received and discussed the reports of its various work teams. These reports reveal much about the present state of the University. They identify areas in need of, or offering opportunities for, development. The recommendations contained in the reports have been drawn from the aspirations and plans of faculty, students and administration. In the task of drawing them up, the work team chairmen have had the help of a great many members of the University community. The University Development Commission thanks all who have given so freely of their time and ideas in support of its difficult assignment and of the University's need.

In the context of its discussions, the Commission came to realize that it was finishing the job started during the Educational Survey of 1953-59. Much of the dissatisfaction with present programs and much of the urge for new development arises from being in this transitional state. It is our hope that now is the critical opportunity to complete the job of building a better University.

In facing this task, the Commission has sensed a unique strength in being One University, a healthy mix of the goals of liberal arts and science and the professions on an integrated campus. One University is the theme that underlies all of our recommendations for academic excellence.

The Commission has gone as far as it can go toward preparation of a final report without the further constructive criticism of members of the University. We now ask you to join us in our task. The enclosed material is for your review and response. It consists of summaries and recommendations, abstracted by Robert Dyson and Eliot Stellar from longer and more detailed reports received by the Development Commission. These longer reports are available for consultation at the Commission Office in the University Museum.* While the enclosed material is as complete as possible at this time, the Commission is still receiving and processing proposals from various parts of the University. The document called "Outline of Final Report" places these summaries in an overall context and tries to convey the concerns we will address ourselves to in the "introduction," "other recommendations," and "conclusions" of the final report. Many of the values behind these concerns were expressed in our Interim Report of May 1972 (ALMANAC May 23, 1972) and that document should be consulted by the serious critic.

Although we have consulted widely in our work, our hope now is that we will receive additional constructive comment from the whole University, pointing out where the reports are weak or in error and where they are strong and on the right track. In the light of this additional information, we will redraft the reports for final review by the Commission and will write the introduction and conclusions.

You can best provide us with the needed assistance in writing, although in some instances there will be opportunity for discussion, as in our projected meeting with the University Council.

Please note that the dollar values given here represent the first "asking" figures for programs we are recommending in this first draft. The total of the proposals add up to more money than we will likely have available to us. The solution to this problem is to

set our priorities on the basis of academic goals and specify those programs which are most important to our future development.

We hope to have all reactions to the Commission's draft reports in hand before December 22nd so that we can have a final draft by the beginning of January in preparation for the meeting of the University Trustees on January 11th and 12th, 1973.

Please send your comments to the University Development Commission Office, University Museum.

OUTLINE OF THE FINAL** REPORT

I. Introduction

A credo of confidence is needed for the University to do well what the University of Pennsylvania does best: to afford an environment for the interaction of the liberal arts and professional traditions; to offer our own brand of intellectual leadership and to be proud of it and enjoy it! [The report to the Trustees in January will:]

1. Give some history and recall guiding principles of the interim report.

2. State University objectives in the light of these principles and of the special features of the University:

A. One University: Programs for Excellence. Mutual strengthening of the Liberal Arts and sciences and professional programs—not just a federation of schools. Sustain historical tradition where possible and encourage administrative independence and responsibility but create general educational thrust that is integrated. Apply the concept of "selective excellence" to the University as a whole—undergraduate and professional schools as well as graduate units.

B. One University: An Environment for Living and Learning. Residential education; the development of beauty in the physical campus; development of cultural and intellectual life on the campus.

C. One University: A Life-long Experience. Continuing education; academic outreach to an international, national and local community.

II. Strategy for Development

Reallocation: Cover deficits, generate planning money, venture capital.

One University: Programs for Excellence:

- (1) Undergraduate programs
- (2) Graduate programs
- (3) Professional schools
- (4) Intrauniversity cooperation
 - A) Public Policy Program
 - B) Computers
 - C) Centers and Institutes
- (5) Black Presence
- (6) Endowed professorships
- (7) Endowed scholarships

*Summarized below. Full text available for examination in the University libraries and in the office of each Dean and department chairman.

**In accordance with Council's December 6 vote, the next stage will not be a final report but a draft report to the Trustees in January.

One University: An environment in living and learning

- (1) General campus appearance
- (2) Support of cultural activities on campus (music, Penn Players, etc.)
- (3) Educational living patterns
- (4) Interuniversity cooperation
- (5) Libraries
- (6) Audio-visual resources

One University: A Life-long experience

- (1) Continuing education

III. Other recommendations

(1) Calendar—"One University" calendar absolutely required for one University: better use of the year.

(2) Integration of University Development Commission recommendations with existing school plans for development.

- A) Law School
- B) Moore School 50th Anniversary
- C) Health Affairs—Johnson Foundation Proposal

(3) Future planning and evaluation mechanisms

- A) Associated Provost for Planning (strengthen and expand)
- B) University Academic Planning and Evaluation Committee—University wide (cf. Academic Planning Committee, Educational Policy Committee, Budget Committee, Academic Development Board)

C) School Planning and Evaluation Committees—reallocation money for initiative

D) Also Recommended

Use of faculty and staff released time

Use of student work study funds to help in planning

Use of outside consultation—academic and commercial

Overall conclusions, summary of recommendations, and a list of priorities; including the need to keep up the momentum and the urgent need for decisions by the President and the Provost.

REALLOCATION

ED. NOTE: The full text of this report is available in the December 5 *Almanac*. It stresses procedures for fiscal control to generate funds for an Academic Development Fund, one third of which would be returned to individual schools for discretionary planning budgets and venture capital. The remaining two-thirds would be granted to schools upon application, to "plan, initiate and test" new short-term programs. It makes 18 specific recommendations on schools and auxiliary enterprises, deficits, and special problems in financial aid, athletics and tenure.

The remainder of this summary is drawn from a News Bureau condensation of the Dyson/Stellar draft of the work-team summaries:

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

In its studies and deliberations, the work team on undergraduate education faced a number of important questions. How do we provide students with a quality educational experience, and at the same time, allow them individuality, independence, and responsibility? How do we do this for freshmen and sophomores who are so often in large, impersonal classes when they need closer contact with the faculty? How can we use our strong professional schools and our strong graduate groups to enrich undergraduate education? How can we assure that we will be able to attract high quality undergraduates of diverse background and goals?

In a word, what can the University of Pennsylvania, as a private institution, offer the undergraduate in return for a premium tuition?

These questions are all the more complicated to answer because Pennsylvania has undergraduates in the College, the College for Women, Wharton, Engineering, Nursing, and the School of Allied Medical Professions, the last four offering its students a mixture of liberal arts and professional education. To complicate matters further, each of these schools offers programs in graduate education as well. Furthermore, the schools differ in size of both student body and faculty.

The report draft makes the following proposals:

A University Scholars Program which would allow a student to proceed through undergraduate and graduate work at his own pace. This program, which might attract as much as 20% of the undergraduate body, would allow students to take time off for

non-university experience, or to achieve degrees in fewer than usual years.

Enrichment of the four-year bachelor's degree program. In addition to the Freshman Seminars program and the College of Thematic Studies, which now exist, the report draft proposes that every freshman and sophomore not enrolled in an under-

MISINFORMATION IN NEWS MEDIA

Development Commission members spent much of last week refuting the inaccurate reports of off-campus media, some of which misinterpreted the function of the Commission as well as the contents of its draft report. In response to one newspaper story picked up by radio and television stations, the chairman and vice chairman issued the following statement:

December 4, 1972

Contrary to news media reports over the weekend, the Development Commission's work team report drafts do not constitute an "ultimatum" to four of the University's professional schools to balance their budgets or face "elimination."

Rather, the main thrust of the draft reports is directed toward strengthening the University's respective schools. In this connection the University ought to make every effort to assist a school in the review of its programs and to improve its academic offerings. Several recommendations have been made dealing with various approaches to mutual support in pursuit of the ideal of "One University" so that no school will be faced with the prospect of future elimination.

Accordingly, these reports do not specify particular schools in relation to the recommendation that "any school whose income in fiscal 1973 is less than direct costs should receive three years in which to equalize them."

Paralleling this recommendation was another which calls for a double review process for any school which fails to meet its target within three years.

First, deans of other schools could vote to subsidize the school involved and distribute the deficit of the affected school among themselves as part of their own direct costs. If the Council of Deans voted not to subsidize the affected school, the Trustees would determine whether to keep the school and, if so, specify how to finance the deficits of the school.

The Development Commission chairmen wish to take this further opportunity to reiterate most emphatically the "draft" character of the work teams reports and their recommendations. The latter should be regarded as items for thoughtful consideration by the campus community whose comments will weigh heavily in the formulation of the Commission's final recommendations.

In response to other inquiries prompted by news reports concerning the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania and the Graduate Hospital, they issued a further clarification:

December 5, 1972

The drafts of the work team reports of the Development Commission do not suggest that the University "close" its hospitals because of operating deficits. The draft reports deal with the future of the University and not with the present. References in the reports to our hospitals should be considered in the context of this time frame and in accord with the main thrust of the reports: the strengthening of the University's various schools and their facilities.

It should also be noted that all of the draft report recommendations have been prepared for full discussion by faculty, students, and administrators with a view toward eliciting constructive criticism and alternatives from the campus community prior to preparation of final recommendations.

Robert H. Dyson, Jr. Chairman
Elliot Stellar, Vice Chairman

graduate professional program be allowed to take at least one course a semester with fewer than 20 students; and that released time be allowed faculty members to develop detailed proposals for an Honors College and Residential Colleges.

Incentives for teaching. The report draft suggests a fund for distinguished outside lecturers, commissioning lectures, reduction in teaching load to provide time to plan new courses, and evaluation of teaching by students and colleagues.

Also, the report suggests development of endowed chairs for the purpose of developing new teaching capabilities where they are needed most.

Endowed professorships to be created within the new programs which are adopted.

GRADUATE EDUCATION

The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences (GSAS) consists of 63 PhD-granting Graduate Groups. Except for six departments, faculty members are budgeted through the College, Wharton, Engineering, and the Professional Schools and thus have responsibilities outside of GSAS. This circumstance leaves the Dean of GSAS in the anomalous position of having responsibility for the academic quality of graduate programs, but no budgetary control or real academic influence.

Perhaps the most pressing problem of GSAS is the uneven quality of its PhD programs. Some are excellent and rank in top positions nationally, others are undistinguished and even below acceptable standards of quality. New academic development calls for the strengthening of graduate programs, but our resources and our energies do not permit across-the-board strengthening, nor is it wise to contemplate such an idea. Instead, the concept of selective excellence in graduate education has been put forward.

To accomplish selective excellence, it is necessary to bring all programs up to a minimal standard of quality or plan to eliminate them. In some cases, reducing the size of programs by cutting out their weakest parts would be advisable. In other cases, adding to programs where strength is needed would be wisest. In addition, a decision has to be made as to what programs might be considered core graduate programs necessary for the very existence of a first-class graduate school. Are these the classical disciplines? Are they the disciplines on which other graduate and professional programs depend critically? Once such a list is drawn up, do we need to have all programs on the list or will having excellence in some reduce the need for others?

Quite clearly, we are in serious need of evaluations which will allow us to see our priorities clearly. The Academic Planning Committee has started this process, and we will make recommendations that will move us further in this direction. Historically it has been easy to form new Graduate Groups at Pennsylvania, but there has been no mechanism for terminating those which have become weak or defunct. We have to find a way to make rational and constructive decisions about these matters very soon.

Despite the problems brought out here, graduate education at Pennsylvania has been quite successful. The concept of "graduate groups" has provided a fruitful flexibility and has promoted excellent grounds for interdisciplinary graduate training. Quite clearly, the graduate programs have had a positive educational impact on the undergraduate programs. Thus we have a strong basis and a healthy atmosphere in which to build even stronger graduate programs.

Key proposals of the report draft are:

To identify the core disciplines which should be strengthened.

To encourage a dozen or more disciplines to reach for national preeminence.

To consider quality of the graduate program as well as that of the student when determining allocation of fellowships and other financial aid.

Three hundred new scholarships and fellowships.

Twenty new endowed professorships in those graduate programs selected for strongest development.

Appointment of committees to review performance and plans of graduate programs.

PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS

There are twelve professional schools at the University and they vary in size of student body and faculty, types of programs and degrees offered, and academic quality.

The University of Pennsylvania is almost unique among private institutions in its traditional variety of professional schools. The liberal arts and sciences have attained prominence at Pennsylvania only in recent decades. The future strength of the University depends on better articulation between the liberal arts and sciences and the professional schools.

Pennsylvania with its many professional schools has its share of two problems. The first is the uneven quality of the scholarly work which prevails between different schools. The other problem is the tendency of professional schools toward rigidity. The solution to the problem of quality of scholarly research can lie in either of two directions, and we can take either one in the case of a school whose quality of scholarship is low, either because of the general state of the profession or because of local circumstances at the school itself. The first is to show that the quality of scholarly research is capable of dramatic improvement and to produce such improvement by hiring new faculty. Alternatively, one can conclude that the quality of scholarly research cannot be improved significantly in the foreseeable future and can decide for this and other reasons to phase out the school. Drifting because no decision is made is not acceptable. A school whose scholarly reputation is not high, however, might offer other compensations to justify its continuation. Naturally, the greater the cost of the school, the clearer must be such justification.

The School of Medicine and the School of Veterinary Medicine are highly visible within their own professions and to scholars throughout the biological and social sciences. Both attract talented students; both receive substantial support from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and both are ranked by outside consultants as among the top five in their areas. Both schools also have serious problems with their clinical facilities. The University of Pennsylvania is unique among excellent schools of medicine in owning two hospitals. As we have indicated elsewhere, Graduate Hospital has generated annual deficits of about \$275,000 in its direct costs. The University is responsible for these deficits. A potentially more serious problem exists at the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania. The metropolitan area of Philadelphia probably has many more hospital beds than it needs. The Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania has reduced its active beds during the past five years. Nevertheless, the occupancy rate at HUP is tending towards alarmingly low levels. The two hospitals owned by the University present a potential financial problem. Recommendation:

That the Trustees closely monitor the financial problems posed by owning two hospitals and be prepared for possibly eliminating some facilities.

In the long run, financially costly clinical facilities could drag down the School of Medicine itself.

The School of Veterinary Medicine has a different problem. Instead of perhaps too many clinical facilities, its clinical facilities are outmoded and badly need replacement. Recommendation:

That the Trustees support the efforts to finance the upgrading of the clinical facilities of the School of Veterinary Medicine.

The School of Dental Medicine has long had an excellent national reputation. Outside consultants, however, no longer place it in the top five, but somewhere in the top 10 or 12. The school has a very large student body and trains more dentists than the average school of dentistry.

Outside consultants pointed out that schools of dentistry throughout the country rarely meet the intellectual level of schools of medicine. The School of Dental Medicine at Pennsylvania was said not to reach that level. A possible way of significantly improving dental medicine at Pennsylvania would be to ally it much more closely with the School of Medicine. This ultimately might involve reorganizing it as a Department of Oral Medicine in the School of Medicine. Recommendation:

That the President appoint a task force to study ways of improving the School of Dental Medicine and to report within the next 18 months.

One entire area where sub-doctoral health workers could play major roles remains untouched. This is preventive medicine. A new school of health science education and preventive medicine might be a worthwhile venture for Pennsylvania to consider. Such a school might also offer a way of reorganizing our present Schools of Nursing and of Allied Medical Professions. Recommendation:

That the President appoint a task force to investigate the feasibility of a School of Health Science Education and Preventive Medicine that could incorporate and strengthen the Schools of Nursing and Allied Medical Professions and could draw upon the Wharton School and the Graduate School of Education as well as the School of Medicine.

Our survey of the College of Engineering and Applied Science indicates that significant improvements could be made by better interaction with other parts of the University. Added strength could be achieved without large expenditures of resources. The future of the College of Engineering and Applied Science is of great concern to many other areas of the University. The potential for strong and fruitful interaction exists. Recommendation:

That the President appoint a task force composed of representatives from the College of Engineering and Applied Science from other Schools in order to investigate strengthening programs of engineering through closer interaction with other parts of the University.

Wharton School is known nationally as having a strong undergraduate program. There also are certain areas of graduate excellence such as finance, insurance, and the emerging program in health care. One of the most promising features of the school is that it may provide a base for a new effort by the University in the area of public policy. Recommendation:

That the President appoint a task force to investigate the establishment of programs in the area of Public Policy to bring together work now represented in Wharton, the Graduate School of Fine Arts, the School of Social Work, and the Graduate School of Education.

All of these schools have programs touching upon a variety of concerns which fall into the area of public policy. The Graduate School of Fine Arts has a national reputation comparable to that of the Wharton School. Thus, cooperation between these two schools would draw on an established intellectual base. The national reputation of the Graduate School of Education has been rising during the last five years. It is not, however, in the top ten. Unfortunately, the Graduate School of Social Work seems even less attractive. The task force on public policy would inevitably have to look in some detail at the future of the Graduate School of Social Work and of the Graduate School of Education. These two schools also have activities which fall into an area which could be considered concerned with human resources. A portion of the task force on public policy should specifically devote its attention to the aspects of professional programs touching on human resources.

The remaining two schools covered by this report, the School of Law and The Annenberg School of Communications both have excellent national reputations. The School of Law is nationally renowned. The Annenberg School of Communications is relatively young, but it has achieved a position of national prominence. It trains faculty for a number of other departments and schools of communication. It should probably not be classified as a professional school. In this light, it could well relate more closely to schools of liberal arts and sciences especially at the undergraduate level. Unfortunately, the school is not in a very favorable financial position. Increased activities at the undergraduate level might help alleviate this problem.

INTRAUNIVERSITY COOPERATION

Historically, the University of Pennsylvania has provided a ready opportunity for interdisciplinary research and teaching, often by encouraging the formation of interdisciplinary graduate groups, centers and institutes, and special programs that cut across departments and schools. Such arrangements bring all the advantage of hybrid vigor, academically and fiscally, and they often are the instruments whereby liberal arts and science disciplines make their contributions to the solution of professional problems and problems of the practical world. As such they are very much in keeping with the concept of "One University".

Often, however, such arrangements bring disadvantages to the academic community. Sometimes, they divert the faculty away from teaching or they orient research away from academic goals and too much toward practical ends regardless of merit. They may compete with schools and departments for funds and per-

sonnel and weaken the structure of the University. And short-term funding from external sources may bring problems.

There are somewhere between 65 and 75 Centers and Institutes in the University. Many of them lie within one school and sometime even within one department. They are not always interdisciplinary, but most of them are. Some appear to be relatively inactive and have no special funds. Others are well funded, a few with endowment, most with outside, short-term funds from government agencies and foundations; a few call upon University funds.

Centers and institutes should be subject to the same kind of periodic academic review as departments and schools.

Faculty members in centers or institutes should have bona fide appointments in departments or schools and should contribute to teaching.

Centers and institutes should operate within the same kinds of fiscal constraints as departments and schools and should not become financial liabilities to the University.

The University has a wide variety of professional schools which are directed at problems which are wholly or partly within the public sphere. There would be a great advantage if Public Policy Programs had a central focus. Recommendation:

The establishment of a Public Policy Division within the Wharton School.

The work team suggests that the Public Policy Program may provide the one occasion in which a new building might be recommended, for the program could be of considerable magnitude.

At present, the University spends in excess of \$2,000,000 a year on computing, including funding from contracts and grants.

Future computer developments on the campus should include coordination of existing computer facilities and programs and making the computer more accessible to potential users throughout the University. There should also be development of data base management, higher level languages and their associated compilers, and disciplinary approaches to computer utilization. Recommendation:

The establishment of a Center for the Technical Enhancement of Academic Programs with 8-10 postdoctoral fellows and one Endowed Professor in charge.

INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

The University is involved in a maze of consortia, course interchanges, affiliations, joint agreements, and many other of the numerous types of arrangements, that are known as interinstitutional cooperation. These are both domestic and foreign. Unfortunately, however, we do not have a University-wide structure or strategy, and in most cases, these programs have a low, almost invisible profile, often remain remote from undergraduate teaching programs, and in general, they display symptoms of administrative neglect, curricular sterility, and financial frustration.

Foreign Interinstitutional Cooperation

There are some 20 "study abroad" programs of varying quality and activity that are available for Pennsylvania students. Of these, the best known and most functional are: the Thouron American-British exchange scholarship for graduating seniors or graduate and professional students, the Romance Language Teaching Fellowship, The Jusserand Traveling Fund in modern language, Penfield Scholarships in diplomacy, international affairs and belles-lettres, and the Pahlavi-Pennsylvania exchange, primarily in the medical areas. In addition, there are other types of arrangements such as the Wharton School's Multinational Enterprise Unit and the Institute of Neurological Sciences—Nencki Institute (Warsaw) Agreement.

As part of this general program of opening out the University to foreign contacts and experience we recommend:

A Program of Endowed Visiting Professorships for Foreign Scholars, Artists and Humanists.

A Program of Endowed Instructorships for University of Pennsylvania Ph.D. candidates to be used either at a domestic or foreign institution, perhaps on an exchange basis but not necessarily so.

A Program of Endowed Instructorships for Ph.D. candidates

(or young foreign scholars) from other institutions in the U.S. or abroad.

These would be highly competitive, prestige grants used to invite the cream of the Ph.D. candidate crop from the best American programs or young scholars from foreign institutions to begin their teaching careers at the University of Pennsylvania.

A Program of Endowed Undergraduate Scholarships for Study Abroad and Away.

An Endowed Traveling Scholar Program for Graduate Students.

To carry out the various recommendations of this program it is recommended that:

An Office of International Affairs headed by an Assistant to both the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research and the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies be established.

Domestic Interinstitutional Cooperation

There are over fifty institutions of higher learning within twenty-five miles of the University of Pennsylvania campus. There are substantial opportunities for mutual enrichment of educational programs and for effective savings in undergraduate and graduate education through non-duplication of course offerings, increased class size, joint faculty appointments, and so on.

The work team recommends that the University of Pennsylvania support positively an effort directed toward greatly increasing cooperative arrangements with other institutions and that work-study and fieldwork opportunities be supported and urged by schools and departments. New programs are proposed as a beginning in this direction:

A Philadelphia Semester focused on the study of colonial history and civilization and the American Revolution as a study in the mechanisms of change in society's institutions.

A Language Teaching Unit for the improvement of Foreign Language Teaching and English for Foreign Students at Pennsylvania and neighboring institutions.

The creation of an Office for Cooperative Educational Exchange as an adjunct to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies.

Interinstitutional Cooperation: Philadelphia Area

The University of Pennsylvania possesses a special strength in its faculty in relation to American History and civilization of the colonial period and, by virtue of its location in Philadelphia, unique in its relation to existing source materials of that period.

Proposed new program: The Benjamin Franklin College.

The Benjamin Franklin College would plan and administer a Philadelphia Semester program and help to coordinate University programs related to the American Bicentennial. The college would have a student body of 100 students per semester drawn from the University, other institutions at home and abroad, alumni, and members of the Philadelphia community.

ENDOWED PROFESSORSHIPS

At present, there are 91 named or endowed professorships in the University. Our present problem can be summed up briefly: Too few endowed chairs, too many of them underendowed, and too many unfilled too long. A goal of 100 additional endowed professorships is by no means too high for the academic programs proposed here. We probably should go beyond it if the University is to take a quantal step forward in the next decade and keep itself on a sound financial basis.

EDUCATIONAL LIVING

There is a growing recognition at Pennsylvania that the enterprise of learning can be conducted outside the classroom and libraries in ways which support and supplement classroom experience. It is the opinion of the work team that the University should make increased use of its residences for educational purposes as part of its program to improve the quality of undergraduate education and as an instrument to assist faculty and students to achieve their goal of an improved environment for living and learning. The program proposed aims at the development of a uniquely Pennsylvania-style college system, consisting of a series of residential units, perhaps but having a certain field of academic interests as a theme.

The size of the colleges would vary from 125 to 150 students with a varying ratio of faculty and graduate fellows to undergraduates.

We recommend:

The endowment of a total of six colleges, four of which are to be located in the Quadrangle.

There is no need for the construction of new residence halls to achieve a collegiate system at Pennsylvania or to meet the foreseeable needs of the student community. We believe that the existing university residences can be converted to colleges at reasonable costs.

[A memorandum to the University Development Commission entitled "Living on the Penn Campus: Residential Opportunities" is available from the co-chairman of this Work Team, H. M. Neiditch, 208 C H, or phone Ext. 6888 or 5202.]

LIBRARY

The Libraries of the University of Pennsylvania have, for many years, merited and received national and even international recognition for the quality and strength of their collections in a variety of fields. In some, excellence was achieved some decades ago and has been maintained; in others, we compare favorably with other major university libraries.

In the past several years, however, it has been increasingly clear that Pennsylvania's libraries cannot hope to continue to serve the University as they should, let alone maintain a position of national significance with a static budget level. Equally disturbing is the small size of the total annual income from special endowed library funds available for the purchase of books and journals: slightly over \$44,000 out of a total book expenditure of over \$1,000,000.

We have also been very slow to move in the area of technological innovations for our library system.

Recommendation:

A Library Technology Fund should be established with a capital sum of \$3,500,000, yielding about \$175,000 a year.

The income from this fund would be used for new technology of an innovative character with the explicit aim, through the application of modern technology, to transform the library system of the University of Pennsylvania into one of the great "working libraries" of the world.

A selective Book Acquisition Fund, with a capital sum of \$14,500,000 yielding about \$725,000 a year for the development of collections.

AUDIO-VISUAL RESOURCES

There is every indication that education could take advantage of new technology and add to the book, the blackboard, the lecture, and the seminar, a variety of new teaching aids such as audio-tape cassettes, audio-visual cassettes, closed-circuit TV for close-up views of material or for transmission over distance, and computer-assisted instructional devices. Orderly development of an Audio-Visual Resources Center at the University could help to solve a number of our current problems and put us in the forefront of an important educational development. Recommendation:

Establish an Audio-Visual Resources Center, under the Provost, to coordinate and assist present programs and plan future developments.

CONTINUING EDUCATION

The various Continuous Education programs have been considered as tangential to the main purpose and programs of the University and have received little central attention, planning or control although they have been with us since the founding of such studies in 1894. Today there are more than a dozen major continuing education programs at the University with an enrollment of 10,000 in 1970-71.

The University has not used the potential of its interest and need for continuing education to its advantage. We think that the University ought to adopt a flexible admissions policy aimed at the inclusion of diversity in both age and experience and provide for a continuous educational process available to students as they perceive their needs for further education. Recommendation:

Combine the College of General Studies and the Continuing Education Program into one division headed by a Dean responsible for admission, counselling, and curriculum.

Provide financial aid for part-time students in proportion to revenue as is the case with full-time students.

*Following is the first part of a report on
TUITION AND FINANCIAL AID AT THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
Dr. Johnstone is Executive Assistant to the President.*

The Financial Context of Higher Education

by Bruce Johnstone

The issues sharpened by the recent financial troubles of higher education include the rising costs faced by institutions and the concomitant rising costs faced by the student and his or her parents. As costs rise, so must income; and when tuition and fees constitute a substantial portion of institutional income, they must almost inevitably follow the rising costs. The pressure on tuitions, then, stems from two phenomena: (1) increasing unit costs, and (2) the inability of non-tuition income sources to absorb these cost increases. The section here examines each of these phenomena in its context before turning to an examination of the current situation and past history of instructional costs, tuitions, and financial aid at Pennsylvania (to be published in a forthcoming issue).

Rising Costs

The rapidly increasing costs experienced by higher education over the past several decades—albeit felt most in the past several years—are a function of four major conditions, or events:

1. The general absence of productivity advances in the kind of education cherished in major universities and colleges—i.e., a generally static ratio of labor input (faculty) to output (students served). Thus, if the costs of the labor input—principally, faculty wages and salaries—simply keep pace with wages and salaries generally, the unit costs must rise relative to unit costs in the economy as a whole where productivity has increased. Assuming that all costs are ultimately covered by “prices” (i.e., tuitions, fees, and other sources of income), this means that prices in higher education—indeed, in all labor intensive, or “productivity immune” sectors—must rise relative to prices in general, and will rise even in the absence of any over-all inflation.

2. Wages and salaries in higher education have risen over the past 20 years—particularly in the 1960's—faster than wages and salaries as a whole, reflecting the need for academic salaries to “catch up” to nearly a half century of erosion relative to wages and salaries elsewhere in the economy. Some historians of higher education, in fact, will claim that the most important single source of subsidies to higher education throughout much of our history has been faculty willingness to teach for salaries far below those of almost any comparable positions outside of academe. The great expansion of demand for, and resources available to, higher education in the past 15 years finally put faculty in a position to rise above low wages and salaries. Thus, the increase in unit costs in higher education relative to unit costs in the economy generally was actually magnified over this period, particularly in the decade of the 1960's, by a relative increase in the cost of the labor input. Again, these compounding phenomena would have occurred even in the absence of general inflation.

3. On top of the above phenomena, the latter years of the 1960's and early years of the 1970's (Phase II notwithstanding) have been years of high inflation, raising all wages, salaries, prices, and incomes—with the unit costs of higher education and all other

“productivity immune” sectors rising even faster than prices generally.

4. Finally, the pressures for increasing costs in higher education have been exacerbated by attempting to do more things: expand the range of course offerings, provide more independent study and seminars, expand grant aid budgets to open higher education to hitherto unserved populations, and so forth. Some, to be sure, may have been done wastefully, and some may have been luxuries which colleges and universities could have done without. But in general, the higher education offered today features more options, more smaller classes, more elaborate student services, and vastly more student aid than was available 15 and 20 years ago.

Two conclusions seem warranted by the foregoing: First, *over the long run*, cost increases in higher education must inevitably be greater than cost increases in the economy as a whole and particularly greater than cost increases in most consumer goods. Second, *over the short run*, this long run phenomenon can be mitigated only by a series of essentially “one-time” savings such as the elimination of entire programs or services, a depression of academic wages and salaries relative to other wages and salaries, an increase in the student-faculty ratio, or a reduction of maintenance and upkeep. Some such “one-time” savings are entirely legitimate and basically healthy; many of these have been effected. Others, such as reductions in maintenance or freezes in salaries, may only shift costs forward to another year. Certain programs, services, and functions carry with them their own incomes (e.g., contract research, endowed programs, or earmarked gifts) which are lost with the program, effecting little or no real net savings. Still other “savings,” such as increases in the student-faculty ratio (i.e., a reduction in the faculty work force), may—at some point *must*—adversely affect the quality of the education offered. Colleges and universities may not yet have trimmed all the fat which can be cut. But the substantial “one-time” savings are becoming increasingly scarce; and the long-run picture is still one of an increasingly costly enterprise.

Sources of Income

Increasing costs must be met by increasing income. The only exception to this rule is the possibility of living for relatively short periods of time on past savings—i.e., “consuming capital” by running deficits. Most private universities have recently faced or are still facing deficits, but none can do so for long. Eventually, the unrestricted savings of the past are depleted, and the institution faces the choice of bankruptcy or the immediate abolition of whatever programs, schools, or facilities are not paying their way.

There are four basic sources of income in support of a university's instruction endeavors: (1) tuition and fees, (2)

government subventions, (3) endowment earnings, and (4) unrestricted annual giving. If costs were to increase by, say 5% and each income source also to increase by 5%, the cost increase would be fully covered. If any income sources were to increase by less than 5%, one or more alternative income sources must increase by more than 5%. Aside from the pressure from rising costs, tuitions and fees are being driven up by the failure of other income sources—most notably government—to even keep pace with these costs. Since endowment and annual giving at most universities are hard put simply to keep up—much less exceed—the current pace of cost increases, tuitions and fees are being called upon as the “residual” income source to keep the books in balance.

Limitations on Tuitions and Other Cost Increases to the Student

Rising tuitions in the view of some are threatening to “price private higher education out of the market.” This view maintains that students and parents do respond to the net “price” of education—tuitions, fees, and other costs *less grant aid*—and choose to apply, matriculate, and/or continue at least in part in response to changes in net price. Continuing increases in tuition, according to this view, will adversely affect the composition of the student body.

In part, this question is not how much students and parents will have to pay, but *which* students and parents will have to pay. The figure relevant to university finances is the *net* tuition revenue, having entered as a “cost” that tuition paid for by grant aid. A net tuition revenue increase can obviously be achieved either with a large tuition increase matched by a substantial increase in grant aid, or by a considerably smaller tuition increase unimpacted by an increased aid budget, or by combinations in between. The choice is principally a policy choice of the desired socio-economic distribution of the class and the desired income redistribution among that class. The questions of tuition revenue, tuition “burden,” and educational opportunities, then, are inextricably tied to both the level of tuition and the level of grant aid. Financially, a decision to increase an aid budget may be indistinguishable from a decision to reduce a contemplated tuition increase.

Probably the most important questions are: (1) the degree to which increasing tuitions actually constitute seriously increasing burdens on the student/family unit in light of concomitant—and often greater proportional—increases in family income; and (2) the degree to which marginal changes in net student charges are significant in the decisions of the student (and family) to apply, matriculate, or continue at any given institution.

In direct reference to the University of Pennsylvania, then, we are interested in knowing whether the obvious increase in price actually requires a greater degree of sacrifice today than at an earlier time *from families in comparable socio-economic positions*. Some clues to this question will be provided in the forthcoming issue showing the increase in costs to student and family relative to increases in median family income. We are also interested in the relationship between costs to the student/faculty unit and student enrollment behavior—i.e., the price and income elasticity of demand for a Pennsylvania education. Finally, we must inquire how a given financial aid budget can be distributed among a given student population in a variety of ways and what effects such policies might have on enrollment behavior and the resulting composition of that student body. The coming section is an attempt to draw together some of the current and historical data on costs to the student, over-all economic indicators, and instructional costs at Pennsylvania which might help answer some of these questions.

FOR COMMENT



University policies require that appointments, promotions, job classifications, compensation, and other conditions of employment be made without regard to race, sex, or minority group status. The only modification of this policy is the requirement set forth in the Council resolution of June 22, 1971; the Provost/Vice President memorandum of September 14, 1971;* and the Provost/Vice President and Vice President for Management memorandum of October 10, 1972** calling for, among other things, special consideration to women and minority persons when all other relevant considerations fail to provide a clear basis for choice among the top candidates. The following is intended as a procedure to resolve employee grievances in cases of alleged violation of these equal opportunity policies. This procedure is applicable for all University employees except teaching staff and those covered by collective bargaining agreements.

1. *Informal review.* It is expected that employees' grievances will first be discussed with their supervisors. The Office of the Ombudsman, the Equal Opportunity Office, and the Personnel Office, among others, are well equipped to facilitate such discussions.

2. *Formal complaint.* If informal processes prove insufficient to resolve the grievance, the complainant may request the Office of Equal Opportunity to initiate a formal review. This review is initiated by a *Complaint Summary* submitted to the Personnel Office by the Office of Equal Opportunity.

The Complaint Summary shall include the following:

- (a) a summary of the alleged discriminatory action;
- (b) a summary of the steps taken to resolve the matter through discussion with the employee's immediate supervisor and any other informal mechanisms pursued;
- (c) a summary of any factual information deemed by the administrator of the Office of Equal Opportunity to be appropriate and necessary to further consideration of the issue;
- (d) identification of the grievance as falling within one of the following two general categories:

Type I: Denial of appointment or promotion to a new position in favor of another individual on bases that allegedly violate either University hiring policy; federal executive orders; or state, local, or federal laws pertaining to equal employment opportunity. The distinguishing characteristics of a Type I grievance are: (i) a claim to a position which has been filled by another individual via an allegedly improper hiring/promotion procedure; and (ii) the consequent absence of immediate redress.

Type II: Dismissal or non-renewal of contract, denial of promotion “in line,” job classification, compensation, or general working conditions that allegedly violate either University hiring policy, federal executive orders, or state, local or federal laws pertaining to equal employment opportunity. This category, in effect, covers all employee grievances not falling under Type I. Its distinguishing characteristic for the purpose of this grievance classification is that some redress would be available immediately without directly affecting any other employee of the University.

* *Almanac*, October 19, 1971

** Page 10, this issue

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION: GRIEVANCE MECHANISM—NONACADEMIC STAFF

Following is the procedure proposed by a University administrative task force to resolve grievances of nonacademic personnel in cases alleging violation of equal opportunity principles or policies.

It is presented here for comment and criticism by the University community before final adoption.

Responses should be sent by December 22, 1972, to the Office of Equal Opportunity, 125 Sergeant Hall.

Complaint Summary Preparation

The Administrator of the Office of Equal Opportunity will prepare the Complaint Summary in consultation with the complainant and his or her immediate supervisor, both of whom will attest to the accuracy and sufficiency of the Complaint Summary by affixing their signatures to the summary and three copies. The Complaint Summary shall be forwarded by the Administrator of the Office of Equal Opportunity to the Executive Director of Personnel Relations; signed copies shall be retained by the complainant, the immediate supervisor and by the Office of Equal Opportunity.

3. *Formal review.* The Executive Director of Personnel Relations or his designee shall attempt to resolve the grievance through consultation with the complainant and all relevant administrative officers, up through administrative channels to include the appropriate Senior Administrative Officer who shall be either the Dean of a school, the Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs, the Vice President for Development and Public Relations or the Vice President for Facilities Management and Construction. The President, the Provost/Vice President, the Vice President for Management, and the Vice President for Health Affairs shall be considered the Senior Administrative Officers for their respective immediate office staffs. The Vice President for Management shall be considered the Senior Administrative Officer of any unit not clearly covered by the Senior Administrative Officers listed above. The Executive Director of Personnel Relations shall determine the appropriate Senior Administrative Officer.

Within 15 working days after receipt of the Complaint Summary, the Executive Director of Personnel Relations, with the concurrence of the appropriate Senior Administrative Officer, shall report back to the Office of Equal Opportunity either that the grievance has been resolved to the satisfaction of the parties concerned or that a special Complaint Appeals Panel has been formed according to procedure #4, below. The letter or memorandum to this effect shall be signed by the Executive Director of Personnel Relations and the appropriate Senior Administrative Officer, and copies shall be sent to the complainant and the immediate supervisor. All efforts shall be made by all relevant parties to resolve the grievance at this level.

4. *The Complaint Appeals Panel.* If a grievance cannot be otherwise satisfactorily resolved, the Executive Director of Personnel Relations with concurrence of the appropriate Senior Administrative Officer will submit a written request to the Office of Equal Opportunity for the establishment of a Complaint Appeals Panel. The panel will be composed of three employees of the University who hold non-temporary positions. One member shall be named by the appropriate Senior Administrative Officer; one by the complainant; and one by the first two among a list compiled and maintained by the Vice President for Management. This list will contain names broadly representative of the employees covered by this procedure, including women and minority group persons, and will at all times contain at least ten persons who have agreed to serve in this capacity.

The Administrator of the Office of Equal Opportunity or

a designee from that office will serve as secretary to the Complaint Appeals Panel. The Secretary shall arrange the time and place of meeting, secure documents and other supporting materials, arrange for tape recording of oral testimony, and otherwise facilitate the work of the panel.

The Complaint Appeals Panel will receive testimony from the complainant and from the complainant's immediate supervisor or from any other administrator designated by the appropriate Senior Administrative Officer, as well as from other witnesses requested by the Panel. All oral testimony will be tape-recorded. All written submissions will be included in the record. Either side may be represented by legal counsel at its own expense.

5. *Recommendations of the Complaint Appeals Panel.* Upon conclusion of its inquiry, the Panel will submit to the Administrator of the Office of Equal Opportunity a written report consisting of findings of fact and recommendations, together with any minority views from the Panel. The Administrator of the Office of Equal Opportunity will solicit written comment on the panel report from the complainant and the immediate supervisor, and will then forward all documents to the Provost/Vice President or to the Vice President for Management (as determined by the Executive Director of Personnel Relations in the event of question) within not more than 10 working days of receipt of the Panel's findings and recommendations. The Provost/Vice President or the Vice President for Management will accept, modify, or reject the recommendation within 10 working days, and will in writing so inform the Administrator of the Office of Equal Opportunity, who will in turn inform all other relevant parties, including the complainant, the immediate supervisor, the Senior Administrative Officer, the Executive Director of Personnel Relations, and the members of the Panel.

The burden of proof is upon the complainant to demonstrate discrimination. If the Panel is persuaded that improper considerations of race, sex, or minority group status were present in the disputed action or actions, it should recommend redress. A finding of discrimination present in a Type I grievance—i.e., the failure to appoint or promote the complainant to a position subsequently filled by another person—will normally lead to a recommendation that the complainant be appointed or promoted to the next equivalent and appropriate position open for whatever reason in the office, department, division, or other work unit as stipulated by the Panel. Such a recommendation, if accepted by the Provost/Vice President or the Vice President for Management, will be enforced by the Executive Director of Personnel Relations in the regular course of monitoring and approving "Requests for Employee Services" emanating from that unit. A finding of discrimination present in a Type II grievance—in which no other employee is directly involved—should lead to a recommendation to the Provost/Vice President or the Vice President for Management for immediate redress.

6. This policy is to be made effective immediately, subject to subsequent modifications upon review by relevant interested members of the University community.

OF RECORD



AFFIRMATIVE ACTION: A-1 HIRING

Following is the text of the joint memorandum issued by Provost Curtis R. Reitz and Vice President Paul O. Gaddis, October 10, 1972, to all Vice Presidents, Deans, Directors and Administrative Officers.

The University is committed to hiring, promotion, and compensation of employees without regard to sex, race, minority group, or other attributes, and to devise new policies which will in time eliminate all existing patterns of under-representation or discrimination.

Fundamental to a program of affirmative action is a search process for qualified candidates among women and minority groups. In order to document more completely the extent of the search process, the following procedures will be followed for all administrative and professional staff appointments to existing or newly created positions (paid predominantly from A-1 funds) except those filled through consultative committee process.

1. Notices of vacancies, whether new positions or occurring as a result of a termination, must be filed with a "Request for Employee Services" form in the Personnel Office. A brief job description must accompany each such notice. A request for a new position will be referred to the Senior Classification Review Committee. Requests to fill existing positions will be evaluated by the Personnel Office. No further processing can take place until these reviews have been completed. Hiring Officers will be notified of the review results.

2. All vacancies must be advertised internally by the Personnel Office for at least 7 days before they may be filled. During this period, the director, supervisor, or other officer responsible for the hiring and the Personnel Office will make every effort to reach a broad candidate pool in which women and members of minority groups are represented. Particular effort will be directed toward potential candidates in senior A-3 or lower-level administrative and professional positions.

3. All Personnel Action Forms will be accompanied by a "Statement of Compliance," a copy of which is attached. *No personnel action is complete and no commitment is to be made to a candidate until notification by the Personnel Office that the Personnel Action Form and the Statement of Compliance have been approved.*

4. The Executive Director of Personnel Relations or a designee has the responsibility of approving compliance forms. The Executive Director may call upon the advice of the Office of Equal Opportunity. Disapproval must be communicated to the administrator responsible for the request for personnel action within 4 working days of receipt of the necessary papers. Disapproval at this level requires an additional period of active recruitment during which time special efforts will be made to find qualified women and minority group candidates. At the end of this period, a recommendation for appointment will be approved unless again deferred by action of the appropriate Vice President acting upon recommendations from the Executive Director of Personnel Relations and the Administrator of the Office of Equal Opportunity.

5. All positions must be offered to the candidate best meeting the qualifications specifically relevant to that job. Following the principle of the Resolution passed by the University Council on June 22, 1971, and the Provost

Memorandum of September 15, 1971, it shall be the policy of the University in filling administrative and professional positions to give special consideration to women and minority persons when all other relevant considerations fail to provide a basis for clear choice among the top candidates.

(THIS IS A FACSIMILE OF THE FORM WHICH WILL BE USED. FORMS WILL BE AVAILABLE IN THE PERSONNEL OFFICE.)

Statement of Compliance With
University of Pennsylvania

Affirmative Action Program:
Administrative and Professional Appointments

To: Executive Director of Personnel Relations

Re: Selection of (Name of Candidate)

as (Job Title) in the Department of
..... effective (Date)

A. The Request for Employee Services form was sent to Personnel on (Date) (must be at least 5 working days prior to date on the form)

A.1 Search for applicants included (check where appropriate and give examples):

☐ Personnel Department referrals

☐ Advertising in the following media:

☐ Solicitation of names from other departments at Penn

☐ Solicitation of names from the following other Universities:

☐ Solicitation of names from the following governmental, community and/or professional organizations:

☐ Other means, such as:

A.2 The candidate selected came to attention via what means?

B. The candidate pool:

B.1 Approximately how many applications/resumes were received for consideration for this position?

B.2 To your knowledge, how many of these were received from women?

B.3 To your knowledge, how many were received from members of a minority group?

B.4 Attach the resume of the best woman candidate.

B.5 Attach the resume of the best candidate known to be a member of a minority group.

C. Include below any comments on your candidate selection, such as reasons why top woman and/or minority group candidates were not chosen.
.....

D. Signed

....., (Title) (Date)



LLOYD PENISTON JONES

One of Pennsylvania's greatest track champions of yesteryear, Lloyd Peniston Jones of the Class of 1907 served this University faithfully until his death in 1971. In his memory, his family has brought into being this gallery.

Thus reads the plaque that Francis Jones (Wh '40) unveiled on November 11 in the gallery named for his father. With the unveiling he turned the first floor of Gimbel Gym into a new Philadelphia landmark, a showcase for the works of a Penn man who was cited by one biographer as "an even greater sculptor of athletes than the Greeks."

The indoor-outdoor gallery displays almost 70 works of Dr. R. Tait McKenzie, a physician who stressed the aesthetic and intellectual values of physical fitness throughout his career.

Born near Ottawa, Ontario, Canada in 1867, McKenzie worked his way through McGill University and Medical School while picking up championships in gymnastics and high jumping, and joining the swimming, fencing, track, boxing and football teams as well.

While still a medical student, he became an instructor in anatomy and an orthopedic specialist and was appointed physician to the Governor-General of Canada. He had been a high school friend of Dr. James Naismith, the inventor of basketball, and succeeded him in 1894 as head of physical education at McGill in addition to his other duties. In 1904, he was appointed the head of the University of Pennsylvania's new Department of Physical Education, an area that he firmly believed was the province of the medically-trained. Even then, he predicted health dangers for a nation of spectators and maintained that watching sports was no substitute for playing them. He established medical exams for athletes and campaigned for more gyms and playgrounds in the city and its schools.

Dr. McKenzie was active in organizing the Boy Scouts' Philadelphia Chapter in 1908. His statue of The Scout on the Benjamin Franklin Parkway is a familiar symbol throughout the world.

Following service in the Royal Medical Corps in World War I, he organized a group to continue research in physical and mental rehabilitation of the severely wounded which became the American Academy of Physical Medicine.

In 1931, concerned with the overemphasis on winning in collegiate competition, he started a movement "to give sports back to the students, teaching to the faculty, and the deficit to the treasurer."

But Dr. McKenzie will be most remembered as an artist and sculptor. His athletic figures have been exhibited at the Paris Salon, The Royal Academy, and in the fine arts competition for the Olympic Games. His 1912 Olympics plaque, the Joy of Effort, was awarded the King's Medal of the King of Sweden. Two coveted athletic prizes, the Penn Relays Medal and the Sullivan Award given annually to the top amateur athlete in the United States, are McKenzie designs.

His most familiar figure, The Youthful Franklin, in front of Pennsylvania's Franklin Field, was a gift to the University from the Class of 1904.

At the dedication, President Martin Meyerson talked about the facility and its significance for the University. He also concentrated in his remarks on the leadership of Lloyd Jones in athletics and in public affairs and industry. The Jones family, he noted, has sent generations of its members to Pennsylvania.

A portion of the President's remarks:

The ambience of any great institution depends to a large degree on members who have excelled and who, in doing so, have created an atmosphere which influences the thoughts, the ambitions, and the ideas of other individuals who will strive to emulate in some way the person of special skills or abilities. Those of extraordinary gifts not only help create the spirit pervading an institution but are generally persons whose interests cut across several fields, who unhesitatingly cross boundaries, who excel in more than one area.

I know that when the poet, Ezra Pound, was a student at the University, he was influenced by (and influenced) a Pennsylvania medical student who also became a great poet, William Carlos Williams. Here, in Williams, was an unexpected joining of the writer and the physician, a melding in one individual of the arts and sciences, an association still worth striving for. It is wonderful when a university has such fusions.

This year, three men associated with Pennsylvania won the Nobel Prize. One of them, J. Robert Schrieffer, is a member of our teaching staff and the remarkable contributions he brings to his field provide a highly charged atmosphere for scientific efforts.

Lloyd Jones to whom we dedicate this gallery was himself an accomplished athlete who was a member of the 1908 Olympics team and a successful and imaginative entrepreneur. The gallery bearing his name itself helps demonstrate the role a university should play in drawing together ideas too often viewed in our culture as separate. Here is a place for both art and athletics, two avenues of human effort seen as far removed from each other. But we have only to remember the zenith of Greek civilization with its veneration of the athlete celebrated in ageless sculpture to envision a linkage that is not remote or forced but natural and appropriate.

In this room now is Harry Fields, like Tait McKenzie a physician and a devotee of athletics. He and Fred Shabel, here today, too, were among those who stimulated anew our interest in Tait McKenzie. Fred also has helped create an atmosphere for excellence in sports on our campus. Pennsylvania has the best record in intercollegiate athletics we ever had. More important, students participate more fully in athletics than ever before: the lights of Franklin Field burn into the night as students take part in track and lacrosse, as faculty jog, as intramural games are played; our students, faculty, and friends join the Brueghel-like scene at the ice rink or swim in Scheerr Pool or turn out in huge numbers to watch a soccer game or basketball in the Palestra.

Excellence in various fields whets everyone's appetite for new activities, for more challenging goals. We are reminded again of what can be accomplished by an environment based on achievement, stimulated by remarkable individuals, by the needed joining of seemingly disparate interests—medicine and poetry, art and athletics. For it is the phenomenon of excellence that catches our imagination, provokes our best capacities, and gives form to our experience, creating among us those linkages which are the most hopeful meaning for a humane institution.

Since the adoption of Admission's Dean Peter Seely's new system involving more faculty members in the selection of students, Penn faculty and staff now share the interviewing of some 75 prospective freshmen each week. The young people talk about themselves, about their education—and about the University of Pennsylvania as they see it. In the article that follows, a faculty interviewer and an admissions staff member compare notes on what they heard from six students who came for interviews on November 14, 1972. "After a long afternoon of interviewing," said Miss Stebbins, "we felt very good about the University and about the superior students it is continuing to attract. We thought it might be interesting to the rest of the University to know how others—removed from the campus, the city and the DAILY PENNSYLVANIAN—see and interpret the University of Pennsylvania."

Six Dialogues on What We Are

by Lance Donaldson-Evans and Gay Stebbins

Gay Stebbins:

Nancy was a petite girl, rather shy and reserved, but her brown eyes seemed to miss nothing. At first I thought her quiet manner might mean I would have difficulty in drawing her out. I was mistaken. Almost immediately she began questioning me about Greek and Etruscan art: "Once I complete introductory courses in anthropology and art history, could I then take graduate courses in archaeology?" Her mother had majored in art history at the University and felt her education had given her a fine background to do extensive museum work; she had written several articles on exhibits and was presently working on a book dealing with classical Roman art. "But I would like to do something different," said Nancy. "Could I take courses at Wharton in Management? I want to be in a position to accomplish something." (Active verbs—"to do", "to serve", "to accomplish"—are frequently used by prospective applicants.) "If I knew some basic business principles I'd like to do something really original, like setting up a gallery or perhaps directing a museum in Boston after I graduate." As Nancy went into greater detail about her plans, I was impressed with the care she had taken in defining her career objectives, and how carefully she had thought about the structure she wanted her academic program to have. I made two quick calls—one to Professor Gordon of the Graduate Classical Archaeology Department and the other to Professor Tom Schutte of the Wharton School who, I remembered, had set up a special seminar in the Management of the Arts in the spring Thematic College on Business Culture. Both gave affirmative answers to Nancy's questions. Yes, an undergraduate education at the University could mean for Nancy a chance to combine the study of art history, anthropology, classical archaeology on a graduate level (provided she maintained her previous record of excellence) and selected courses at the Wharton School. As I talked with her about these various options, Nancy responded with great enthusiasm. Then she paused. "You know, my family has moved several times and I've been in different kinds of schools. Private school for me was like a prison. It was so programmed. Everyone took the same courses—Latin I, freshmen English, algebra . . . I felt held back. My education was like going through a cafeteria line with the same menu over and over. I'm now in a big public school (and first in her class) and I have to choose all of my own classes and arrange my schedule myself. I'm doing independent study in history and some creative writing on my own. I could never go back to a girls' school. I wasn't sure if I would like a private university. I was afraid it would be very inhibiting but there is something different about Penn. It's 'loose' and I like it. I want liberal arts but I don't want to stay in school forever working on a Ph.D." I thought the program we had discussed would

provide a nice balance between the liberal arts and professional skills which could enable her to use her Art History in creative practical ways. As we said goodbye, Nancy was smiling and so was I; I couldn't help but feel that Nancy's sense of education was very close to the spirit which had led to the founding of this University.

John was a handsome young man with dark hair and a polite manner, who started the interview by asking about the pre-med program: Was it true that 80% of the pre-med students at Penn were admitted to medical school? Are introductory lectures in the physical sciences given to hundreds of students at once? I said I thought his impressions were accurate, even though I did not have exact figures. I asked if he wanted to talk to the Pre-med Advisory Board and he said no. There was a sudden pause in the conversation. He stared at the floor. Then he looked up and said quietly "I'm not really sure I want to be a doctor. I just know I like science. I'm taking an advanced physics course right now and it's a different world. I've done quite a bit of work on my own. I have my own telescope." I was intrigued by the shift in the tone of our conversation. He began telling me about his teachers, particularly his science teachers who had often worked with him on an individual basis. He told me he had developed a new theory which impressed his teachers. Being very non-scientific I was a little afraid to ask what this new theory was, as I was sure I would have little or no comprehension. He reached into the back pocket of his coat and took out his wallet. Leafing through a series of his identification cards, he came across a piece of white paper folded into a small square. As he began opening it, he said that he had developed a new theory of infinity (written, I might add, on only one half of one side of the white sheet of paper) and that his Physics teacher was very interested in it. I called the Physics Department to aid me in my responses to John. As he talked, I began to understand that his thoughts were indeed, "in a different world." Fortunately, at about that time, I was assured by a member of the Physics Department that John's theory would be given careful consideration. No one in the department was free to join the interview since most were teaching, but Dr. Brody said he would arrange for John to return to campus to meet with several of his colleagues to discuss both his theory and a program of study in physics. As I thanked Dr. Brody, John looked surprised. "I can't believe it. I never thought in a big place like this you could just pick up the phone and get people to listen." John, by the way, was first in his class of 720 in a large urban high school. We chatted a bit longer. He was curious about the social life at Penn . . . And then, feeling that we had both learned a good deal, I walked with him to the reception room to meet his father, who had been patiently

reading the '69 *Record* and the *Daily Pennsylvanian* for over two hours and looked fatigued. When I introduced myself, he said he hoped nothing had gone wrong. I was puzzled and it must have shown. He explained that usually John was very reserved and disliked talking about himself. His interview at Princeton had lasted less than twenty minutes and at Harvard it had been the usual discussion of grades, class rank, outside activity; what had been the difference here? "Dad," John said, "I got to talk about science. I never knew Penn had such a good Physics Department. It got me thinking. I guess I'm not sure whether I really do want medicine. Even if I change my mind, there are so many good departments in science that I know I would be happy either way. At least I'll have some time to think about what I want and work on my theory. I'm coming back . . ."

Lance Donaldson-Evans:

Richard looked like the kid-from-next-door, bright, intelligent, nice, but one from whom I didn't expect any more than the usual high school activities and achievements. The first indication that this was not quite the case came when I noticed from his record that he had received a "President's Award for Ecology". I asked just what exactly this had entailed. Richard replied: "Oh it was nothing really—I simply built a working model of a Venturi air-scrubber which my biology teacher thought was good enough to be entered in the competition". Already impressed, I asked him if he was engaged in other projects of the sort. "Yes," he replied, "I am currently working on the effects of outside stimuli on plants". When I asked him to elaborate, he said: "I started by building myself a polygraph and wired it to various species of plants to register their reactions to such things as removing leaves one by one, playing them music and that sort of thing". I was even more fascinated when he continued: "Plants are much more sensitive than most of us realize and are not only influenced by stimuli such as light and heat, but also by noise and even human emotions". "So, if you love your African violet it will grow for you no matter what?" "Not quite, but you've got the general idea", he said. I made a mental note to start loving my lawn as soon as I got home that evening. My original feeling of interviewing an intelligent but 'typical' high school student was fast giving way to a feeling of respect, even awe. I asked him why he was interested in Penn. "Reputation first of all, and the personal recommendation of a friend of mine who is now here and is delighted with the place". To someone who, like myself, spends 8 or 9 hours a week hearing students complain about how bad things are here, this was refreshing. "I am also impressed with the vast array of learning experiences Penn offers. If I'm accepted here, I hope to combine my studies in biology with a business degree. You see, I'm interested not just in research *per se*, but in its practical applications." I asked him if he would like to meet someone in the Biology Department who could talk with him about his experiments. His face lit up. A phone call to Dr. Hans Borei put me on the track of Dr. Allan Brown, whose research projects on plants would probably be of great interest to Richard. When I called Dr. Brown, he immediately invited Richard over to his office to chat with him. The last I saw of Richard was an ill-concealed expression of sheer delight as he went off to talk plant reactions with Dr. Brown. I was inwardly grateful to a responsive Biology Department that was ready to help confirm Richard's initial favorable impressions about Penn.

My next interview was with Charles, who had just flown in from Boston. After some conversation about the 'scenic beauties' of the drive to Penn from Philadelphia International, he volunteered: "I've been really surprised by the beautiful [sic] campus Penn has, for an urban university." I thought at first he was being ironic, but he was quite serious and as he elabo-

rated, I began to realize that our campus really is much better looking than we usually care to admit. We talked about his high school career and his reasons for wanting to come to Penn. They were almost a carbon copy of Richard's: "Penn has a great reputation, particularly in the sciences, and it offers such a diversity of courses". "What are your main academic interests?" I asked. "Math and physics mostly", he said. "And what do you do in your spare time, if you have any?" "Work with the school's computer. My high school has a time-sharing arrangement with a school based in Dartmouth and I'm currently working with problems associated with computer languages and their development". He showed me a sample of his work and patiently explained it to me, when I made a helpless quip to the effect that it looked as though someone had been playing with a typewriter keyboard. Perhaps it is just a humanist's abysmal ignorance of things scientific which makes me unduly impressionable. But as I had with Richard, I felt some amazement that a high school student was engaged in the sort of research I'd previously associated only with graduate students. This interview was both stimulating and humbling, and strangely satisfying. I was left with a great feeling of optimism and confidence in Penn's future, when it was managing to interest such students.

Gay Stebbins:

Wendy, my third applicant, was black. In her school uniform, she seemed subdued, probably because she was scared and nervous. As we walked to my office, I told her that I knew her New York school well and had once been offered a teaching job there. This was her second year in a private school. Did she like it there? "Yes," she began slowly, "you can get a good education at a small school." I thought her answer was somewhat prescribed. Did she *really* like the school? Again she answered cautiously. "It has given me a feeling of security. It's made me think about my future." Why was she interested in the University of Pennsylvania? "I want to be around lots of different people. It helps you understand yourself better. I also want to be in a city. It is more real. The country is nice but you're so removed from problems. I could never be happy in a place where you feel cut off. I've had too much of that already." It was hard to miss her point. What did she want to study at Penn? "I've decided I want to be a doctor. Everyone says you have a good med school." Yes, I affirmed, it is the oldest and one of the best in the country. "Would it be impossible for me to get in?" As she asked me more questions, I glanced at her secondary school transcript which she had brought with her. Her scholastic aptitude in math was in the mid 500's, both math and chemistry achievement scores were in the 600's. Her class record showed she was an above average student in a highly competitive school and her transcript showed steady improvement. She was fifteen in a class of 25, and she already told me her school was tough. "Of course. But then I've always had to work hard," she explained. If she kept her drive and determination, I doubted that she would have any real trouble. "The roughest part will probably be the big 'intro' courses in chemistry and biology," I told her, "but there would be tutors to help. There are also some wonderful women on our faculty in science who could give you moral support." Immediately the face of Dr. Helen Davies registered in my mind as one who had done so much for getting young women like Wendy into good medical programs. A mental note: call Helen and have her talk to Wendy . . . We began to discuss on Black life at Penn—the DuBois House, Afro-American Studies, the Morgan State Exchange program. Before I had covered all of these programs, Wendy was asking me questions as if she already were a freshman at Penn. "Can I get a single room? Do you have to sign up for a meal ticket? How

long does the train take to get to New York? . . ." I wasn't quite sure if I had convinced Wendy that Penn would be a good place for her, but I was convinced that in September, 1973, I wanted to see Wendy moving into Hill House.

Amy was my final applicant: a tall, serious-looking girl from a big public high school in the midwest. I had already interviewed three other candidates from her school earlier in the week, so I knew exactly what she meant when she referred to her senior honors course in American civilization and her independent study project which involved teaching art, music and dance in a ghetto school. Amy was a fine student (not a "grind", she assured me, but one who "cared about people"). Her boards were exceptional by any standard (both SAT's over 700 and Achievements of equal strength). I felt challenged. How did she want to direct her education? What were her career goals? What was it about the University of Pennsylvania that had made her come well over a thousand miles for an interview? Amy thought for a moment and then began. "Last summer I lived on a kibbutz. It was great, something I'll never forget. You worked as a group and it was strenuous. The spirit was terrific. Everyone was struggling to do something together. It really made me think about myself. I've always been so protected. I kind of want to break out of that. Being in a comfortable home with lots of protection is not real security. I want to be in a place where there are lots of different people from all over from all kinds of backgrounds . . ." When I asked Amy if she knew what she thought she'd like to study at Penn, she said she wasn't sure. She might like anthropology, particularly if she could focus on the heritage of the Jewish people. She said she wanted to be in the east, in an urban environment. She wanted the academic excellence of an Ivy school. "What other schools are you considering?" I asked. "I've just come from two days in Boston. Yesterday I was at Radcliffe. They were really serious up there. The first thing they said in my interview was they had the best undergraduate program in the country. Everyone seemed to be studying. Then I went to Brown. The man who interviewed me told me *Brown* had the best undergraduate program in the country and I should go there. And now I'm looking at Penn," she laughed. Not wanting to fall into this pattern, I said simply "Well Amy, of course, I'm not in a position to be categorical about our undergraduate program. You're probably in a far better position to judge than I am. Maybe you might like to look over a report I did a few weeks ago called 'New Directions in Undergraduate Education'." I handed her my report—hardly more than an outline with short briefs on freshmen seminars, thematic studies, individualized major, and some concluding remarks by Humphrey Tonkin on the role of undergraduates in shaping the curriculum at the University. As Amy was reading this, it occurred to me that she might also enjoy looking at the small yellow booklet—*Topical and Interdisciplinary Studies, a Directory for Students*, which has become a Bible in the Admissions Office. Written with freshness and flair by two talented undergraduates, this little booklet has "turned on" more students by showing them the many constellations of classes that can be put together in pursuing a single theme or topic. As Amy glanced over the table of contents, I could feel her enthusiasm. She looked up. "I can't believe it. I could study Hebrew language and literature or take courses on Judaism in the Department of Religious Thought. There are so many good courses. You could really have fun putting it all together." Amy paused and then said, "You know, this is the only school I've seen that hasn't said that its undergraduate program was the 'best' in the country. But none of those schools has these kinds of courses. I think Penn really does have the best undergraduate study in the country, at least it's the best for me." I was silent. Amy had said it all.

NEWS IN BRIEF

WHARTON GOLD MEDAL: PHILIP HOFMANN

Philip B. Hofmann, Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of Johnson & Johnson, has been selected to receive the prestigious Gold Medal presented annually by the Wharton School Alumni Society.

The Medal will be presented by President Martin Meyerson at the annual Wharton Gold Medal dinner tonight in the University Museum, where Mr. Hofmann will speak on "West of Hawaii; East of Suez."

The Wharton Gold Medal has been presented each year since 1950 "for distinguished leadership in the promotion of public understanding of business" and for "personal contribution to the progress of American business."

WOMEN'S FACULTY CLUB: DECEMBER 13

Members of the faculty of the School of Nursing will be panelists at a discussion meeting tomorrow at the December meeting of the Women's Faculty Club, in the Ivy Room, Houston Hall, from 12:15 to 1 p.m.

A-3 ASSEMBLY: DECEMBER 21

Paul O. Gaddis, Vice President for Management, will speak at the A-3 Assembly meeting next Thursday in Room 200, College Hall, at 1 p.m. "We hope to learn something of plans for the University and how A-3 employees will fit into the new management picture," said Mrs. Margaret Weyand, Assembly Spokesman. All A-3's are invited to attend.

TUITION REMISSION GUIDELINES

The tuition remission announcement in the December 5 issue of the *Almanac* has created such interest that the following guidelines are provided for those full-time employees who are considering enrollment in University courses for the first time:

1. If the course desired meets during the normal working period, the employee will first obtain supervisory permission for taking the course and making up the lost time. The long-time University practice of permitting an employee to take one 4:30 p.m. class per week without make-up of the time will be continued.
2. All employee applications for University courses are processed through the College of General Studies Office in Room 210 Logan Hall (Ext. 7327) or through the Evening School of Accounts and Finance in E115 Dietrich Hall (Ext. 7607). Employees wishing to enroll in daytime courses make such application through the CGS Office. Only those individuals meeting admission standards for the school will be permitted to register. Since a transcript of high school and college grades is a requisite for admission to all daytime and CGS courses, employees planning Spring semester class attendance should immediately request that transcripts be mailed directly to the CGS Office. Employees wishing to work toward a degree through the Evening School should arrange for the mailing of the transcript to that office.
3. As soon as a class schedule has been approved, the employee secures from the Student Financial Aid Office in Room 200 Logan Hall a Faculty and Staff application form. The completed form including the class schedule arrangement is presented to the employee's department head for approval and forwarding to Student Financial Aid.

—Gerald L. Robinson

LIBRARY CHRISTMAS HOURS

Van Pelt and Dietrich libraries will be closed this year from December 23 to January 1. Dr. Joan Gotwals, Assistant Director of Libraries, said that the Christmas week closing would be more efficient for library staff and users than if the library were to operate with a greatly reduced staff throughout the holidays. Hours after New Year's day will be:

Weekdays, January 2-January 16: 9 a.m.-5 p.m.

Weekends, January 6-January 14: Closed

On December 22 the library will be open from 8:45 a.m.-5 p.m. Regular hours will resume on January 17.

REST YE MERRY (FOR TWO WEEKS)

The last *Almanac* of the term will be published December 19. We will resume publication with the issue of January 9.

VARSITY BASKETBALL

| | | | | |
|----------|----|------|------------------------|------|
| December | 13 | 9:05 | St. Joseph's | Home |
| | 23 | 8:05 | Temple | Home |
| | 27 | 8:00 | Cincinnati | Away |
| | 29 | 8:00 | Univ. of San Francisco | Away |
| January | 5 | 8:00 | Dartmouth | Away |
| | 6 | 8:00 | Harvard | Away |
| | 10 | 8:05 | Massachusetts | Home |
| | 13 | 1:00 | Princeton | Away |
| | 17 | 8:05 | Villanova | Home |
| | 20 | 9:05 | Manhattan | Home |
| | 24 | 9:05 | LaSalle | Home |
| | 30 | 7:05 | Princeton | Home |

The Department of Intercollegiate Athletics reminds faculty and staff members that there is a *limit of 4 tickets* which can be purchased at the reduced rate of \$1 off the regular price of \$2, \$3, or \$4. For reservations, call EV 6-0961.

OF RECORD



Last April 12th the University Council approved the Code of Academic Integrity and the Honor Board which oversees operation of the Code.

Since the approval of the Code questions have been raised concerning the procedures the individual instructor should follow in dealing with situations in which he believes cheating has occurred. The Office of the Judicial System (of which the Honor Board is a constituent part) suggests that the following points be kept in mind in reporting such alleged cheating.

1. The instructor has the right to discipline within the framework of the instructor's class any student who he believes has cheated.

2. When the instructor takes action against such a student, however, he must inform the Honor Board in writing of what action he has taken. At the same time he must inform the student that the student has the right to appeal the instructor's action to the Honor Board, such appeal to be made in writing within ten days.

3. Alternatively, an instructor who believes that a student may have cheated may ask the Honor Board to determine whether cheating has indeed occurred and, if so, to determine an appropriate sanction.

4. When an instructor chooses to discipline a student for cheating, he may either "(a) put the student on probation in the course if the act occurs during the semester; or (b) give a permanent mark of X (no credit because of violation of the Code of Academic Integrity) and dismiss the student from the course."

The mark of "X" has still to be approved by some of the undergraduate schools. It seemed to the committee that drew up the Code that "F" should be reserved solely as a grade indicating *academic failure*, that is, failure to meet the minimum standards set by the instructor to pass an examination or to pass the course. The mark (not grade) of "X" would then clearly indicate failure through cheating.

In any event, the important point is for the instructor to remember that he must report any instance of cheating that he chooses to punish in any manner to the Office of the Judicial System (112 College Hall). The enclosed forms may be used to report such infractions. I suggest that such forms be available in the offices of departments and schools.

—Humphrey Tonkin

IMPLEMENTATION OF CODE OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Following is the text of a memorandum sent by the Office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs to all undergraduate deans and department chairmen on November 9, 1972

SAMPLE FORM

Date

To the Instructor:

Please use this form to report possible violations of the Code of Academic Integrity which you want the Honor Board to consider. Four options are available:

1. You may resolve questions of cheating entirely within the framework of your course.
2. You may either impose a penalty or withhold it, perhaps by giving the student an Incomplete, and then sending the Honor Board the case for disposition.
3. You may put the student on disciplinary probation in the course.
4. You may give the student a permanent, non-credit mark of "X" in the course and dismiss him. The "X" is still pending approval by the Executive Committees of several of the undergraduate schools; therefore, please check with your school's committee before imposing the mark.

If you elect Option Three or Option Four, the Code of Academic Integrity requires that the accused student and the Office of the Judicial System (112 College Hall) be sent written notice of your action within ten days. The Honor Board must hear the case if the accused student appeals your action within ten more days.

If you elect Option Two, please fill in the questions below and mail this form to the Office of the Judicial System.

1. Student's name
School and Class
Student's grade before alleged violation, if known.....
2. If you have already imposed a penalty for review by the Honor Board, what was it?
3. Please attach a description of the alleged cheating incident. Any evidence that you can include would be most helpful in expediting the hearing later. You will be notified as soon as possible of the time of the hearing.

.....
Instructor's Signature

.....
Title

To: Members of the University Community

December 12, 1972

An important charge of the Committee on Committees is the recommendation to the Steering Committee of individuals to be members of the Committees of the Council and several other University operating committees as listed below. On behalf of the Committee on Committees, I am requesting nominations of persons able and willing to serve effectively in 1973-74.

When you suggest a person, please indicate also the committee you think that person would be willing to join . . . and feel free to suggest one or more committees on which you, yourself, would like to serve. Nominations should be submitted by January 20, 1973, to the Office of the Secretary, 112 CH, using the following form:

Name of Committee: _____

Nominee: _____

Nominee's school, department or office: _____

Please give us your advice as soon as possible, so that we can establish the make-up of the Council committees early enough in the academic year to allow for smooth transition in their work.

S. Reid Warren Jr., Chairman

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION continued

of Council, the campus AAUP and WEOUP. These and other elements affecting the faculty (including a document in preparation which will outline review procedures in academic appointments and promotions) will be reviewed by an Academic Committee on Equal Opportunity now being formed.

An administrative task force based in the Equal Opportunity Office is assembling the various elements. On the task force with EO staff members James H. Robinson and Verity Powell are Dr. Johnstone, Executive Personnel Director Gerald Robinson, and Scott Lederman of the Office of the Vice President for Management.

The Plan is viewed as an "ongoing document" subject to continuous review, Dr. Johnstone said. "Even those pieces published of RECORD will be subject to reconsideration if they do not prove effective in terms of our affirmative action responsibilities."

He also said that regional and national HEW representatives who visited the University last week to discuss data analysis had added new procedures to those given in earlier guidelines. One of these is a "census of the faculty by discipline, with discipline defined as the highest degree received relative to current position. The census is designed to allow for better analysis of candidate pools both by the institution and nationally by the HEW."

DESCRIPTIONS OF UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES

I. Open to the faculty and administration

Educational Policy—has cognizance of all matters of general educational policy which cut across the interests of two or more schools or educational matters of University-wide interest. It maintains close liaison with the Academic Planning Committee.

Student Affairs—has cognizance of the conditions and rules of student life on campus, including allocation of University income to student activities and residential arrangements.

University Facilities Committee—has cognizance of the planning and operation of buildings and grounds and associated services, including transportation, parking and security.

Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid—recommends policies on admission of and awarding of financial aid to students in the undergraduate schools and reviews implementation of these policies.

Conflict of Interest—(joint subcommittee of Research and Faculty Affairs)—makes recommendations relating to extramural consultative and other professional activities by faculty members and administrators.

Community Relations—has cognizance of problems of the University's role in the surrounding community and advises on the appropriateness and degree of University involvement in general community affairs.

Personnel Benefits—has cognizance of all of the personnel benefits available to members of the academic and administrative staffs.

II. Open to the faculty only*

University Budget—has cognizance of matters of policy relating to University budgets (both current operations and capital); it shall advise the President and participate in formulation of the annual budget.

Research—has cognizance of policies relating to research and expenditure of research funds, and the issuance of periodic reports on the research activities of the faculties.

*One or more responsible administrative officers serve as liaison for most of these committees.

Faculty Grants and Awards—(subcommittee of Research)—reviews applications for NSF and University funds to support faculty research.

University City Science Center Advisory—(subcommittee of Research) is advisory to the management of the Science Center and Science Center Institute.

Implementation of University Policy in Conduct of Research Programs—(joint Senate-Council Committee) considers questions of interpretation of University policy concerning the conduct of research programs.

Faculty Affairs—has cognizance of general welfare and interests of faculty, of faculty relationships with the Administration and Trustees, *The Almanac*, *Handbook for Faculty and Administration*, and faculty-student relations.

Honorary Degrees—(subcommittee of Faculty Affairs) solicits recommendations from the faculties and students and submits a slate of nominations for action by the Trustees.

Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics has cognizance of the integration of recreation and intercollegiate athletics with the educational program: it provides liaison among the several University groups in the interest of promoting the fullest and most effective support for an outstanding program.

Library—is advisory to the Director of Libraries.

International Services—is advisory to the Office of International Services.

Disability Board—evaluates applications for disability status by University personnel.

Student Health Advisory—is advisory to the Vice President for Health Affairs and Health Service.

Student Fulbright Awards—evaluates undergraduate and graduate students applying for scholarships for study abroad.

University Bookstore—considers the function of a bookstore in the University community and advises the Director of the Bookstore on policies and procedures.

Laboratory Animal Care—advises on the maintenance of facilities in accordance with governmental standards.