

Almanac

Volume 19, Number 33

April 24, 1973

Published Weekly by the University of Pennsylvania

IN THIS ISSUE

- SENATE: *Report on Early Retirement, Tenure Policy*
- HONORS • JOB OPENINGS • BULLETINS
- OF RECORD: *Memorial Day*



**PENN
RELAYS
APRIL
27-28**

FOUR GUGGENHEIMS: CRUMB, FRYE, GELMAN, WILF

Among the 339 scholars, scientists and artists chosen to receive the 1973 Guggenheim Fellowships are four University faculty members:

DR. GEORGE H. CRUMB, Professor of Music who won a Pulitzer Prize in 1968, will use the new award for further studies in composition.

DR. ROLAND M. FRYE, Professor of English and author of several works on Shakespeare, will study Milton's epic poetry and the visual arts.

DR. ROCHEL GELMAN, Associate Professor of Psychology, will use her Guggenheim to investigate the development of number concepts.

DR. HERBERT S. WILF, Professor of Mathematics, will apply his Fellowship to studies in combinatorial analysis. (For other HONORS, see page 2).

PENN'S COMEBACK IN ADMISSIONS

In his April 15 analysis of college admissions applications, *New York Times* writer Iver Peterson notes a 4.2% decline in applications to public institutions and an uneven rise in applications among the Ivy schools. Penn is one of the favored Ivies, however:

At the Ivy League, whose application deadlines are stricter and whose figures can be considered all but final, the rise in applications was 3.3 per cent over last year. This represents a slowing of the previous year's rate of increase of 12 per cent, however, and the rise this spring was not uniform.

Brown, Dartmouth, the University of Pennsylvania, Princeton and Yale showed increases that offset slight drops in applications at Columbia, Cornell and Harvard. Part of the increases at Dartmouth and Princeton may be ascribed to the two colleges' expansions of freshman classes to make room for co-education. Penn, which registered a loss in applications last year, made a strong comeback this spring, surpassing even its 1971 level.

DR. NEARING AT PENN: APRIL 25

The Department of Economics invites the University community to a lecture on "The Making of a Radical" by Dr. Scott Nearing in W-1 Dietrich Hall, April 25 at 4 p.m.

ANSPACH CONFERENCE: APRIL 26-27

Ecuador's former president Galo Plaza, Secretary-General of the Organization of American States, will speak in the University's fourth annual Anspach Institute Conference, devoted this year to "The OAS Today and Tomorrow: Twenty-five Years of Regionalism Examined."

The two-day conference opens with a 2 p.m. session Thursday, April 26 at International House. Colombian Carlos Sanz de Santamaria, chairman of the Inter-American Committee of the Alliance for Progress, is the principal speaker. Secretary-General Plaza speaks at the Thursday night session, and Friday's program continues with three papers by U.S. scholars. The final session Friday afternoon features OAS figures Pedro Contreras of Venezuela and John W. Ford of the U.S., with Gabriel Valdes of the U.N. Development Program.

Members of the University community may contact the co-chairmen of the Conference, Dr. Henry Wells of Political Science and Covey T. Oliver of the Law School, for information about attending.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSEMBLY: STELLAR APRIL 26

Provost Eliot Stellar will be the featured speaker at the Administrative Assembly's spring meeting Thursday, April 26, at 1 p.m. in W-1 Dietrich Hall.

The meeting will also elect Assembly officers for 1973-74 from the following slate of nominees:

Chairman, 1973-1974: Lloyd S. Herrick, George Kidd, Jr.

Chairman-elect: Charles F. Farrell, Karen C. Gaines.

Secretary-elect: Maureen T. Parris, Raymond C. Sallbach.

Executive Committee (three to be chosen): Helena F. Clark, Richard L. Corrigan, Edwin M. Ledwell, Jr., Robert L. MacDonald, Donald J. McAleer, Effie Thompson.

Chairman William Owen will report, and there will be additional reports from the Personnel Office and from Assembly committees on research, economic status, membership and social activity.

BLACK ARTS FESTIVAL: APRIL 27-29

The Black Inter-Graduate Council will sponsor a series of programs on black music, dance, cinema, and fine arts at the Annenberg Center April 27-29. Dr. C.L. R. James, professor of black history at Federal City College and Howard University in Washington, D.C. will give the keynote speech on "Black People in the World Today" at Zellerbach Theatre, April 27 at 4 p.m. Dr. James received the award of the Black Academy of Arts and Letters last year. Proceeds of the Festival will benefit the University Tutorial Program. For more information, telephone Annenberg Center box office, Ext. 6791.

HONORS

OUTSTANDING EDUCATORS OF AMERICA

Six more Penn professors' biographies will be included in the next volume of *Outstanding Educators of America*. The professors, nominated by their deans, are: DR. MORTON AMSTERDAM, Professor of Periodontal Prosthesis and Director of Postgraduate Periodontics and Periodontal Prosthesis; DR. BENJAMIN HAMMOND, Professor and Chairman of Microbiology (Dent.); DR. WESLEY G. HUTCHINSON, Professor of Microbiology (Med.); DR. DAVID SOLOMONS, Professor and Chairman of Accounting; DR. OTTO SPRINGER, University Professor of German and DR. ANDRE VON GRONICKA, Professor of German.

HONORS IN SPORTS

The BASKETBALL TEAM, Ivy Champion for the fourth time, was presented with the Schoenfeld Sportsmanship Award of the Collegiate Basketball Officials Association.

Fencing coach LAJOS CSISZAR, whose team won the Ivy League championship this winter, was named fencing coach of the year at the NCAA Fencing Championships. This is the second time he has received the award.

HONORS IN BRIEF

DR. CARL C. CHAMBERS, University Professor of Electrical Engineering, received the Allan R. Cullimore Medal for Distinguished Service at the Founders Day celebration of Newark College of Engineering.

DR. PAUL GYORGY, Emeritus Professor of Pediatrics, has been elected an honorary member of the British Nutrition Society.

Along with Young Great Society founder and president Herman C. Wrice, Penn's Silberberg Professor RUSSELL ACKOFF received the George Washington Honor Medal of the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge this spring. Both were honored for improving the Philadelphia community—establishing an infant day care center, conducting a campaign against drug addiction and producing and staging a one-act play, "Dope for Dummies," for Philadelphia schools.

DEAN ARTHUR E. HUMPHREY has been elected to the National Academy of Engineering. He is one of 70 new members cited for contributions to engineering theory and practice and for their accomplishments in new fields of technology—in his case, biochemical engineering.

DR. JOSEPH M. LANE, resident and assistant instructor in orthopedic surgery, was chosen a Carl Berg Fellow of the Orthopaedic Research and Education Foundation. The fellowship is given to an outstanding senior resident in academic orthopedic surgery and provides funds for visiting laboratories and clinics.

DR. MAX A. LISTGARTEN, Professor of Periodontology, received the research award of the International Association for Dental Research for his work on bacterial and immunological causes of periodontal disease. The award, sponsored by the Colgate-Palmolive Company, recognizes Dr. Listgarten's research in the ultrastructure of periodontal tissues and how this tissue is attached to tooth surfaces.

DR. DAVID P. POPE, Assistant Professor of Metallurgy and Materials Science, was given the U.S. Army's Outstanding Citizen Medal for a study of the academic merits of military science courses. Dr. Pope chaired the subcommittee of the Undergraduate Affairs Committee of the engineering schools which carried out the investigation.

GERALD L. ROBINSON, Executive Director of Personnel Relations, is the recipient of the Award of Merit of the University's North Jersey Alumni Club. The annual award is reserved for members of University administration or faculty.

SENATE

Report of the ad hoc Committee on the Faculty

The Senate ad hoc Committee on the Faculty was established in November 1972. It met once before the Christmas vacation, and at regular intervals thereafter. Its initial charge was to make recommendations to the Senate Advisory Committee and the Senate on the following matters particularly affecting faculty interests:

1. The establishment of an appropriate faculty grievance mechanism.
2. Clarification and possible modification of the tenure rules to deal with a number of specific problems.
3. The development of an early retirement option for faculty members.
4. The overview of procedures for collection, recording and release to governmental agencies of data on race and sex of faculty employees.

Subsequently, in January 1973, the Committee was requested to address itself specifically to recommendations 21, 22, 23 and 25 of the report of the University Development Commission at the regular spring meeting of the Senate.

Dr. Robert Summers is serving as chairman of a subcommittee addressing the problem of early retirement. Other members of this subcommittee are Robert H. Edelstein, Edward G. Effros and Michael L. Wachter.

The draft report of this subcommittee was discussed and modified by the full Committee, and is incorporated in the report submitted herewith.

Dr. Maria Brooks is serving as chairperson of a subcommittee on tenure policy. Other members are Frank P. Brooks, Brian F. Chellas, Jean Crockett, Noyes E. Leech and Peter Sterling.

The draft report prepared by this group was submitted to the Committee on the Faculty, where it was discussed and amended. It is incorporated, as amended, in the report of the Committee herewith submitted to the Senate.

The report on faculty grievance procedures will be distributed to the Faculty Senate at a subsequent date. The chairperson of the subcommittee which has addressed this problem is Dr. Dorothea Hurvich, who will summarize orally the work so far completed at the Faculty Senate meeting on April 25. Other members of the subcommittee are Brian F. Chellas, Jean Crockett, Lucienne Frappier-Mazur, Robert Gorman and Noyes E. Leech.

Report on Early Retirement

The Committee here reports to the Faculty Senate on the following issues raised by the Development Commission's recommendations #21 and #22 (Appendix A, page 6 this issue):

1. Should the University's compulsory retirement age be reduced to 65 for faculty members appointed to tenure positions after July 1, 1974? (#22)

Our answer is YES, for the reasons given in II below.

2. Is it feasible for the University to develop an early retirement option, mutually advantageous to the University and faculty, for faculty members who presently have a compulsory retirement age of 70 or 68? (#21)

Our answer is YES, for the reasons given in III below.

These responses assume that the views of the Committee about the continuing responsibilities of the University to its retired faculty, as outlined in I below, represent and will continue to represent University policy.

I. Meaning of "Retirement"

A faculty member's association with the University has a number of facets and it is worthwhile establishing at the outset just what we believe "retirement" means for each of them. We distinguish five major connections (not necessarily in order of importance): (1) the University salary paid to the faculty member; (2) the teaching responsibilities of the faculty member to the University; (3) the faculty member's participation in University governance; (4) the research activity of the faculty member; and (5) the provision by the University of personal and professional amenities to the faculty member, including various personnel benefits. Under present arrangements, items (1), (2), and (3) unambiguously terminate at the time of retirement. However, items (4) and (5) do not end abruptly. Appendix B (page 6), the relevant sections from the *Handbook for Faculty and Administration*, and Appendix C (page 6), a Provost's memorandum to deans, academic vice presidents, and department chairmen, document the present University policy with respect to the continuing role of retired faculty in the University. The Committee wishes to underline its own endorsement of this view of retirement. At the time of retirement a faculty member's salary, teaching, and governance activity should stop, and he should begin to draw his pension benefits. But the retiring faculty member should be allowed to continue to participate in the life of the University if he wishes to: (1) he should be able to continue his research activity, subject only to serious shortages of research facilities; (2) he should be included, if he wishes to be, in the relevant parts of the University's personnel benefits program (e.g., access to group medical insurance); and (3) subject only to serious shortages a retired faculty member should be provided an office and access to secretarial assistance for a continuation of his or her scholarly work. While priority must be given to regular faculty members in the assignment of the University's resources, we strongly advocate that the University continue to commit itself to this policy of treating retirement primarily as a change in a faculty member's teaching, governance, and pay status.

II. Compulsory Retirement at 65 for Newly Tenured Faculty

The average expectation of life at age 65 is now 17 years for male faculty members and 21 years for females. This leaves a long period for a retirement income to cover, so it is easy to see why retirement at that age is only possible in the presence of a strong pension plan and significant Social Security benefits. Appendix D (page 7) provides a table showing that indeed a faculty member in the future spending thirty-five years in academia elsewhere and/or at the University can reasonably expect a retirement income comprised of his TIAA-CREF annuity and Social Security benefits amounting to something in the neighborhood of 70% of the average of his last five years' academic salary. We regard this level to be adequate to meet our faculty's needs at that stage of life, so we wish to judge the merits of compulsory retirement at 65 independently of their pecuniary implications for faculty members. We examine four initial implications for faculty members and the University.

a. In 1959 the compulsory retirement age was reduced from 70 to 68 for newly tenured faculty. The change at that time reflected largely the concern that a faculty member well into his sixties was likely to be less effective as a classroom teacher. Clearly, the students of the University stand to lose when teaching effectiveness is diminished. There may have also been a similar concern about research activity at that stage, but there was no need to sit in judgment on that aspect. We are inclined to think, for the reasons of fourteen years ago, that the shift in 1959 was a step in the right direction which should be followed now by another.

b. Another reason for reducing the compulsory retirement age, that was not compelling in 1959, derives from the fact that the University is now faced with the prospect of a faculty of constant size. This has serious implications for the proportion of assistant professors who can be promoted, and for the ratio of tenured

persons to the total faculty. These implications have been spelled out elsewhere ("On Life in the Stationary State" by J. Crockett, *Almanac* March 27, 1973), but they point to the desirability of shortening the period during which a faculty member has tenure.

c. The argument of (b) is essentially independent of the financial exigencies of the University. However, earlier retirement does help the University's budget if, as is usual, retiring professors are replaced by substantially less expensive assistant professors. Drawing upon the comments in (a) above, it may be argued that this saving accompanies an increase in teaching effectiveness.

d. Turning to the consequences for faculty members required to retire at 65, we refer to the general remarks of I above where we emphasized that retirement is to be regarded primarily as a shift out of teaching. If the faculty member's retirement income is adequate and he or she still has access to other aspects of the University community, we feel that the available options augment rather than reduce the person's opportunity to engage in fruitful activity.

It should be emphasized that what is recommended is a lower compulsory retirement age for *newly* tenured faculty. The compulsory retirement age of a person at the time of appointment to tenure governs his rights, so existing tenured faculty would not be affected by this recommendation. This means, of course, that the gains from the recommendation will only be obtained some thirty years or more in the future when today's new associate professors retire.

III. Early Retirement Options

From the standpoint of the University all of the reasons above for wishing to have the compulsory age lowered to 65 apply to the existing tenured faculty. The rights of the existing tenured faculty guarantee that they may continue to teach beyond 65, but many such persons may well be willing to forego this guarantee if their retirement income would permit them an adequate standard of living. Faculty members planning to retire at 68 or 70 would, of course, have substantially smaller retirement incomes than expected if payments into the pension fund stopped early and the annuity based upon that fund then had to cover a longer period. We have examined a number of devices the University could use to supplement the pensions of faculty members if they agree to retire early, and while we are not prepared to make a specific proposal at this time for encouraging early retirement, we are confident that a program attractive to both the University and faculty can be devised.

Other universities faced with the problems like Pennsylvania's have been acquiring experience with various approaches. We list a few of these just to illustrate the possibilities: (a) increased TIAA-CREF contribution by the employer and employees for a number of years before the early retirement date; (b) direct supplement of the retirement fund at time of early retirement to bring the pension up to the level that would be available at the time of normal retirement; and (c) reduced teaching load in the years before retirement at a salary that is also reduced, but not proportionately so. There is evidence at other universities that programs financially beneficial to the University can be designed which will induce faculty members to retire before they must.

Over the next six months the Committee, working closely with the appropriate administrative officers, hopes to develop in specific detail a proposal for an early retirement option.

Report on Tenure Policy

The Committee believes that the present tenure policy of the University is basically sound, but that there are some weaknesses which call for revisions. Among other matters, we have addressed ourselves to certain proposals contained in *Pennsylvania: One University*, the report of the University Development Commission—particularly recommendations 23 and 25 (see Appendix A)—and to proposals concerning the University's tenure rules made by Curtis Reitz in a letter to Jean Crockett dated 8 January 1973 (Appendix E page 7).

On certain questions we have reached a conclusion. Other questions are still under consideration, and some of these are described at the end of this report (Remaining Agenda on Tenure page 5). At this time, we offer the following recommendations.

Recommendation 1. Except for temporary adaptations to extraordinary circumstances, the tenured faculty should not be less than 60% of the total faculty.* This is intended both to provide assistant professors an acceptable probability of promotion and to insure that a substantial majority of the faculty will have the guarantee of academic freedom that tenure provides.

Comment. Under conditions of constant faculty size, any significant reduction in the percentage of tenured faculty has the long-run effect of diminishing substantially the probability that an assistant professor will be promoted to a tenured rank. In a competitive market for assistant professors, a reasonable chance of acquiring tenure may well be an important consideration with respect to recruitment. If the University were to maintain the percentage of tenured faculty at the proposed minimum of 60%, without growth in faculty size, it could not expect to promote more than one assistant professor in three to tenure, under reasonable assumptions about other relevant variables. We do not think it advisable, as a long-term policy, to reduce the promotion ratio below this level, and therefore would oppose reducing the percentage of tenured faculty below 60%.

Furthermore, too low a percentage of tenured faculty would dangerously reduce the number of faculty with complete freedom to engage in innovative scholarship and could well diminish the influence and contribution of the faculty to University governance.

Some upper limit to the percentage of tenured faculty is also desirable, though it is difficult to specify a maximum. To a considerable extent, service as assistant professor is a period during which research and teaching capabilities are developed and enhanced, and evidence of scholarship potential is established. There is a substantial competitive advantage for the University in obtaining outstanding young scholars for its tenured faculty if they have served as assistant professors here. Only a few universities have a status that enables them to neglect this kind of competitive advantage.

Secondly, because the growth in capabilities of an assistant professor is likely to be greater in an environment of distinguished senior faculty, we believe that there is some responsibility for each major university to provide this setting for a substantial number of young faculty.

Finally, there are two economic factors which cannot be ignored in a period of precarious solvency for the private universities: (a) A number of educational services can be performed very adequately by non-tenured faculty at lower cost than if performed by tenured faculty. (b) A high percentage of tenured faculty makes the University extremely vulnerable to shifts in student interests and in the research directions for which external financing is available. To maintain revenues, faculty must be increased in growing areas, while compensating reductions in the areas of declining demand are severely restricted.

Recommendation 2. With the exception stated below in recommendation 4, the probationary period for tenure should be a maximum of seven years in the case of a full-time faculty member initially appointed as instructor, associate, or assistant professor, provided that at the time of appointment a terminal professional degree (normally the Ph.D.) is held.

Comment. It is intended that the basic probationary period for tenure shall remain as heretofore set out in the University's *Handbook for Faculty and Administration*, p. 35, para. 5 (a), to wit:

The probationary period . . . is seven years in the case of a faculty member initially appointed as an assistant professor or associate or instructor; if at least one year prior to completion of the applicable probationary period the faculty member is notified in writing that his appointment will not be continued or renewed, academic tenure will not be acquired upon completion of the period in question.

The current financial difficulties of the University have created significant pressure for an extension of the probationary period for tenure at the University. Under reasonable assumptions about the growth in faculty size, the rate of retirement and the maximum percentage of tenured faculty that is considered acceptable, the percentage of assistant professors the University is able to promote to tenured positions will decrease sharply in the next several years. An extension of the probationary period for tenure, e.g., to nine years, improves this percentage moderately. Nevertheless, it is our opinion that relatively short-term problems of ad-
*“Faculty” here means all persons holding tenure at the University as well as all those serving in a probationary period for tenure.

justment to a change in growth rate do not constitute compelling reasons for alteration of the well-established standards concerning the length of the probationary period for tenure.

It is a practice in some areas of the University to review a faculty member for tenure in the fifth year of the probationary period. It should be noted, however, that a review in the sixth such year is consistent with the recommendation above and with current tenure rules, provided that a terminal one-year contract is given any person in the sixth year of a probationary period who is not granted tenure. Postponing the tenure decision from the fifth to the sixth year would obviously alleviate some of the problems mentioned above.

The Committee also found unconvincing the argument that a probationary period for tenure of nine or ten years would put the University at a competitive advantage with regard to the recruitment of young scholars in non-tenured ranks. Such a policy does not seem genuinely to be in the best interests of such individuals. Indeed, it would appear to be against their best interests—in terms of the length of service with abridged academic freedom, in terms of the number of years of personal and possibly familial uncertainty, and in terms of the probably severe difficulty in obtaining a position elsewhere in case of termination at the end of the probationary period. In any case, there simply are no data to support the contention that a longer probationary period for tenure is perceived by young scholars as in their interest; it may well be that a shorter period is desired.

Aside from the aforementioned considerations, we considered the argument that an extension of the probationary period for tenure would permit significantly better judgments to be made about the scholarly potential of a non-tenured colleague by the time of the tenure decision. This may well be true in some areas of the University, and in our opinion it can be convincingly supported for clinical departments in the schools of health science (see recommendation 4). However, we are not persuaded that it is generally true; indeed, in some areas a probationary period of less than seven years seems feasible. Thus to extend the probationary period for tenure on a University-wide basis would inflict hardship on the large majority of non-tenured faculty, especially in view of the inevitable temptation to defer a decision until the last possible moment.

In summary, the Committee believes that the academic freedom of the faculty is a commodity too precious and too precarious to be tampered with through any lengthening of the probationary period for tenure for the University as a whole.

Recommendation 3. Service as instructor or associate without a terminal professional degree (normally the Ph.D.) should not be counted as part of the probationary period for tenure. However, the probationary period for such persons should begin automatically at the beginning of the academic year following that in which the terminal degree is awarded. It is not intended that this policy should be applied retroactively upon adoption. (See proposal 2 in Reitz letter, Appendix E.)

Comment. The *Handbook for Faculty and Administration* now provides that the probationary period for tenure begins in the case of an instructor or associate “upon completion of adequate professional preparation” (p. 34). This permits ad hoc judgments in individual cases and results in uncertainty with respect to the time when the probationary period begins. One solution to this problem of uncertainty is to exclude time spent in the rank of instructor or associate from the probationary period and to provide that the probationary period shall begin only upon appointment to the rank of assistant professor. We believe that it is undesirable automatically to exclude time spent, after attainment of a terminal professional degree, as full-time teachers and scholars in the non-professorial ranks, since such exclusion would treat very differently individuals with similar training performing similar functions and thus would have the effect for some individuals of increasing the actual probationary period beyond seven years. We have sought instead to suggest an automatic determination of the beginning of the probationary period for individuals who are fully professionally qualified and have chosen as the measure of such qualification the acquisition of the terminal professional degree normally required. Each school must specify explicitly the professional degree(s) that it accepts as terminal.

It shall be the responsibility of the Administration to determine at the beginning of each academic year whether such a degree has

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

Wednesday, April 25, 1973
3 to 6 p.m. • Stiteler B-6

On the agenda for the regular spring meeting of the Senate tomorrow are two sets of proposed changes in the bylaws (*Almanac* April 10) and the Report of the ad hoc Committee on the Faculty, above.

The Report of the ad hoc Committee on Students will be distributed at the April 25 meeting.

Standing committees on Academic Freedom and Responsibility and on Economic Status of the Faculty are also due to report tomorrow, the former in writing and the latter from the floor. Chairman Jean Crockett will declare elected the slate published March 20; she will yield the gavel June 1.

been awarded to any full-time faculty member not already in a tenure-probationary status. Failure of the Administration to do so shall not defer the automatic inception of the probationary period.

Recommendation 4.

a. The probationary period for tenure should be a maximum of ten years for faculty members of clinical departments in the schools of health sciences initially appointed as instructors, associates, or assistant professors, provided that at the time of appointment a terminal professional degree is held. This should apply only to those appointed after the effective date of this change in the tenure rules.

b. In the clinical departments of the schools of health sciences, promotion of faculty members from within the University to the rank of associate professor without tenure should be permitted; but the maximum total service in that rank without tenure must not exceed seven years.

Comment.

a. This change in the tenure policy of the University is desirable because experience indicates that faculty who devote a major proportion of their time to patient care and clinical teaching, as contrasted with research and scholarly writing, cannot be evaluated adequately for tenure under the current seven-year rule. It simply takes more time to identify the clinician who can be expected to achieve the level of research accomplishment desired for tenured faculty at the University.

b. With a probationary period for tenure of possibly ten years, it is desirable to be able to promote individuals to the rank of associate professor without tenure before the end of the probationary period. This modification is needed to permit recognition of superior performance at an intermediate point in time, to encourage young faculty, and to enable the University to compete with other institutions for promising scholars on its own faculty.

Recommendation 5. A tenured position vacated by retirement, resignation, or death should be filled by the person whose scholarly qualifications will best serve the long-term interests of the department and school concerned. In making such a determination, some consideration should be given to maintaining a reasonable faculty age profile.

Comment. This recommendation is addressed to recommendation 23 of the University Development Commission (see Appendix A). We believe it inappropriate to try to resolve a relatively short-run problem through a change in policy which will, in the long run, severely restrict departments in their attempts to recruit the best available faculty.

Recommendation 6. Except for associate professors without tenure appointed from within the University (as provided for in recommendation 4), reappointment in the rank of associate professor without tenure to a total maximum service in that rank of seven years should be permitted. (See proposal 2 in Reitz letter, Appendix E.)

Comment. The University's *Statutes of the Corporation* currently provide that "the initial appointment of an appointee from without the University of Pennsylvania [to the rank of associate professor] may be made for a period of three years or five years" (Article VIII, para. 1 (c), p. 13; the *Handbook for Faculty and Administration*, p. 38, says "three to five years"). A faculty member holding such an appointment and not given tenure at the end of the period of appointment must leave the University. Thus the effect of the existing policy is, in cases in which the person has had no

prior academic service elsewhere, to deny a faculty member a full probationary period for tenure of seven years. The effect of the proposed modification is to permit, where appropriate, a probationary period for tenure of seven years for associate professors appointed to that rank from without the University.

Recommendation 7. Titles such as "lecturer" and "visiting professor" that are by present University regulations excluded from eligibility for tenure should not be abused. They should not be given to full-time faculty members who are continuously engaged over an extended period in the same academic activities as faculty members having tenure or those serving in a probationary period for tenure.

Such ranks as lecturer or visiting professor should be tenure-accruing only in the following circumstances: (a) Promotion from such ranks to the rank of instructor, associate, or assistant professor shall make all previous full-time academic service at the University during which a terminal professional degree was held count as part of the probationary period. (b) In case a total of six continuous years is served during which a terminal professional degree is held, these years shall all count as a probationary period for tenure.

Recommendation 8. The University should formally adopt the *Standards for Notice of Nonreappointment of the American Association of University Professors*; to wit:

Notice of nonreappointment, or of intention not to recommend reappointment to the governing board, should be given in writing in accordance with the following standards:

1. Not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination.

2. Not later than December 15 of the second academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if an initial two-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination.

3. At least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years in the institution.

(From *Policy Documents and Reports of the American Association of University Professors*.)

Further, in the event the standards are not met, the faculty member concerned should have an additional year beyond the year in which the date occurs in which notice should have been given.

Remaining Agenda on Tenure

A number of questions under consideration by the Committee have not yet been resolved. Among these are:

1. The possibility that partially-affiliated members of the faculty be permitted to accrue time toward the acquisition of tenure.

2. The issues involved in determining whether and how scholars on research grants or contracts may accrue time toward the acquisition of tenure.

3. The question of whether an appropriate body should be recognized or constituted to interpret the rules governing tenure at the University.

4. The question of whether promotion from within the University to the rank of associate professor without tenure should be permitted for non-clinical faculty.

5. The issues involved in determining to what extent, if any, service in a tenure-probationary status in another institution should be counted for individuals appointed to non-tenured, tenure-accruing ranks from without the University.

6. The problem of a mechanism for full disclosure of the University's tenure policy to appointees, as well, perhaps, as a statement about the likelihood of the appointee's acquiring tenure.

7. Issues concerning the elimination of tenure as a remedy for procedural irregularity.

Maria Z. Brooks

Brian F. Chellas

Jean Crockett (ex officio)

Dorothea Hurvich

Noyes E. Leech

Ludo J. Rocher, Chairman

Robert Summers

(Appendices A through E start on page 6.)

APPENDIX A

RECOMMENDATIONS 21, 22, 23 AND 25 FROM PENNSYLVANIA: ONE UNIVERSITY, THE REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

21. That immediate steps be taken to render voluntary early retirement an acceptable financial possibility.

22. That the Board of Trustees immediately lower the normal retirement age to 65 for all faculty members who achieve tenure after June 30, 1974.

23. That whenever possible, a tenured position vacated by resignation or retirement be turned into a position for hiring a non-tenured faculty member. This procedure should be avoided, however, when it poses a serious threat to academic quality and reputation, especially in smaller departments.

25. That an appropriate Senate committee be asked to consider whether fully-affiliated faculty members should be permitted to serve without tenure for a total of nine years.

APPENDIX B

EXCERPTS FROM PAGES 36, 37 AND 38 OF THE HANDBOOK FOR FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION

Retirement

Retirement is mandatory on June 30th following a member's 68th birthday except for those faculty members receiving tenure before October 15, 1959; retirement for them is mandatory June 30th following their 70th birthday. (In the School of Medicine, however, the retirement age is 68 regardless of when tenure was received.)

A faculty member may retire at an earlier age at his own option. Under current practice, deans, directors and department chairmen give up their administrative posts at age 65 but may continue in their professional positions as outlined above.

A faculty member wishing to alleviate his academic responsibilities before final retirement may do so without loss of tenure. Tenure would continue to age 68 with an option by the faculty member to teach part time at proportional compensation between the ages of 65 and 68 without prejudice to his status of affiliation. If a faculty member becomes disabled before age 65 and thus is eligible for the Long-Term Disability Income Plan, he will be placed in retirement status at age 65.

Members of the administration who have no teaching appointments must retire at age 68.

The retired member of the faculty or administration may be asked to serve on a University committee, join the academic procession at commencement or some other special convocation, or represent the University at an academic exercise at another institution. Most privileges he enjoyed at the University before retirement, such as using the Libraries, his discount at the Bookstore, the facilities of the Faculty Club, and the like, will remain available to him. (36)

Academic Titles

Considerable effort has been made in recent years to simplify and to make uniform the academic titles used throughout the University. The following titles are in general and current use:

Professor Emeritus—A professor who has reached the age of retirement from active service may be designated by the Trustees as professor emeritus. Recommendation to the Executive Board of the Trustees for such action is made by the President on the advice of the Provost's Staff Conference. The Provost's Staff Conference may also approve, upon recommendation from the appropriate department, the yearly reappointment of professor emeritus to a salaried basis as a partially-affiliated member of the faculty. It is rare for them to do so for persons of 70 or more years of age. (37)

Should a professor for reasons of health or other exigencies, find it necessary to retire before the statutory age for retirement, the President may recommend his appointment to the rank of professor emeritus if such action is recommended by the school of which the professor is a member and approved by the Provost's Staff Conference. In certain exceptional cases the President may recommend designation by the Trustees to emeritus status for persons who reach the statutory age of retirement in a rank lower than that of professor, provided that such action is strongly supported by the school to which the person belongs. (38)

APPENDIX C

Reprinted from ALMANAC April 18, 1972

OF RECORD



RETIRED FACULTY MEMBERS

Following is the text of a memorandum on the Rights and Privileges of Retired Faculty Members (6-72) sent January 26, 1972, to all Academic Deans, Academic Vice Presidents, Department Chairmen and retired faculty.

Though no faculty member acquires new rights or privileges in the University upon his retirement, certain of those rights and privileges to which he or she was entitled prior to retirement are still extended.

1. When a retired faculty member is actively engaged in productive scholarship, the University will try to furnish him or her office space as well as assistance from the departmental secretarial pool. Such aid can be granted only if it is available; prior consideration must necessarily be given to the regular faculty.

2. Retired faculty members may file research or travel grant applications. The consent of the relevant Department Chairman or Dean should be obtained prior to submission to the Vice Provost for Research. Such applications will be transmitted further only if the Vice Provost believes the project to be of significance, if there is probability of its being completed and if necessary office and laboratory space is available. If there is a shortage of such space, first priority must go to the regular faculty.

3. Retired faculty members may attend meetings of their School faculties and may participate in the work of committees of those faculties if invited.

4. The right to attend University Senate meetings is extended by the By-laws of the Senate.

5. The library use privileges enjoyed by active faculty members are continued for retired faculty members, who may apply for faculty-studies in the library if such facilities are required.

6. Retired faculty will be listed in the Faculty and Staff Telephone Directory, if they so desire.

7. Retired faculty may receive mail at the University and may use the University as a mailing address.

8. The right of continued membership in the Faculty Club of the University is now extended by the Club.

9. The privilege of receiving *Almanac*, *The Gazette*, *The Annual Report* and special reports is continued.

10. Retirement benefits of TIAA-CREF and a paid-up life insurance policy if contracted before retirement are part of the existing personnel benefits program. TIAA-CREF and the life insurance policy are contracts between the companies and individual faculty members and ownership of such contracts is fully vested in the individual.

11. Retired faculty may participate in the Major Medical Insurance plan as a supplement to Medicare.

12. Faculty Staff Scholarship benefits are continued to those eligible for such benefits at the time of retirement.

13. Membership in the Blood Donor Club continues into retirement.

14. A University of Pennsylvania identification card and all the privileges attached thereto is available to retired faculty members.

15. Access to recreational and cultural activities is the same for active and retired faculty members.

This supersedes Provost's Memorandum No. 9-69, dated March 25, 1969.

—Curtis R. Reitz, Provost and Vice President

APPENDIX D

ILLUSTRATIVE RETIREMENT BENEFITS AS PERCENTAGES OF FINAL (5-YEAR) AVERAGE SALARIES

Based on Entry at Age 30 and Retirement at Age 65

Assumptions about rate of faculty salary increase and TIAA interest rate (not guaranteed)

	Salary increase	Interest rate	Retirement Benefits as a Percentage of Final (5-year) Average Salary						Couples		
			Individuals								
			Social Security	TIAA Male	Plan Female	Male	Total Female		Social Security	TIAA Plan	Total
(1)	5% /yr.	4 3/4% pre-retirement 6 1/2% post-retirement	32%	49%	45%	81%	77%		49%	45%	94%
(2)	6% /yr.	5 3/4% pre-retirement 7 1/2% post-retirement	24	53	49	77	73		36	50	86
(3)	7% /yr.	5 3/4% pre-retirement 7 1/2% post-retirement	17	46	42	63	59		26	45	71

The illustrated retirement benefits are based on:

- (1) The Social Security Act as amended through October 30, 1972
- (2) Payment of all premiums to a TIAA annuity (rather than to a combined TIAA-CREF annuity)
- (3) The Social Security retirement income is based upon the Social Security Administration's assumptions of annual increases of 2 3/4% in the Consumer Price Index and of 5% in all wages covered by Social Security.
- (4) For "Individuals' Benefits" - TIAA life annuity option with payments guaranteed for a minimum of 10 years, and the Social Security Primary Insurance Amount;
- (5) For "Couples' Benefits" - TIAA joint and 2/3 to survivor option and Social Security retired employee and spouse option, with husband and wife assumed to be the same age.
- (6) Contribution rate: 5% rate by faculty member at all ages; and a University of Pennsylvania contribution rate of 8% while the faculty member is between 30 and 39 followed by a contribution rate of 9% at 40 and above.
- (7) Salary of \$12,000 commencing at age 30.

APPENDIX E

CONDENSED TEXT OF REITZ LETTER ON TENURE, JANUARY 8, 1973

Prior to the holidays, we spoke about the process of changing the tenure system. The Development Commission proposals are now in view. I have been working on a set of changes somewhat more extensive. These have already been reviewed informally with the academic deans. The time is appropriate, I believe for full scale Senate consideration. . . .

I make nine recommendations:

1. *Eliminate from tenure-significant ranks appointments as Associate or Instructor.* The 1959 statement states that appointments as Associate and Instructor normally begin the running of the tenure clock. These are now made by departments with concurrence of Deans. The provisions in paragraph 4 of the 1959 statement have created great confusion on the meaning of "completion of adequate professional preparation," which can determine whether the tenure clock begins or not. Elimination of these ranks from tenure significance will end that source of confusion. The effect will be that only appointments made by action of the Trustees, following approval of the Provost Staff Conference, will be tenure-significant.

2. *Permit reappointment in the rank of Associate Professor without tenure.* Presently the only appointment without tenure permitted at the rank of Associate Professor is an initial appointment. The 1959 statement limited the term to three years; the 1964 statement extended the term to five years. It is proposed to permit service in this rank without tenure for the same period as Assistant Professors.

3. *Eliminate from tenure-significant ranks appointments designated as "Visiting", "Adjunct", or "Research".* Within the ranks of Professor, Associate Professor and Assistant Professor, there are modifiers sometimes used to indicate special status. "Visiting" indicates a person whose primary affiliation is with another academic institution. "Adjunct" indicates a person who holds another non-academic position within or without the University. "Research" indicates a person whose work in the University is research supported primarily by external grants or contracts. All such appointments should be for a definite term of years, with a maximum of three years, subject to renewal. None should be tenure-significant.

4. *Permit appointments to academic ranks for an indefinite period determined by a parallel non-faculty appointment.* On several occasions it has been useful to make an academic appointment of indefinite duration, but without tenure commitment. These have involved persons who simultaneously hold academic-administrative positions, such as director of a library or center, which are subject to termination. Defining the period of their academic appointment as co-extensive with their administrative appointment ought to be a recognized and accepted form of contractual relationship.

5. *Define "full affiliation" to require a minimum of professional service to the University.* The present definition of "full affiliation" is

in part "one who makes the University the principal center of his educational and professional effort and for whom University affairs primarily determine the employment of his time and talents." A person whose professional life is part-time, say three days a week, would appear to be fully affiliated if those days were devoted to the University. It is proposed that a sense of the total effort be included so that full affiliation requires some minimum of full-time professional services to the University. One possible formulation, drawn from the conflict of interest provisions, would define full affiliation in terms of the effort now permitted to be expended on extramural consultative and other professional activities (one day in seven).

6. *Permit conferral of tenure to some partially-affiliated faculty members.* Presently only fully-affiliated faculty members are eligible to tenure appointments. I proposed last year that we open the tenure track to some partially-affiliated faculty members. Possibly all of these will be women whose family obligations do not permit a sufficiently full-time professional life to be fully-affiliated.

7. *Eliminate tenure as a remedy for procedural irregularity.* Any tenure system will have certain procedural requirements (e.g., the nature and timing of notice of non-renewal of a term contract). Violations of these norms are now viewed as grounds to claim tenure by default. This is a remedy often grossly disproportionate to the alleged violation. A remedial provision ought to be added to the tenure rules to grant an aggrieved faculty member such relief as may be appropriate to the circumstances. For example, if too short a period of notice has been given, an additional period without tenure can be allowed to relieve the hardship. Generally, the remedy should seek to overcome the procedural failing in a fair and equitable manner.

8. *Permit reduction of effort beyond a stated age without loss of tenure.* A tenured faculty member who becomes partially-affiliated loses tenure in our present system. An exception now exists only for persons over 65. The protection of tenure during a period of reduced activity (and reduced compensation) would facilitate negotiations for partial early retirement. The protection would be limited to guarantee of rank and salary at the reduced level.

9. *Permit extension of the maximum pre-tenure period, either generally or by Schools or Departments as exceptions.* We now permit a maximum of six years in tenure-significant ranks before a tenure decision is required. The School of Medicine has requested permission to extend to ten years, on the ground that sound professional judgments cannot be made in the existing time frame. Other universities are considering general extensions; Princeton is reportedly moving to a nine year norm. Consideration of extension either for the entire system or for sectors with special needs is appropriate. I favor a general maximum of ten years in lieu of the present seven years, with the qualification that a rigorous set of intermediate assessments be made to avoid continuation of term appointments which ought to be terminated sooner. Opening the possibility of longer service before tenure does not foreclose earlier decisions where appropriate basis exists.

OF RECORD



MEMORIAL DAY

Following is the text of a memorandum sent April 13, 1973, to all Deans, Directors, and Budget Administrators.

By federal law, the last Monday of the month of May is now designated as Memorial Day. In compliance with this regulation, the University will observe the Memorial Day holiday on Monday, May 28.

A-3 personnel and employees under collective bargaining agreements who are required to be present for duty on this holiday will be compensated on a holiday overtime basis or be given one and one-half days off as compensatory time at a later date.

—James J. Keller

Director of Personnel Services

JOB OPENINGS

The most recent position vacancies now appear weekly on Personnel Office bulletin boards around campus. In preparation for *Almanac's* summer publishing hiatus, get used to checking these locations for job listings:

1. College Hall, first floor next to room 116
2. Franklin Building, next to room 130
3. Towne School, first floor center
4. Veterinary School, first floor adjacent to directory
5. Leidy Labs, first floor next to room 102
6. Dental School, second floor center
7. Anatomy-Chemistry Building, near room 358
8. David Rittenhouse Labs, east staircase, second floor
9. Richards Building, near mailroom
10. Johnson Pavilion, first floor near directory
11. Logan Hall, first floor near room 117
12. LRSM, first floor near elevator

DIRECTOR, HILL HOUSE

Responsible to the Director of Residential Life in the Office of the Dean of Students for the direction and control of all services and residence staff programs within the operating unit; responsible to the Director of Residential Programs in the Office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies for the development and support of the educational program. He or she assists in the formulation and implementation of housing policies and is responsible for the administration of the unit including such functions as leasing, staffing, maintenance, housekeeping operations, communications, tenant relations, security, personnel, and budgetary control. He or she also directs the residence staff counseling program for the unit, assists the Faculty Master in the development of the academic program, cooperates with the Faculty Master in the organization of activities with the Faculty Fellows and participates in the development of long-range plans for the project. The Director is required to live in residence. *Qualifications:* College degree from a recognized college or university, and experience in management, administration and counseling; awareness of and sensitivity to new trends in undergraduate education and a broad knowledge of the values and principles associated with education in the liberal arts and the professions. University experience is helpful. *Salary:* Undetermined. Resumes to Margo P. Marshall, 106 CH, or Edwin M. Ledwell, 3533 Locust Walk.

HOUSEMASTER, HILL HOUSE

An exceptional upperclassman or graduate student is wanted to serve as a Housemaster in Hill House for 1973-74. This is a part-time position which requires strong abilities in counseling, organization of student activities and communications with faculty members. Room and partial board are provided along with a stipend. Counseling experience is required. For further information or an interview, contact Janet Bly at Ext. 5237.

BULLETINS

EMPLOYEE REGISTRATION FOR SUMMER COURSES

University employees who wish to take Summer Sessions courses register through the College of General Studies, 210 Logan Hall, Ext. 7327, or through the Continuing Education Program Office, 116A College Hall, Ext. 8927. Employees who have already been admitted to the College of General Studies may register now for summer courses. The complete registration, through the issuance of bills, may be completed in a few minutes if the registrant avoids peak periods immediately before each summer term begins. Vouchers valid for payment of bills are available next door to the CGS office in the Office of Student Financial Aid. After the tuition and fees bill is paid at the Cashier's Office, the CGS Office will issue class admission cards. Advising is available in the CGS Office and in the Continuing Education Program Office. University employees who are interested in the *Special Summer Program (Almanac February 20)* may wish to consult Mrs. Nancy Jacobsen, Coordinator for this program, 227 Logan Hall, Ext. 8279.

Employees who have not yet been admitted to the College of General Studies may obtain admission application forms in 210 Logan Hall or in 116A College Hall, or by mail or phone request.

Applications for admission should be filed as soon as possible. The applicant should have a transcript from his or her high school sent to CGS and from any institution of higher learning previously attended.

NEW ACCOUNTING SYSTEM

With the start of the new fiscal year July 1, a new University-wide accounting system will go into effect, Acting Comptroller William Drye, Jr., has announced. In cooperation with Training Officer Jack Glover, the Comptroller's Office is conducting seminars this month to detail important changes:

1. A complete conversion of accounting codes and subcodes.
2. A change in method of budget preparation.
3. Changes that affect the authorization of payroll accounts.
4. Changes in the methods currently used to account for unrestricted funds, restricted endowments, grants and contracts and other restricted accounts.

Any University office whose designated budget personnel have not had orientation to the new system should contact Mr. Glover immediately at Ext. 6015, Mr. Drye said.

WHITNEY FOUNDATION

Fellowships are available to any properly qualified person in the United States or abroad, up to the age of 35, holding the M.D., Ph.D., or equivalent degree, who is seriously considering a career in biological or medical research. Preference is given to those applicants whose approach more directly relates to connective tissue and its diseases. Fellowships to non-citizens are tenable only in the United States.

Fellowships are awarded for three years.

The stipend is \$8,000 per annum, plus \$500 annual increment, plus \$500 for each dependent. Allowance is made in the amount of \$750 for each year of professional pre-fellowship experience. The number of years so accepted is at the discretion of the Foundation.

Applications for fellowships to begin in July, 1974 must be received on or before July 1, 1973, for those applying from abroad, and by August 15, 1973 for those applying from within the United States or Canada.

Late applications are not accepted.

—The Helen Hay Whitney Foundation
1230 York Avenue, New York, New York 10021

ALMANAC: 515 Franklin Building, Ext. 5274

Editor Karen C. Gaines

Assistant Editor Margaret M. McIlmoyl