

# Almanac

Vol. 20 No. 10

October 30, 1973

Published Weekly by the University of Pennsylvania

## Gemmill Chair: Dean Wolfman

Dean Bernard Wolfman of the Law School, has been named to a new endowed professorship in taxation. The appointment of Dr. Wolfman to the Kenneth W. Gemmill Professorship of Tax Law and Tax Policy was announced by President Martin Meyerson after approval by the University Trustees at their meeting October 26. Professor Wolfman will continue as Dean of the Law School.

The professorship is named in honor of Kenneth W. Gemmill, chairman of the Philadelphia law firm of Deckert, Price and Rhoads. Mr. Gemmill received his law degree from Pennsylvania in 1935 and his bachelor of arts degree from Princeton in 1932. A tax lawyer of international distinction, he served as Chief Counsel of the Internal Revenue Service and as Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Policy in 1953-55.

"Bernard Wolfman is one of the great deans of American law schools," Mr. Meyerson said. "But he is much more than that. He is one of the most distinguished professors in his field. Nothing could be more fitting, therefore, than to have so extraordinary a professional and scholar as Dean Wolfman be the first holder of the Kenneth Gemmill Professorship."

Dean Wolfman, a professor on the Law School faculty since 1962, was appointed Dean of the Law School in 1970. In this post he has continued both teaching and scholarship in taxation. He is a past chairman of the Faculty Senate here, and headed the Task Force on Governance that functioned 1968-70. Before joining the faculty, he had been a member of the Philadelphia law firm of Wolf, Block, Schorr and Solis-Cohen since 1948. He served as Visiting Professor of Law at Harvard and Stanford Universities in 1964-65 and 1966. A Pennsylvania Alumnus (C'46 and L'48) he was awarded the honorary LL.D. by the Jewish Theological Seminary of America in 1971.

Dean Wolfman served as general counsel of the American Association of University Professors from 1966 to 1968 and was a consultant on tax policy to the U. S. Treasury Department, 1963-68. He was a member of the advisory group to the U. S. Commissioner of Internal Revenue in 1966-67. He is author of *Federal Income Taxation of Business Enterprise*, and has published numerous articles in the field of tax law and tax policy.

He is presently chairman of the Committee on Taxation and its Relation to Human Rights of the American Bar Association's Section on Individual Rights and Responsibilities; vice chairman of the International Legal Education Section of the World Peace Through Law Center; and a member of the Philadelphia Regional Planning Council of the Governor's Justice Commission and of the advisory council of the newly created National Commission on Philanthropy.

The Dean was elected President of the Greater Philadelphia Branch of the American Civil Liberties Union in 1972. He had been a member of its board of directors since 1965 and now serves on the national A.C.L.U. Board, as well.

## IN THIS ISSUE

- **SENATE:** *Comments on Tenure Rules (Brooks); Agenda for October 31; Early Retirement; Faculty Grievances (Revised)*
- **LETTERS:** *Academic Planning; Affirmative Action; Retirement*
- **OPENINGS • GRANTS • THINGS TO DO**

Copyright © 1973 by C. F. Peters Corporation, New York.  
Reprint permission granted by the publisher.



*The Things George Crumb Does Are THINGS TO DO . . . Page 12*

## STUDY ON HOUSING POLICY

Dean of Students Alice F. Emerson has named Dr. Arnold Rosoff, Assistant Professor of Business Law, as special assistant to conduct a study on University housing with a view to (1) solution of short-term problems in space utilization and (2) developing information to form the basis of a unified housing policy to replace the several incompatible policies now in existence.

"At the very least," said Dr. Rosoff, "this inquiry should prevent the recurrence of short-term 'crises.' If successful, it will go far beyond that and enable the University to use its housing resources in innovative, efficient and humane ways to further its primary goal of excellence in education."

Dr. Emerson said the study is focused around a questionnaire developed by Dr. Rosoff and designed to serve as the basis of interviews which he will conduct with a wide variety of individuals and groups.

## GROUP PRACTICE: DENTAL

A group practice facility has been opened at the School of Dental Medicine to give fully-affiliated faculty an opportunity for private practice. It is open to faculty, staff and students (Ext. 8961 for information) with hours initially limited to Saturdays, 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. The Group is housed in a refurbished area of Evans Building, 40th & Spruce.

## LINDBACK NOMINATIONS: NOVEMBER 1

Nominations for Lindback Awards for Undergraduate Teaching will open November 1. For details, contact Vice Provost Humphrey Tonkin or Eileen Warburton at 6081.

## Comments on Proposed Changes in Tenure Rules

*by Maria Z. Brooks*

Tenure rules are complex. The Subcommittee on Tenure has been meeting weekly since last January preparing Proposed Changes in Tenure Rules (see ALMANAC, October 16, 1973). These changes in rules are presented as brief and concise recommendations which will be offered as motions at the forthcoming Senate meeting. I feel that the reasons for some of these motions should be explained fully since these changes assume prior detailed knowledge of our present rules which are complex and at times involved. I hope that the comments offered here will clarify some points and will cut down on the discussion time at the meeting. What follows is my own understanding of the motions to be offered to the Senate on October 31.

The Proposed Changes in Tenure Rules are not intended to be a replacement of the present tenure rules as defined in the Statutes of the Corporation or in the Procedures Relating to Tenure. In some cases they represent a proposed amendment or a proposed replacement but they can be adequately understood only in conjunction with the two above-mentioned documents. The first proposed change in tenure rules is worded as follows:

1. After June 30, 1974, tenure may be acquired only by individuals holding the ranks of Professor or Associate Professor and only by an explicit grant of tenure after appropriate investigation of qualifications at the departmental, school and central administration levels.

This recommendation represents a substantial change in rules and also in the concept of tenure. A faculty member who has tenure has a continuous appointment. Our present procedures imply that this continuous appointment may be on occasion acquired merely by passage of time, by continuation of employment without notice of termination beyond the sixth year of service. I understand this to mean that merely performing duties of an assistant professor, for instance, beyond the penultimate year of probationary period and without notice of termination implies that the person possesses qualifications to perform these duties for an indefinite term. The proposed change gives a different interpretation of that person's qualifications. It is only through an explicit grant of tenure that tenure can be acquired. In this recommendation the emphasis is on tenure review and on the explicit grant of tenure by the Provost.

The second part of this motion brings another change:

a. Each department must review the qualifications for tenure of all its members in tenure-probationary status well in advance of the end of their probationary period, and a decision by the school based on this review must be rendered at least 15 months before the end of the probationary period. This decision must be to recommend either tenure, contingent upon the approval of higher administrative levels, or termination with appropriate notice. All required action at higher administrative levels (other than Trustee approval) must be completed at least 12 months before the end of the probationary period; and if tenure is not granted, notice of termination must be given at that time.

The proposed change explicitly states that departments are obligated to review qualifications for tenure of all its

members in tenure-probationary status. This is a common practice but it has not been written down or legislated.

Part *b* of this motion reads:

b. Failure to complete all required administrative action (other than Trustee approval) one year prior to the end of the probationary period constitutes grounds for grievance and, if the aggrieved faculty member is not subsequently granted tenure during the final year of his probationary period, entitles him to substantial financial compensation from the University, to be funded (to the extent of responsibility for the delinquency) through reductions in subsequent budgetary allocations to his department and school. If a negative decision is delayed more than one month after the end of the penultimate year, the faculty member's compensation should not be less than one year's salary, as severance pay. Depending on the circumstances it could be substantially in excess of that amount in any case in which employment without tenure is permitted to continue, beyond the probationary period.

The intention here is to pay the aggrieved faculty member one year's salary so that he/she does not lose the opportunity to look for another position: notice of termination issued a year ahead of termination date allows a person to look for another position which usually is available for next September only. Shortening this period to less than eleven months is to the disadvantage of the faculty member. (One month leeway is provided so that unnoticed cases can still be found out.) According to this recommendation, if the faculty member's employment is continued without tenure review and without notice of termination beyond the probationary period and if his/her employment is then terminated, the faculty member is entitled to severance pay substantially in excess of one year's salary. This provision is important because without it, it might be attractive for a department not to terminate the employment of a person who has been continued in service without notice of termination and without explicit grant of tenure beyond his/her sixth year of employment. Such an individual would be entitled to one year's salary as severance pay no matter how long he/she had been employed, and it would be very attractive to his/her department to continue his/her employment without tenure thus avoiding the payment to him/her of one year severance pay. On the other hand, the proposed increase in severance pay proportionate to the length of his/her service without tenure beyond the end of the probationary period will be disadvantageous to the offending department.

Recommendation 2a, which permits the extension of the probationary period to ten years for faculty members in clinical departments if they so desire and if their chairman certifies that they have substantial clinical duties, had been voted on and passed by the Senate on April 25, 1973. The present wording of the recommendation brings in one new aspect, namely that the extension to ten years applies only to those faculty members who want it and whose chairman certifies that they qualify for it. The subcommittee discussed various situations and some of us were concerned that no pressure be exerted to choose the ten-year probationary period over the seven-year. I personally believe



that the way to avoid such coercion is to allow the faculty member who had chosen a ten-year probationary period to change his mind in the sixth year of his probationary period and request a tenure review if he believes that his chances are particularly good at this point.

Recommendation 3 states that:

3. Appointees from outside the University to Associate Professor without tenure, if they have had no previous full-time academic experience, may be continued in this rank for seven years (including renewal of original contract). However, if such appointees have had previous full-time academic experience, service without tenure continues to be limited to a maximum of five years.

The intention of this recommendation is to handle some special cases, such as those of outstanding lawyers who have never held academic appointments but who are eminent enough that they should not be appointed to a rank below associate professor. It was felt that the same length of probationary period should apply to these people as to all others at the University.

In Recommendation 4, which requires that all instructors and associates have terminal degrees, we attempted to insure that all those for whom the tenure clock starts running have the necessary qualifications for tenure-probationary rank and that their appointments be made with the approval of the Provost. We felt that it is advisable to keep these ranks since in some schools there is a real need for them. Most of us did not like substitution of "adequate professional preparation" for "terminal degree." We feared that "adequate professional preparation" is too vague a term and as such might be interpreted by some chairmen to mean years of service after attainment of the terminal professional degree. Each school has to determine which degree is terminal for its faculty. In the Medical School, such a term as "board eligible" may be more appropriate than "terminal professional degree."

In Recommendation 5 the present practice to appoint graduate students to the rank of lecturer, in which an individual does not accrue time for tenure review, was recognized. We felt strongly that graduate students are here to study and that continuing their employment beyond three years is not to their benefit since they should be encouraged to complete their graduate studies as soon as feasible. We recognize the fact that in some areas, such as rare foreign languages, it is difficult to find qualified personnel and that it is tempting to continue good lecturers indefinitely. This recognition, however, also brings a realization that institutional reasons are no excuse for exploitation, and putting no time limit on service in this rank may lead to exploitation. We believe that putting a time limit on service in this rank is in the best interests of the lecturers themselves. We are well aware of the fact that the present practice is to accord the rank of lecturer not only to graduate students but also to auxiliary teaching personnel. In some schools, such as SAMP or in the School of Education, there are physical therapists or reading specialists who teach and who are lecturers. They command valuable skills but do not have academic scholarly qualifications to be in tenure-probationary ranks. We do not believe that these people should be appointed to the rank of lecturer, and we are currently working on defining a new category. We might call them "specialists." The term and the duties will be defined later.

The remaining agenda includes research personnel and the question of tenure for some part-time personnel. We hope to have recommendations this winter or early spring.

*Dr. Brooks, Associate Professor of Slavic,  
Chairman of the Subcommittee on Tenure,  
Senate Committee on the Faculty.*

## SENATE

### October 31 MOTIONS

The Faculty Senate's Fall meeting will be held 3 to 6 p.m. in Room 102 of the New Chemistry Building at 34th and Spruce. Following the Chairman's Report, agenda items will be:

- A motion of Dr. Henry Hiz (15 minutes), which was introduced at the Spring meeting and deferred to fall:

The University should not keep a racial record of its faculty. If it has entered into an agreement with the government in that matter, it should renegotiate it.

- Discussion and action on Faculty Grievance Procedures and accompanying bylaws changes (One hour). Text published *Almanac* October 2; responses October 23; a revised version on pages 6-7 of this issue supersedes the October 2 document.

- Discussion and action on the Report on Tenure (30 minutes). Text published *Almanac* October 16; revisions and a proposed amendment below.

- Discussion and action on the Academic Planning Committee's Report dealing with ranking of departments by excellence. (30 minutes). Text in *Almanac* October 16.

- Discussion and action on the Report on Optional Early Retirement (30 minutes). Text on pp. 4 and 5, this issue.

- Proposal to aid Chilean intellectuals and students (at the written request of five or more Senate members; ten minutes.) Text to be circulated at meeting.

### FROM THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON TENURE

The Subcommittee on Tenure published its PROPOSED CHANGES IN TENURE RULES on October 16 in these pages. The Subcommittee has since adopted a series of amendments, so that the text discussed at Senate on October 31 should be altered as follows:

Replace the first sentence in ii by:

ii) At the time of the first reappointment occurring after the completion of first two years of service, any individual initially appointed at one of the above listed ranks may request to shift from a seven- to a ten-year probationary period (or from a ten- to a seven-year probationary period) if his current and prospective duties involve a significantly different emphasis on clinical responsibilities from that initially anticipated.

Replace 5 with:

Full-time service in the rank of Lecturer following the effective day of this change is limited to three years in the absence of a terminal professional degree.

Replace 6b with:

Full-time service as Visiting Professor, Visiting Associate Professor or Visiting Assistant Professor shall be limited to three consecutive years. If an individual who has performed such service after the effective date of this rule is appointed for the following year at a tenure probationary rank, the time served in one of the visiting professorial ranks after attainment of a terminal professional degree shall count as part of the probationary period.

Renumber 7 to 8.

Add 7:

In the case of an appointment that takes effect after the opening of the academic school year and at or before the opening of the following academic year as determined for the relevant department or school, the probationary period begins on the intervening July 1.

### FROM DR. BENSON

I should like to present the following amendment to Section 5 of the proposed changes in tenure rules printed in the October 16 *Almanac*:

Academic Deans may make exceptions for foreign language teaching specialists possessing native fluency.

—Morton Benson, Department of Slavic Languages

## Early Retirement

### *A Report of the Senate Committee on the Faculty*

In Fall 1972 the Senate Committee on the Faculty investigated the recommendations the Development Commission made with respect to a lowering of the retirement age of the faculty. These recommendations were that (1) the mandatory retirement age of newly tenured faculty members be set at 65 and (2) early retirement options be developed which would make it possible for faculty members with mandatory retirement ages of 68 and 70 to retire early. The Committee reported to the Senate on (1), and indeed the Senate in Spring 1973 approved with only a minor change the recommendation that the mandatory retirement age be lowered to 65. The Committee herewith presents its recommendations with respect to (2), early retirement options.

The Subcommittee on Early Retirement, which was primarily responsible for developing the Early Retirement Plan, consisted of Drs. J. Crockett, R. H. Edelstein, E. G. Effros, H. E. Winkelvoss, and R. Summers (Chairman).

### Preamble

The Early Retirement Plan that the Committee recommends, described in detail below, was developed to embody a set of principles the Committee considered appropriate to the University as a whole and to its senior faculty. These principles are as follows:

(1) The Committee recognizes the diversity of circumstances (financial, health, and other) senior faculty members find themselves in as they consider early retirement possibilities. Therefore, options favorable to faculty members with different needs should be available. For example, some may wish to retire outright at 65 while others will wish to reduce their University commitments only partially at that time. Of those who wish to retire early, some may find it possible to commit themselves as long as a decade in advance while others may wish to delay the retirement decision until they are closer to 65. Because it aids University planning, earlier decisions should be rewarded by a slight premium.

(2) Once a faculty member commits himself to the Early Retirement Plan, the associated financial arrangements should be entirely vested. Supplemental contributions to TIAA-CREF are admirably suited to this purpose.

(3) The University should incur no extra dollar costs from the Plan. The benefits flowing from increased faculty options and from increased flexibility in appointing and eventually granting tenure to junior faculty should be financed by the difference between the salaries of retiring senior faculty and their more junior replacements.

(4) Financial supplements provided to faculty members who retire early should be the same for all persons within the same School or other appropriate grouping. It should be noted that persons with salaries below the median for their School or other appropriate groupings will generally have comparatively low TIAA-CREF accumulations as they approach 65. If in addition the University should offer them comparatively low supplements for early retirement the early retirement option may not be financially attractive for them.

(5) During the transition period immediately following the introduction of the Plan, older faculty members should be allowed

to participate on a basis as favorable as the one they would have enjoyed if they had joined at 55.

(6) The Early Retirement Plan should be an addition to the existing University regulations concerning retirement. It should leave undisturbed all present provisions governing the status of retired or retiring faculty members.

The Committee has examined a wide variety of early retirement programs now in operation or in prospect at other universities and colleges. Also, it has benefited from the extremely useful counsel of Penn's institutional representative at TIAA. The program recommended for Penn is not identical with any of those we have encountered elsewhere but it shares features, though not parameters, with the programs adapted at Princeton, Wesleyan and Stanford.

## The University of Pennsylvania Faculty Early Retirement Plan

### 1) MOTIVATION

The mandatory retirement age for newly-tenured faculty members has been lowered to 65. However, present faculty members are exempted from the change in retirement age, and quite appropriately so, because their retirement age was one of the terms of their appointment. Still, the reasons for preferring 65 as the retirement age have equal force for those with 68 and 70 mandatory retirement ages. Many of these latter faculty members might be glad to retire early if it were not for financial problems that would result from leaving the University salary roll earlier than originally planned. As a consequence, a set of retirement options which may make early retirement feasible is to be made available to the faculty. It should be noted that "retirement" here refers to a faculty member's withdrawing from teaching and from University governance, and his receiving his income from his TIAA-CREF pension fund and Social Security rather than the University. It should be emphasized that retirement should not entail loss of access to research facilities or to the enjoyment of the University's amenities to the extent possible.

### 2) ELIGIBILITY

Tenured faculty members of any rank whose mandatory retirement age is either 68 or 70 are eligible to select an option within the Plan provided that (a) they are between 55 and 64 and (b) they will have at least ten years of full-time service with the University at the time of scheduled retirement under the provisions of Early Retirement Plan.

### 3) EARLY RETIREMENT OPTIONS

#### a. "Tapering-off" retirement

An eligible faculty member may at 65 or older have his University teaching and administrative load reduced by any agreed upon proportion of a full-time load (as defined for his Department or School) and receive a salary which has been reduced by less than that reduction proportion. Specifically, a faculty member carrying a work load which is  $p$  proportion of a full-time load should receive a salary equal to 120% of  $p$  times his normal salary. (Eg., if he carries 75% of a full load, he should receive 90% of his full salary; if he carries 50% of a full load, he should receive 60% of his full salary.) However, in no case can the faculty member's salary under this option exceed 90% of his full-load salary. Once

TABLE A

*Annual Contribution Rates in the University of Pennsylvania Early Retirement Plan. (All Rates Are Expressed as Percentages of the Median Academic Income of the Faculty Member's School or Other Appropriate Grouping in the Previous Academic Year.)*

MANDATORY 68					MANDATORY RETIREMENT AGE 70									
Retirement at 65					Retirement at 65					Retirement at 67				
Age of entry into ERP	No. ann. pay-ments	Penn	Fac. Mem.	Total	No. ann. pay-ments	Penn	Fac. Mem.	Total		No. ann. pay-ments	Penn	Fac. Mem.	Total	
55	10	7.50	3.75	11.25	10	11.25	5.63	16.88	12	6.25	3.13	9.38		
56	9	7.92	3.96	11.88	9	11.88	5.94	17.82	11	6.48	3.24	9.72		
57	8	8.81	4.41	13.22	8	13.22	6.61	19.83	10	7.10	3.55	10.65		
58	7	9.96	4.98	14.94	7	14.94	7.47	22.41	9	7.75	3.88	11.63		
59	6	11.50	5.75	17.25	6	17.25	8.63	25.88	8	8.63	4.32	12.95		
60	5	13.65	6.83	20.48	5	20.48	10.24	30.72	7	9.76	4.88	14.64		
61	4	16.87	8.44	25.31	4	25.31	12.66	37.97	6	11.30	5.65	16.95		
62	3	21.14	10.57	31.71	3	31.71	15.86	47.57	5	13.35	6.68	20.03		
63	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	16.50	8.25	24.75		
64	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	21.75	10.88	32.63		

reduced, the lesser load would be in effect to the mandatory retirement age.

b. Full retirement

(i) Eligible faculty members who are 55 years old and have a mandatory retirement age of 70:

If the faculty member at age 55 expressly waives his right to continue in active status after 65, for the next ten years an extra supplement, above and beyond the standard University and employee contribution, would be paid into his TIAA-CREF retirement account. Responsibility for the financing of this supplement would be shared by the University and the faculty member on a (2/3, 1/3) basis. The exact amount of this supplement in any year would be set at 16.88% of the previous year's median income of all persons in the faculty member's School (or other appropriate grouping) in the 55-64 age group. At the age of 65 the faculty member would retire and receive the TIAA-CREF annuity benefit derived from his TIAA-CREF total accumulation at that time, plus social security benefits.

If the faculty member at age 55 expressly waives his right to continue in active status after 67, for the next twelve years an extra supplement, above and beyond the standard University and employee contributions, would be paid into his TIAA-CREF retirement account. Responsibility for the financing of this supplement would be shared by the University and the faculty member on a (2/3, 1/3) basis. The exact amount of this supplement in any year would be set at 9.38% of the previous year's median income of all persons in the faculty member's School (or other appropriate grouping) in the 55-64 age group. At the age of 67 the faculty member would retire and receive the TIAA-CREF annuity benefit derived from his TIAA-CREF total accumulation at that time, plus social security benefits.

(ii) Eligible faculty members who are 55 years old and have a mandatory retirement age of 68:

If the faculty member at age 55 expressly waives his right to continue in active status after 65, for the next ten years an extra supplement, above and beyond the standard University and employee contributions, would be paid into his TIAA-CREF retirement account. Responsibility for the financing of this supplement would be shared by the University and the faculty member on a (2/3, 1/3) basis. The exact amount of this supplement in any year would be set at 11.25% of the previous year's median income of all persons in the faculty member's School (or other appropriate grouping) in the 55-64 age group. At the age of 65, the faculty member would retire and receive the TIAA-CREF annuity benefit derived from his TIAA-CREF total accumulation at that time, plus social security benefits.

TABLE B

*Annual Contribution Rates in the University of Pennsylvania Early Retirement Plan During the Transition Period. (All Rates are Expressed as Percentages of the Median Academic Income of the Faculty Member's School or Other Appropriate Grouping in the Previous Academic Year.)*

MANDATORY 68					MANDATORY RETIREMENT AGE 70									
Retirement at 65					Retirement at 65					Retirement at 67				
Age of entry into ERP	No. ann. pay-ments	Penn	Fac. Mem.	Total	No. ann. pay-ments	Penn	Fac. Mem.	Total		No. ann. pay-ments	Penn	Fac. Mem.	Total	
55	10	7.50	3.75	11.25	10	11.25	5.63	16.88	12	6.25	3.13	9.38		
56	9	8.33	4.17	12.50	9	12.50	6.25	18.75	11	6.82	3.41	10.23		
57	8	9.38	4.69	14.06	8	14.06	7.03	21.09	10	7.50	3.75	11.25		
58	7	10.71	5.36	16.07	7	16.07	8.04	24.11	9	8.33	4.17	12.50		
59	6	12.50	6.25	18.75	6	18.75	9.38	28.13	8	9.38	4.69	14.06		
60	5	15.00	7.50	22.50	5	22.50	11.25	33.79	7	10.71	5.36	16.07		
61	4	18.75	9.38	28.13	4	28.13	14.07	42.20	6	12.50	6.25	18.75		
62	3	25.00	12.50	37.50	3	37.50	18.75	56.25	5	15.00	7.50	22.50		
63	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	18.75	9.38	28.13		
64	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	25.00	12.50	37.50		

(iii) Eligible faculty members who are between 56 and 64 years old and have a mandatory retirement age of either 68 or 70:

Faculty members in this category who wish to retire early may arrange to have the standard TIAA-CREF contributions of the University and themselves supplemented by the amounts determined by the entries specified in Table A. The entries indicate that the total supplement is greatest for faculty members who enter the Early Retirement Plan at age 55. During the transition period of adoption of the Plan, within the first two years, faculty members above 55 would receive supplements given by Table B.

(iv) Eligible faculty members with a mandatory retirement age of 70 who have not entered the Early Retirement Plan by the time they are 64, or those with a mandatory retirement age of 68 who have not entered the Plan by the time they are 62:

If the faculty member expressly waives his right to continue in active status after 67 if his mandatory retirement age is 70, or 65 if his mandatory retirement age is 68, a single extra supplement above and beyond the standard University and employee contribution would be paid into his TIAA-CREF retirement account during the last year of his active status. The exact amount of this supplement would be set at 50% of the previous year's median income of all persons in the faculty member's School (or other appropriate grouping) in the 55-64 age group. During the transition period of adoption of the Plan, within the first two years, the single-supplement percentage would be set at 75%. Upon retirement the faculty member would receive the TIAA-CREF annuity benefits derived from his TIAA-CREF total accumulation at that time, plus social security benefits.

Eligible faculty members with a mandatory retirement age of 70 who have not entered the Early Retirement Plan by the time they are 62:

If the faculty member expressly waives his right to continue in active status after 65, a single extra supplement above and beyond standard University and employee contribution would be paid into his TIAA-CREF retirement account during the last year of his active status. The exact amount of this supplement would be set at 75% of the previous year's median income of all persons in the faculty member's School (or other appropriate grouping) in the 55-64 age group. During the transition period of adoption of the Plan, within the first two years, the single-supplement percentage would be set at 112.5%. Upon retirement the faculty member would receive the TIAA-CREF annuity benefits derived from his TIAA-CREF total accumulation at that time, plus social security benefits.



# SENATE

*The Senate Committee on the Faculty has revised its text on PROPOSED FACULTY GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES. The following version supersedes the document published October 2.*

—Paul Taubman, Chairman, Faculty Senate

## Proposed Faculty Grievance Procedures

### I. APPLICABILITY

a. This grievance procedure shall be available to any member of the University faculty, whether tenured or untenured, whether fully or partially affiliated.

b. A grievance is a claim that action has been taken which affects the faculty member's personnel status or the terms or conditions of his/her employment and which is: (1) arbitrary and capricious; (2) discriminatory with regard to race, sex, creed or national origin; or (3) not in compliance with University procedures or regulations (other than those relating to academic freedom).

### II. GRIEVANCE COMMISSION: INQUIRY PANELS

a. There shall be selected by the Senate Advisory Committee sixteen persons from the full-time University faculty to constitute a Grievance Commission. The Commission shall be broadly representative (including women and members of minority groups), but shall not include department chairmen; deans and directors; associate, assistant or vice deans; or members of the central administration. Upon appointment to the Commission each member shall agree to commit himself/herself to maintain confidentiality with respect to oral and documentary evidence presented during the investigation of individual cases. Members shall serve three-year terms expiring June 30 which shall be so arranged that the terms of no more than six members shall expire simultaneously. Replacements shall be selected by the Senate Advisory Committee at least once a year as needed. Each year members of the Grievance Commission shall select from among themselves one person to chair the Commission.

b. The Grievance Commission shall have power to receive and to process grievances in accordance with the procedure set forth below. In so doing, the Grievance Commission shall act in each individual case through a three-member Inquiry Panel, the composition of which shall be determined by alphabetical rotation. The Panel shall not include persons belonging to the grievant's department nor, in a case involving termination at the end of the probationary period, an untenured person from the grievant's School. The grievant shall be permitted a peremptory challenge of one Panel member. Either the grievant or the parties who made the decision which is the subject of the grievance may challenge panel members for cause, such challenges to be ruled upon by the remaining members of the Grievance Commission.

### III. PRELIMINARY PROCEDURES

a. Before filing a grievance with the Grievance Commission, the affected faculty member shall first (1) request in writing from his/her Dean a written statement of the reasons for the decision which is the subject of the faculty member's grievance, and (2) make an effort to confer in person with the Dean to attempt to reach an equitable settlement of the grievance. The Dean shall promptly cooperate with the grievant in this preliminary procedure. The Dean's written statement should either be approved by the department chairman and the chairmen of any departmental or school personnel panels which have reviewed the case or be accompanied by separate statements from those persons. In cases involving reappointment, promotion or tenure the affected faculty member must initiate the grievance procedure by requesting the written statement from the Dean within five months after formal

notification of the unfavorable personnel action which is the subject of the grievance.

b. Failing a settlement within four weeks after the request to the Dean for a written statement, the grievant may submit to the Grievance Commission through its Chairperson a written notice of grievance and request for a hearing. In such a case, the grievant shall at the same time notify the Provost in writing that such notice and request have been filed. In the event it should appear to the Chairperson of the Grievance Commission that the grievance implicates questions of academic freedom, he/she shall refer the notice of grievance to the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom, Faculty Rights and Faculty Responsibility (Senate Committee)\*, which shall promptly determine whether the grievance is in fact within the jurisdiction of the appropriate School Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility. In the event that a determination is required as to whether the grievant presently does or does not have tenure, the chairperson shall refer this issue to the Senate Committee for determination.

c. Upon receipt of notice of the grievance, the Grievance Commission shall appoint an Inquiry Panel to process the grievance. The Panel shall undertake a full examination of relevant evidence, to commence between two and four weeks from the date of filing of the grievance, unless the Senate Committee earlier determines that the grievance is in fact within the jurisdiction of the appropriate School Committee under Section IIIb. The Panel is encouraged, as its inquiry progresses, to effect an equitable settlement of the grievance through mediation.

### IV. INQUIRY PROCEDURES

a. Both the grievant and the parties who made the decision which is the subject of the grievance shall be permitted to provide to the Panel oral and documentary evidence in support of their respective positions.

b. In cases involving reappointment, promotion, or tenure, the Panel shall have access to all documentary evidence concerning the grievance that was available to the parties who made the decision. Such "parties who made the decision" might include any or all of the following: department chairmen, department personnel committees, department members who decide on departmental recommendations for personnel action, the deans of the schools, the school personnel committees, the Provost, the Provost's Staff Conference. The Panel shall also be authorized to solicit additional documentary evidence on its own initiative.

c. The grievant may be accompanied by a University colleague when appearing at Panel meetings. (This colleague may not address the Panel unless invited to do so by the Panel.)

### V. FINDINGS

a. Except in extraordinary circumstances findings shall be reported within ten weeks of the filing of the complaint.

b. The Panel shall promptly prepare a written report and recommendations, setting forth, in detail appropriate to the case, the factual findings of the Panel, its conclusions regarding the merit of the grievance and its recommended disposition of the case. In

\*The change in title and broadening of the functions of the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility which is implicit in this proposal would require a change in the Senate Bylaws. (See box.)

cases involving reappointment, promotion, or tenure, where the Panel has found persuasive evidence of arbitrariness, discrimination, or non-compliance with University procedures, it shall recommend re-evaluation of the decision on proper grounds. Neither the Inquiry Panel nor the Grievance Commission shall have the responsibility or authority to make such a re-evaluation of professional competence on its own.

c. The Grievance Commission shall promptly communicate the report and recommendations both to the grievant and to the Provost.

d. While these recommendations are to be accorded great weight, they are advisory to the Provost and not binding upon him. In the event the Provost declines to implement the recommendations, he/she shall communicate that decision to the Commission in writing, accompanied by compelling reasons stated in detail. The Provost's decision shall be rendered within six weeks.

#### VI. HEARING BY SENATE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM, FACULTY RIGHTS AND FACULTY RESPONSIBILITY

a. In cases which involve reappointment, promotion, tenure or salary, the grievant, if not satisfied with the disposition of his/her case, may request a formal hearing before the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom, Faculty Rights and Faculty Responsibility (Senate Committee) on the grounds asserted in the grievance. If after examining the evidence the Committee determines that there are no substantial grounds for grievance, it may refuse such a request. Such a hearing may also be requested by the grievant's department or school. The report and recommendations of the Grievance Commission shall then be made available to the Committee.

b. The Senate Committee shall adopt procedures for the conduct of the hearing. Such procedures shall be similar to those stipulated in cases involving suspension or removal of a tenured faculty member for just cause, except that in the present case, the burden of proof shall be upon the grievant. In particular, the grievant shall have the right to question adverse witnesses and to call witnesses on his/her own behalf, and shall have the assistance of the administration in securing the attendance of witnesses on his/her behalf; both the grievant and the administrative officers whose decision is the subject of the complaint may have the assistance of counsel; and a verbatim record of the hearing shall be taken.

c. The Senate Committee shall report its findings and recommendations to the President with copies to the Provost and the grievant.

#### PROPOSED MOTION FOR AMENDMENT OF THE SENATE RULES

Implementation of the accompanying proposal for Faculty Grievance Procedures will require some broadening of the stated functions of the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility to include a role in the protection of the civil rights of the faculty. The Senate Committee on the Faculty therefore moves the following amendments of the Senate Rules:

1. That the title of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility be changed to the *Committee on Academic Freedom, Faculty Rights and Faculty Responsibilities*, in order to reflect the broadening of its charge, and that all references to this Committee in the Senate Rules be modified conformingly.

2. That Section 8 (b) be amended by the addition of the following paragraph:

(iii) *The Committee shall advise and consult with faculty bodies charged with investigation of faculty grievances in respect to procedural questions. After informal procedures have been exhausted in a grievance involving questions of reappointment, promotion or tenure, the Committee shall, in accordance with grievance procedures that may be in force in the University from time to time, at the request either of the grievant or of the administrative officer(s) whose actions are the basis of the grievance, conduct a formal hearing of the case and shall report its findings to the President. The Committee shall formally establish standing procedures for such hearings.*

## LETTERS

### MEASURING EXCELLENCE

In the October 16 issue of the *Almanac*, Lawrence Klein described the criteria developed by the Academic Planning Committee for estimating departmental excellence. I was very disturbed to discover that none of these criteria is a measure of quality of undergraduate teaching. If the University intends to honor its stated commitment to excellence in undergraduate teaching, then surely some estimate of quality of undergraduate teaching should be included as a component of the measure of departmental excellence.

—Ingrid Waldron, Associate Professor of Biology

### WORSHIP OF RATIOS

The report on the Affirmative Action Program makes the following statement (*Almanac*, October 9): "A significant new element affecting the promotion of assistant professor to the rank of associate professor with tenure is the virtual cessation of growth in the overall size of the faculty, coupled with reduction in retirements and resignations in senior faculty. As a result, promotions to tenure must be limited if the overall ratio of tenured to non-tenured faculty is to remain roughly constant (at about 2:1). Given these constraints, promotions to tenure will increasingly have to be based not simply upon the individual's competence as a scholar and teacher, however demonstrated, but with consideration to the future growth and present ratio of senior to junior faculty in the department and school. . ."

Paradoxically, the Affirmative Action Program here endorses another kind of discrimination—that based upon age and seniority. In effect, junior faculty, even though competent, are forced to leave. Except during a period of reduction in force, such a policy is grossly unfair to those who may have their lives disrupted, and it pollutes the institutional atmosphere.

Consider some of the effects of this policy. Without justification, junior faculty suffer anxiety and lowered morale. Faced with the high likelihood that he or she will not make tenure, the "sensible" young faculty member soon learns to devote most of his or her energies to behaviors which will bring him or her offers elsewhere. He or she avoids the office, skimps on instructional obligations, and writes a book. (Students then complain about impersonal instruction and too little return on high tuition fees!) But what if he or she is so dedicated to students as to teach well? When tenure is denied, he or she and his devotees will waste months quarreling with department chairmen, personnel committees and deans before departing the ivory tower in a cloud of ill will.

Furthermore, the senior faculty are equally victims in the convoluted processes of terminating one junior person and selecting another. Personnel committees and *ad hoc* search committees eat up valuable time and often do little to improve the human relationships of their members. (Since Prof. X voted against my friend and protege, assistant Professor Y, I'll vote against his friend and protege, Assistant Professor Z.") If the departing assistant professor leaves before his terminal year is up, the senior people must pick up his work until a replacement is found, sometimes after a full academic year or more. Then the new junior replacement may take several months to learn the ropes and begin to pull his weight. By this time the cycle is ready to repeat.

A slavish worship of ratios reflects a mindless administrative attitude. Far better a productive faculty who will all be tenured senior professors by 1983 (a dean's nightmare!) than a nicely balanced representation of the three ranks who spend half their time on personnel matters! The key question to ask about any faculty member—male or female, black or white, young or old—is this: Is he carrying out his instructional and scholarly obligations with dedication and excellence? Once appointed, if a faculty member is indeed competent, administrators and fellow faculty should facilitate his teaching and scholarship, not harass him. I am disappointed that the Affirmative Action Program in its devotion to fairness should accept without question a horribly destructive academic policy.

—Arthur A. Dole, Professor of Education

LETTERS CONTINUE NEXT PAGE



# LETTERS CONTINUED

## BLUEPRINT FOR REGRESSION

On May 25 I sent the following letter to President Meyerson on behalf of WEOUP.

We have received the "Faculty Goals and Timetables" you propose to submit to the HEW, and we wish to inform you that our analysis of your figures indicates that even if your goals are entirely fulfilled, they will fail to achieve their ostensible purpose of increasing the number of women on the University of Pennsylvania faculty. In fact, they will serve to decrease it.

A few simple calculations enable us to estimate the number of full-time faculty women at the end of the three-year period involved. The census for December 1972 lists 193 women who currently have tenure or are on the tenure track. Of these, approximately 50 (the full and associate professors) are currently tenured and the remaining 143 (74 percent) are untenured. Since the 143 untenured women are all at least in their first year at the University, we may assume that all of them will come up for tenure within the following five years and therefore that 60 percent (or 86) of them will come up within the next three years. The Zemsky-Davis-Rubin report published in *Almanac* April 10 suggests that a 75 percent rejection rate in tenure decisions will be necessary within the next three years. Even assuming that no faculty women will retire, resign or die during the next three years, this rejection rate projects a loss of 64 women during those three years. Your goals project hiring 56 women during that same period. Therefore, even if you fully meet your goals and not one woman retires, resigns or dies during those three years, you will have a net loss of eight women from the faculty.

Since such a result is obviously not your intention, we must assume that you intend a significantly higher promotion rate for women. But even if we assume that 50 percent of those 86 women will be promoted to tenured positions and that you entirely achieve your stated hiring goals, the percentage of women on the faculty would only increase from the present inadequate 13 percent to 13.5 percent—and then only if we accept the absurd assumption that not one woman will retire, resign or die.

Since you have repeatedly announced a desire to play a leadership role in this area, and these projections show the University falling further behind, it seems clear that the goals for the hiring of women have not been set properly. We suggest that there are several fundamental errors: an incorrect estimate of the pools of available women; a hiring rate calculated so close to those pools that it makes no allowance for attrition, let alone affirmative action; and no goals and timetables for promotion of women.

Because of past discrimination across the country, there are significantly more women looking for positions than would be suggested by the 1960-69 doctoral figures you cite. For example, your table cites 13.8 percent of the doctorates awarded to women in biology, but the Society of Cell Biology Placement Service for 1973 indicates that 23 percent of current applicants are women.

In addition, if the proportion of women on campus is to be significantly increased, the proportion of women hired must be significantly higher than that in the available pool. Even if we assume the available pools are as low as those listed in your table, your use of them to set goals is not consistent with affirmative action. The percentage of women in your goals averages only 1.25 percent more than the percentage of women in the pools you cite. Your goals range from 13 percent higher than the pool to 18 percent lower, but most stay very close to the cited pool. We anticipate that most if not all deans and department chairmen will view their goals as maximum rather than minimum targets. It is therefore particularly important that the goals set be set high enough to effect change.

The net result of all these factors is to make your goals and timetables a blueprint for regression rather than affirmative action. We trust this is not your intention and that you will make the necessary revisions promptly.

This letter was written last spring in response to a draft version of the GOALS AND TIMETABLES. Although I have never received a reply from President Meyerson, several individuals

have expressed concern over the assumptions made as to non-promotion rates (e.g., *DAILY PENNSYLVANIAN*, September 24, 1973). In addition, some changes have been made in the final version of the University's table with respect to the number of women presently on the faculty and goals for hiring women faculty.

In Table I below, I have set forth calculations revised according to the final goals as published (*ALMANAC*, October 9, 1973), and based on the more generous assumption that only one half of untenured faculty will come up for tenure by 1976. I might point out that any revision in this direction, if applied across the board to all untenured faculty, results in a projected significant increase in the size of the faculty. Thus, if one were to assume one half of untenured faculty considered for promotion in the next three years in conjunction with a 50 percent rejection rate, the faculty would increase by a presumably unacceptable 9 percent by 1976. The projections in Table I, assuming 75 percent rejection for tenure, indicate that the total faculty will be increasing by 75, or 4.9 percent, while women faculty will decrease by 2 (1 percent!) Even this calculation is undoubtedly too optimistic with respect to retention of women, since untenured women faculty are more often found at ranks below that of assistant professor, which would further decrease their chances of being promoted to a tenured position.

The major conclusion to be drawn from Table I is that the University's plan for affirmative action will result in 77 more men faculty and 2 fewer women faculty by 1976.

Table II demonstrates that the University of Pennsylvania is already headed in this direction. After two years of affirmative action efforts, the number of tenured or tenure-accruing women on the faculty has decreased by nine. This occurred during a period which, according to the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, was marked by a slight increase in women faculty nationwide. Was it the University's intention to reduce the number of women faculty here? And if not, isn't it time to reexamine our affirmative action goals so that they at least PROPOSE to increase women's presence instead of giving formal sanction to the projected decline?

—Phoebe S. Leboy, Associate Professor, Biochemistry/Dent.

Table I  
PROJECTIONS BASED ON GOALS AND TIMETABLES

	total	men	women
Current Faculty (Dec. 1972)	1524	1333	191 (12.5%)
Untenured (Dec. 1972)	488 (32%)*	346	142** (74%)
1.5% attrition* x 3 years	-69	-60	-9
Loss due to termination, assuming	-183	-130	-53
1) 75% non-promotion rate*			
2) 1/2 of untenured faculty up for promotion by June, 1976			
Total loss of faculty by 1976	-252	-190	-62
Proposed new hires†	+327	+267	+60‡
Net change after 3 years	+75	+77	-2
Faculty in 1976	1599	1409	189 (11.8%)

\*Zemsky, Davis and Rubin, *ALMANAC*, April 10, 1973

\*\*EEO Office information as of December, 1972

†*ALMANAC*, October 9, 1973

‡*Ibid.* This is based on the College's high estimate of 13, which it calls "less probable" than its low of 10.

Table 2  
COMPARISON OF COMPUTER PRINT-OUT OF DECEMBER 1972  
WITH COHN COMMITTEE REPORT, 1970-71

	Women in Full-Time Tenured or Tenure-Accruing-Ranks			
	Full Professors	Associate Professors	Assistant Professors	Other Tenure Accruing*
1970-71	13	28	60	81
Dec. 1972	19	30	65	59
				<u>182</u>
				<u>173</u>

\*Excludes "other tenure-accruing ranks" in Clinical Departments in Medical School, since these data are not available in the Cohn Committee Report



## AGE DISCRIMINATION

The recommendation of the Faculty Senate that the compulsory retirement age be reduced for all new faculty from 68 years to 65 years is, in our view, at best ill-advised. In contrast to the report issued by the Faculty Senate, we believe that the proposal will have substantial detrimental effects on the University and more importantly on the faculty member forced to resign.

Initially, one must question the logic of a proposed solution for what is termed "a current problem" which will have no appreciable impact until at least the year 2000. Certainly no one can today predict the situation that will exist then, one that may well be exacerbated by this proposed solution.

Even were we able safely to predict the future situation, there is no evidence that age 65 represents the point where a faculty member's contribution to the University would become less than that offered by a newly hired "younger person." We believe that the truth is often just the opposite, even if you add in the additional considerations of lower salary cost for the younger person and the need to offer advancement possibilities to attract able younger faculty. If this is true, the detrimental effect on the University is both clear and substantial. This loss will be particularly felt by the students who are deprived of the exposure to faculty who possess the very best experience in their fields.

The effect on the individual faculty member, forced to resign while still possessing the ability and vigor to excite students, is even more disturbing. There is evidence which suggests that money is not the only motive for people over 65. It turns out that *work* is also very important. Those who work tend to be happier and to live longer than those who do not work. [See for example the study by Erdman B. Palmore, "Predicting Longevity: A Follow-Up Controlling for Age," *The Gerontologist*, 9 (Winter, 1969), 247-250. This study controls for other key factors such as age and current state of health.] Certainly, the University owes an obligation to its older faculty to provide meaningful work if the individual so desires and can in fact do the job effectively. Given the widespread prejudice in our society against older individuals (this being one of the bases of the present Faculty Senate proposal) these older faculty are quite likely to be unable to find suitable employment elsewhere.

Therefore, we suggest as an alternative to the Faculty Senate proposal that a compulsory retirement age be dropped completely. Rather, a mechanism be set up for periodic review of an individual's ability to do his job effectively beginning at age 65. Under this system, a faculty member may remain active so long as both he and the University determine he is able effectively to do so. The grounds for retirement should be based upon the effectiveness of the individual—not upon the skin color, religion, sex or age of that individual.

We recognize the argument that one may feel "less worse" to be the victim of a mass discrimination than of being told he can no longer carry out his duties effectively. However, in the long run the individuals saved by our proposal should more than balance the temporary unhappiness occasioned by selective retirement. This is particularly true since those who retire (or who are retired) will more than likely be aware of their decreased effectiveness.

The adoption of the above suggested alternative has the added advantage of avoiding the serious legal question raised by making an employment decision based *solely* on age. Because of this issue of discrimination, it would not be inappropriate to seek legal redress if the Trustees accept the current Faculty Senate Proposal.

—J. Scott Armstrong, Associate Professor of Marketing,

Paul Barron, Assistant Professor of Business Law,

Edward J. Lusk, Assistant Professor of Accounting and Health Care Systems,

Thomas S. Robertson, Associate Professor of Marketing

## OPENINGS

### ADMINISTRATIVE/PROFESSIONAL (A-1)

ADMISSIONS OFFICER, LAW SCHOOL (10/16/73).

ASSISTANT MANAGER, CONTRACT ACCOUNTING, responsible to Manager, with administrative and supervising duties related to computation of charges and billings for services rendered under grants and contracts with government agencies of all levels and private contractors. *Qualifications:* Graduation from recognized college or university, preferably with degree in business administration and a major in accounting. At least three years' progressively responsible administrative experience including at least one year in an accounting department. \$10,250-\$12,750 (midpoint)

ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT (10/9/73).

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR IV (10/23/73).

DIRECTOR OF STUDENT FINANCIAL AID (9/25/73).

ELECTRICAL ENGINEER II (9/18/73).

ASSISTANT PERSONNEL DIRECTOR FOR EMPLOYMENT AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION, responsible for supervision of the employment staff in recruiting, interviewing, testing applicants; grievance handling; counseling; affirmative action. *Qualifications:* graduation from recognized college; prefer advanced degree in business or counseling. At least two years' similar experience. Ability to deal with people. Extensive experience can be substituted for up to two years of college. \$11,800-\$14,700 (midpoint).

RESEARCH ADMINISTRATOR, Environmental Med. (10/2/73).

DIRECTOR, NATIONAL EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES INFORMATION CLEARINGHOUSE, to be responsible for operating functions of section. *Qualifications:* Graduation from college with an advanced degree; at least eight years' experience in Health Care Administration especially emergency medical services. Salary to be determined.

### SUPPORT STAFF (A-3)

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I in Administrative Office. (10/23/73).

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT II for business office. (9/18/73).

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT II, Houston Hall. Keep budgets, prepare purchasing, building-and-grounds, and personnel forms, reports, petty cash, maintenance log; assist Business Administrator in supervising staff and related duties. *Qualifications:* At least three years' demonstrated bookkeeping ability, knowledge of accounting, some basic statistics for compiling reports. Accurate typing and use of Monroe Calculator. Interest in working with people. \$6,725-\$7,950-\$9,150 (10/23/73).

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT II in medical research department. (10/12/73).

DATA CONTROL CLERK for Data Processing Office. Maintain appropriate data and quality controls for preparation, screening and auditing of all ADP reports and documents. *Qualifications:* High School graduate plus formal training in computer operations. Several years' direct experience. \$6,250-\$7,350-\$8,450.

DATA CONTROL COORDINATOR for Dental area (10/9/73).

ELECTRON MICROSCOPE TECHNICIAN II (9/18/73).

PHOTOGRAPHER II for research area (10/23/73).

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN III (9/4/73).

SECRETARY I for campus office. *Qualifications:* Excellent typing skills. Good clerical aptitude. Some experience preferred. \$5,050-\$5,875-\$6,675.

SECRETARY II Morris Arboretum in Chestnut Hill. *Qualifications:* Excellent typing ability. Must be able to use the dictaphone. Several years' experience preferred. \$5,425-\$6,325-\$7,225.

SECRETARY II (3) *Qualifications:* Excellent typing; some require shorthand as well as dictaphone. Ability to perform varied duties. \$5,425-\$6,325-\$7,225.

SECRETARY III (4) *Qualifications:* Interest in working with

figures. Excellent typing, shorthand and/or dictaphone. Ability to work with minimum of supervision in performing varied duties. \$5,825-\$6,825-\$7,825.

SECRETARY IV, Dean of Students Office. (10/16/73).

TYPIST II, Dental School office. *Qualifications:* Good accurate typing. Ability to deal effectively with students. Several years' experience in clinical unit preferred. \$5,050-\$5,875-\$6,675.

*Dates in parentheses refer to publication of full job description in Almanac. Those interested should contact the Employment Section of Personnel Service at Ext. 7285 for an interview appointment. Inquiries by present employees concerning job openings are treated confidentially.*

## GRANTS

### SPONSORED RESEARCH

**A Summary of Contracts and Grants for Research and Related Activities Received by Faculty Members during July, August, September 1973.**

AIR FORCE: *D. Moulton* (Monell) "Factors Influencing Odor Sensitivity in the Dog" \$40,915.

ARMY: *R. Schwartzman* (Clin. Stud./Vet.) "Histopathology and Histochemistry of Laser-Induced Skin Lesions" \$9,219.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA: *J. Reif* (Clin. Stud./Vet.) "Research on Equine Infectious Anemia" \$6,100; *L. Shoemaker* (Social Work) "50-Week Child Care Course" \$20,640; *R. Spritzer* (Law) "Indigent Prisoner Litigation Program" \$13,174.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE: *R. Marshak* (Clin. Stud./Vet.) "Research on the Epizootiology of Bovine Leukemia" \$30,000.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE: *M. Meyerson* (President) Seminars and Final Report on Strategies for Institutional Renewal \$50,500.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR: *M. Kare* (Monell) "Sensory Physiology of Vertebrate Pests and Other Species" \$16,504.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR: *R. Glover* (Training Off.) Jobs Entry Program \$54,688; *R. Hopkins* (Econ.) "The Demand for Municipal Employees" \$10,953.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE: *J. Schwartz* (Wharton) "Instruction in Automatic Data Processing and Related Disciplines" \$168,673.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION: *A. Brown* (Biol.) "Plant Morphogenesis Under Weightlessness" \$4,192; Extend and Complete Biosatellite II Plant Experiments \$6,039; "Plant Morphogenesis under Conditions of Hyper- and Hypogravia" \$59,710.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES: *O. Franklin* (Ext. Aff.) Black Film Classics Series \$8,500.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION: *S. Ackerman* (Econ.) "Prejudice and Black Housing Patterns" \$5,800; *W. Bonner* (Johnson Fdn./Biophys.) "The Molecular Basis of Energy Transfer in Higher and Lower Plants" \$40,000; *F. Charalampous* (Biochem./Med.) "Mechanism of Induction of Cytochrome Oxidase in Yeast" \$25,000; *M. Civan* (Physio./Med.) "Transport and the Inter-cellular Fluids" \$30,000; *W. Cozzens* (Reg. Sci.) Doctoral Dissertation—"Decision Making for the Intrametropolitan Location of Subsidized Houses" \$3,500; *S. Gale* (Peace Sci.) "Processes of Change in the Spatial Distribution of Occupancy Patterns in Metropolitan Areas" \$78,700; *R. Ginsberg* (Sociol.) "Testing the Extended Semi-Markov Model on Mobility Data" \$69,300; *W. Isard* (Reg. Sci.) "Analysis and Models of Economic, Political and Social Distributions over Space and Time" \$80,300; *H. Kritikos* (Moore) "Effect of Microwave Radiation on Nervous Activities" \$61,800; *H. Kunreuther* (Mgt.) "Reducing Losses from Selected Natural Hazards: The Role of the Public and Private Sectors" \$429,600; *D. Langenberg* (Physics) "Microwave Phenomena in Solids" \$67,800; *J. Margolis* (Econ.) Dissertation Support—"Intrametropolitan Residential Location and the Local Public Sector" \$1,600; *T. Saghaft-Nejad* (GSAS), "Multinational Corporation Transfer of Technology and Development: Case Study-Iran" \$2,100; *P. Taubman* (Econ.) "The Importance of Nature on Earnings and Occupational Mobility" \$67,100; *W. Telfer*

(Biol.) "Physiology and Development of Intercellular Bridges" \$50,000; *D. Williams* (Psychol.) "Operant and Respondent Control of Non-Arbitrary Instrumental Behavior" \$34,000; *T. Yonetani* (Johnson Fdn./Biophys.) "Structure and Mechanistic Studies of Heme-Enzymes" \$40,000.

NAVY: *E. Krendel* (Mgt. Sci. Ctr.) "New Directions for Management Relations in the United States Navy" \$59,736; *H. Rasmussen* (Biochem./Med.) "Effects of Increased Oxygen Tension on Cell Metabolism" \$28,800.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION: *A. Dole* (GSE) "A Program for Advanced College Student Personnel Specialists" \$32,500; *D. O'Kane* (GSAS) Fulbright-Hays Doctoral Dissertation Abroad \$15,495; *J. Shada* (Student Aid) NDEA Student Loan Program \$2,129,034.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE: *N. Adler* (Psychol.) "Biopsychology of Reproduction" \$51,033; *J. Aronfreed* (Psychol.) "The Development of Children's Naturalistic Concepts" \$34,225; *A. Beckman* (Physiol.) "Responses of Thermosensitive Cells to Biogenic Amines" \$20,977; *J. Blaisie* (Johnson Fdn./Biophys.) "Structure and Function of Biological Membrane" \$24,333; *C. Breedis* (Pathol.) "Differentiation during Progression to Malignancy" \$36,095; *J. Brobeck* (Physio./Med.) Physiology \$7,560; *R. Cagan* (Monell) "Mechanisms of Taste Function" \$24,552; *J. Clark* (Med.) Regional Medical Program \$30,946; \$24,568; *D. W. Cohen* (Periodont.) "Training in the Basic Sciences and in Periodontics" \$14,736; *M. Cohn* (Johnson Fdn./Biophys.) "220 MHZ NMR Spectrometer Facility" \$64,709; *R. Colman* (Med.) "Biochemistry and Pathophysiology of Plasma Kallikrein" \$74,086; "Molecular Basis of Activation of Coagulation Proteins" \$65,347; *D. Cooper* (Surg./Neurosurg.) "Aerobic Hydroxylases in Steroid and Drug Metabolism Hematology" \$109,519; *R. Cooper* (Med.) Hematology \$44,388; "Disorders of the Red Cell Membrane in Diseases" \$60,073; *J. Corriere* (Surg./Neurosurg.) Urinary Particle Scanning in Urinary Tract Disease" \$36,142; *M. Cross* (Animal Biol.) "Blastocyst Expansion" \$49,530; *R. Davies* (Animal Biol.) "The Energy Source for Contraction of Muscle" \$40,555; *W. Donawick* (Clin. Stud./Vet.) "Heart Transplant and ALS Treatment" \$38,113; *A. Dubois* (Physiol.) "Pulmonary Circulatory Insufficiency" \$26,686; *R. Easterlin* (Econ.) "Rural Fertility Decline in North America" \$65,912; *H. Edmunds* (Surg./Neurosurg.) "Physiology of Perfusion Hypothermia in Newborns" \$83,741; *W. Elkins* (Pathol.) "Graft-versus-Host Reaction as an Immune Response" \$31,632; *K. Engelman* (Med.) "Altered Adrenergic Function in Essential Hypertension" \$48,996; *S. Englander* (Biochem./Med.) "Physical Studies of Biological Macromolecules" \$60,950; *A. Epstein* (Biol.) "The Neurological Basis of Feeding and Drinking" \$66,385; *J. Ferguson* (Biochem./Med.) "Biochemistry of Sperm and Other Reproductive Tissues" \$51,980; *A. Fishman* (Med.) "Cardiovascular and Pulmonary Performance" \$962,451; *W. Fitts* (Surg./Neurosurg.) "Training of Clinical Investigators in Surgery" \$3,240; *P. Gambetti* (Neuro.) "Studies on Synaptosomes" \$71,730; *M. Goldberg* (Med.) "Electrolyte Disturbances in Cardio-Renal Disease" \$306,047; *H. Goldfine* (Microbiol.) "Structure and Function of Bacterial Lipids" \$49,499; *B. Goldreyer* (Med.) "Mechanisms of Sino-Atrial and Atrial Arrhythmias" \$29,245; *N. Gonatas* (Pathol.) "Cellular Aspects of Neurologic Disorders" \$104,686; *D. Graham* (Pathol.) International Fellowship \$11,000; *C. Hamilton* (Physiol.) "Regulation of Food Intake" \$13,466; *B. Hammond* (Dent.) "Training in the Basic Sciences" \$12,740; *Z. Harris* (Ling.) "Objective and Subjective Components of Grammar" \$82,907; *N. Haugaard* (Pharm.) "Regulation of Metabolism by Drugs and Hormones" \$59,697; *T. Hershberg* (Hist.) "Social Mobility in Philadelphia" \$169,560; *F. Irwin* (Psychol.) "Some Parameters of Decision Making" \$13,013; *M. Kare* (Monell) "A Comparative Study of the Sense of Taste" \$30,581; *S. Kim* (Pathol.) "Experimental Neuropathology in Tissue Culture" \$44,156; *N. Klinman* (Pathol.) "Clonal Analysis of the Immune Mechanism" \$63,628; *D. Kritchevsky* (Animal Biol.) "Molecular Biology" \$6,480; *D. Kuhl* (Radiol.) "Nuclear Medicine" \$5,400; *T. Langfitt* (Surg./Neurosurg.) "Neurological Diseases and Stroke" \$372,193; *J. Lash* (Anat.) "Analysis of Chondrogenesis" \$72,738; *C. Lee* (Johnson Fdn./Biophys.) "Subcellular Respiratory Functions of Cardiac Muscle" \$53,150; *P. Liebman* (Anat.) "Microphoto-



metric Studies on Retinal Rods and Cones" \$34,982; *M. Litt* (Chem. and Biochem. Eng.) "Physico-Chemical Properties of Tracheal Mucus" \$24,107; *J. Marsh* (Biochem./Dent.) "Biosynthesis of Plasma Lipoprotein" \$31,919; *B. Marshall* (Anesth.) "Pulmonary Abnormalities Associated with Anesthesia and Trauma" \$25,000; *E. Moore* (Physiol.) "Electrophysiology of Fibrillation" \$51,348; *M. Morad* (Physiol.) "Electrophysiology of Prenatal to Adult Mammal and Frog Heart" \$62,292; *A. Morrison* (Animal Biol.) "Cortical-Thalamic Relationships" \$39,698; *V. Nachmias* (Anat.) "Cytoplasmic Streaming and Contractile Proteins" \$19,032; *A. Nemeth* (Anat.) "Induction and Development of Liver Enzymes" \$23,475; *M. Papadopoulos* (Physiol.) "Pathophysiology of Tissue Oxygen Transport" \$34,627; *D. Patterson* (Clin. Stud. Vet.) "Hereditary Defects in Cardiovascular Development" \$83,887; *R. Root* (Med.) "Human Phagocyte Function in Health and Disease" \$28,611; *D. Schotland* (Neuro.) "Studies of Human Muscle Disease at the Cellular Level" \$28,678; *H. Schwan* (Moore) "Biomedical Engineering" \$3,780; *J. Shada* (Student Aid) Graduate Nursing Scholarship \$5,310; Veterinary Medical School Scholarship \$31,042; Baccalaureate Nursing Scholarship \$20,276; Medical School Scholarship \$52,804; Dental School Scholarships \$49,026; *W. Shelley* (Dermat.) Dermatology Research Training Grant \$17,600; *L. Shoemaker* (Social Work) "Psychiatric Social Work—Doctoral and Third Year" \$98,980; School of Social Work \$46,867; *R. Solomon* (Psychol.) "Conditioning and Training Experiments" \$66,020; *R. Soloway* (Med.) "Sickle Cell Disease: Gallstones and Liver Dysfunction" \$76,380; *J. Sprague* (Anat.) "Visual Behavior—Anatomical and Functional Basis" \$37,299; *E. Stellar* (Inst. Neurol. Sci.) "Neurological Mechanisms Underlying Behavior" \$246,010; *P. Teitelbaum* (Psychol.) "Does Experience Help Lateral Hypothalamic Recovery?" \$57,088; *T. Trapnell* (Miscellaneous) Veterinary Student Loan \$116,805; Graduate Student Nursing Loan \$9,214; Baccalaureate Student Nursing Loan \$35,186; Medical School Student Loan \$198,696; Dental Medicine Student Loan \$184,481; *D. Voet* (Chem.) "The Structures of Nucleic Acids and Related . . ." \$26,163; *M. Wachter* (Econ.) "Effect of Labor Market on Birth and Marriage Rates" \$7,398; *A. Weber* (Biochem./Med.) "Troponin Action in Cardiac and Skeletal Muscle" \$21,782; "Control of Force Development in Heart Muscle" \$54,229; *W. Weber* (Pathobiol.) "Lymphocyte Functional Capacities" \$25,745; *J. Wiley* (Med.) "Regulation of Cell Volume in Disease States" \$53,702; *J. Williamson* (Johnson Fdn./Biophys.) "Cardiac Metabolism in Heart Failure" \$81,487; *D. Wilson* (Pathol.) "Immunologic Aspects of Aging and Neoplasia" \$55,362.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION: *E. Shils* (Mgt.) "Management Counseling and Technical Assistance" \$5,000; "Management Counseling and Technical Assistance to Small Business Concerns" \$10,000.

#### PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS, RESEARCH ORGANIZATIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS AND INDUSTRY

AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY: *H. Holtzer* (Anat.) "The Mitotic Cycle Synthesis of Cell Specific Molecules" \$35,108; *J. Rhoads* (Surg./Neurosurg.) Institutional Research Grant \$40,000.

AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION: *M. Cohn* (Johnson Fdn./Biophys.) Career Investigatorship Grant-In-Aid \$12,000; *A. Scarpa* (Johnson Fdn./Biophys.) "Control of Intracellular Calcium in Cardiac Muscle" \$14,630.

AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY: *T. Weiss* (Psychiatry) Daland Fellowship for Research in Clinical Medicine \$7,000.

AMERICAN QUARTER HORSE ASSOCIATION: *R. Kenney* (Clin. Stud./Vet.) "Control of Ovulation and Early Pregnancy in the Mare" \$20,000.

ARTHRITIS FOUNDATION: *A. Myers* (Med.) Arthritis Clinical Research Center \$15,000.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN MEDICAL COLLEGES: *P. Storey* (Com. Med.) "HMO Prototype Development Program" \$14,000.

BURROUGHS CORPORATION: *H. Gray* (Moore) "Semiconductor Memory Studies" \$25,976.

CATERPILLAR TRACTOR COMPANY: *C. Graham* (Met. and Mat. Sci.) "The Effect of High Magnetic Fields on the Hardening of Steels" \$3,131.

DUKE UNIVERSITY: *J. Campbell* (GSE) Junior Science and Humanities Symposium \$6,000.

DUPONT: *J. Ferguson* (Biochem./Med.) Graduate Fellowship \$10,000.

EARHART FOUNDATION: *J. Margolis* (Fels) Postdoctoral Fellowship for David D. Frieichman \$15,000.

FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF PENNSYLVANIA: *R. Ackoff* (Mgt. Sci. Ctr.) sponsored research—"Federal Reserve Bank-Philadelphia and the University of Pennsylvania" \$60,000.

FORD FOUNDATION: *N. Gross* (GSE) "Third Year Support of a Training Program for the Preparation of Education Leaders in School Administration" \$250,420; *D. O'Kane* (GSAS) Dissertation Fellowship for Sheila A. Radford \$7,114; Dissertation Fellowship for Bernadine T. Hawes \$7,714; Dissertation Fellowship for Clarence E. Witt \$7,714; Dissertation Fellowship for Rudolph Wallace \$4,746; Dissertation Fellowship for Guillermo Loubriel \$6,624; Dissertation Fellowship for Sheila A. Seitel \$3,550.

GENERAL FOODS CORPORATION: *S. Cohen* (Med.) "The Dose Response Relationships of Caffeine and Coffee Upon Gastric Acid Secretion" \$35,000.

HEART ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA: *J. Davis* (Surg./Neurosurg.) "Respirator Induced Fluid Shifts in Cardiac Patients" \$5,000.

HAAS COMMUNITY FUND: *M. Murphey* (Am. Civ.) "Exhibit of Artifacts from Archaeological Excavations—Head House Square East" \$25,000; *H. Northrup* (Ind. Res.) "Employee Organization Relationships and Philadelphia School System Effectiveness" \$20,000.

HEALTH HOSPITAL PLANNING COUNCIL: *R. Leopold* (Com. Med.) "Center for Study of Emergency Services" \$4,000.

HUNTINGTON'S CHOREA: *M. Goldberg* (Med.) "The Diuretic Efficacy and Mode of Action of RO 10-6338 Versus Furosemide . . ." \$35,167.

IREX: *B. Chance* (Johnson Fdn./Biophys.) 1973-74 East European Participation Grant \$2,625.

JAPAN RESEARCH FOUNDATION: *R. Colman* (Med.) "Study of Postulated Secondary Mechanisms During Hyperimmune Renal Allograft" \$15,000.

MIT CLINICAL RESEARCH: *R. Colman* (Med.) "Platelet Function and Intravascular Coagulation in Atherosclerosis" \$5,305.

MONSANTO: *R. Ackoff* (Mgt. Sci. Ctr.) "Problems Associated with the Commercial Development of 'Lopac' Containers" \$25,000.

NCAA: *R. Bond* (Recreation) 1973 Youth Recreation and Sports Program \$35,000.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH: *R. Ross* (Eng.) "Theoretical Studies in Literature" \$1,600.

NATIONAL CYSTIC FIBROSIS FOUNDATION: *J. Deren* (Med.) "Vitamin B-12 Absorption in Cystic Fibrosis" \$1,000.

PENN STATE UNIVERSITY: *V. Ganjam* (New Bolton) "Role of Epididymis in Sperm Maturation" \$51,589.

PHILADELPHIA COUNCIL FOR FAMILY PLANNING: *G. Huggins* (Ob/Gyn) Coordinating Council—Family Planning Program \$40,000.

PHILADELPHIA HEALTH MANAGEMENT CORPORATION: *R. Leopold* (Com. Med.) Center for the Study of Emergency Health Services \$9,958.

ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION: *J. Pack* (Fels) "Population Distribution and Public Preferences in Suburban Towns" \$44,005.

STROLLER CHEMICAL CORPORATION: *A. Humphrey* (Chem. and Biochem. Eng.) "Research into Possible Protein Sources for Supplementing Liquid Animal Feeds" \$5,760.

WESTERN ELECTRIC: *R. Ackoff* (Mgt. Sci. Ctr.) Presentation of Upper-Level Seminar \$38,455.

WISTAR INSTITUTE: *F. Lief* (Animal Biol.) "Etiology and Pathogenesis of Multiple Sclerosis" \$31,270.

Summary: Contract and Grant Awards July 1973 through September 1973: 178, Totalling \$10,903,397.



# BULLETINS

## DIALING IN AND OUT

The South Jersey foreign exchange service allows callers here to dial direct to Beaverbrook, Camden, Collingswood, Gloucester, Haddonfield, Haddon Heights, Merchantville, Moorestown and Riverton. Dial 23 and, on hearing the dial tone, dial the phone number, not "1" and the area code. Exchanges you can dial directly: 234 235 365 424 428 429 541 546 547 662 663 665 667 742 751 772 779 786 795 827 829 854 858 931 933 939 962 963 964 966.

Use WATS lines when calling New Jersey area code 201 and the Trenton-Princeton exchanges within area code 609.

\* \* \*

Beginning October, 1974, University telephone system will originate from Bell's central office instead of from College Hall basement. Centrex C.O.I will eliminate dial tone delays and busy signals on outside lines. The automatic call-forwarding arrangements will, in many cases, render call-director equipment unnecessary.

The new system will cost about 6 percent of present telephone equipment expense; to figure the cost to your budget, multiply the equipment charge by .06.

Orientation sessions on the Centrex C.O.I system will be held on November 14 and on December 12 in the Benjamin Franklin Room, Houston Hall, at 3 p.m. Notify Mrs. Ruth Iskoe if you plan to attend one of the sessions; Ext. 8664.

## THINGS TO DO

### THEATRE: EXT. 6791

*The Threepenny Opera*, directed by Joseph F. Leonardo. Penn Players production of the Brecht-Weill play adapted by Marc Blitzstein. Prince Theater, November 1-4 and 7-10, 8 p.m.

*Group Motion*. The new production of the multimedia dance troupe is based on Castenada's *The Teachings of Don Juan* and uses film, video and light as well as dance and music. Zellerbach Theatre, November 3 at 8 p.m., November 4 at 2:30 p.m.

*Repeat Performance*, by Slawomir Mrozek. Ilona Gerbner directs satire by a Polish avant-garde author. Annenberg Auditorium, November 8, 9, 10-15, 16, 17, 8 p.m. Fielder Cook's film of Mrozek's *The Police*, Studio Theatre, November 13, 8 p.m. Panel discussions follow the performances November 9 and 16.

*Hockey Seen*. Harvard University presents a film-drawing-Rabbit Run and rock-dance concert based on hockey. Zellerbach Theatre, November 9, 8 p.m.

### MUSIC

*Computers and Music*. Lecture-demonstration by Dr. Stephen Smoliar of the Department of Computer and Information Science, with taped performances and a synthesizer. Alumni Hall, Towne Building, October 31, 8 p.m. Free.

*University Choir*, William Parberry, conductor. Works by Bach, Brahms, Ives, Stravinsky and Weelkes. St. Mary's Church, November 2, 8:30 p.m. Free.

*Turkish Concert*. Dinçer Dalkilic and the Anatolian Folk Music Ensemble of Philadelphia will perform Turkish folk and classical music, Museum, November 4, 8 p.m. Free.

*Makrokosmos: Twelve Fantasy Pieces after the Zodiac for Amplified Piano*, by Professor George Crumb. David Burge, professor of piano at the University of Colorado (Boulder), to whom the Crumb piece is dedicated, will give the first Philadelphia performance of the work. Recent piano music by Dallapiccola, Moss, Wuorinen, Cage and Davidovsky are also on the program. Museum Auditorium, November 6, 8:30 p.m. Free.

## LECTURES

*Electronics and the Automobile*. Today Trevor O. Jones, director of advance product engineering at General Motors technical center, will discuss the future of the car. Second of the Moore School fiftieth anniversary lectures, Fine Arts auditorium, 8 p.m. Free.

*Good Design is Good Business*. IBM executive committee chairman Thomas J. Watson Jr. on the need for corporate aesthetics. Fifth Tiffany Lecture, B-1 Fine Arts Building, October 31, 4:30 p.m. Next week: Van Day Truex, design consultant and former president of Parsons School of Design, will speak on *The Environment for Creating Good Design*. Same time and place. Free tickets must be obtained in advance at the Dean's offices, E-111 or E-116 Dietrich Hall or at the Graduate office, Vance Hall.

*"Dance as Communication."* First of a series exploring dance. Museum, November 1, 3:30 p.m. Free.

*Women in Law*. Beryl Dean, director of the Pre-Law Advisory Office at the Law School, will moderate a panel discussion. Second of the Life Options for Women series, Stouffer recreation area, November 1, 7:30 p.m. Free.

*Women and Martial Arts*. Women's self defense series, CA auditorium, November 3, 8 p.m. Free.

*Four-letter Threat to Authority*. Annenberg Colloquium led by David L. Paletz, associate professor of political science at Duke, on why and how obscenities affect persons in authority. Colloquium Room, Annenberg School, November 5, 4 p.m.

## FILM

*The Railway Children*. First of the Museum's childrens film series. November 3, 10:30 a.m. Free, sponsored by the Charles C. Harrison Foundation.

*Walkabout*. A girl, her brother and an aborigine in Australian wilds. Museum, November 4, 2:30 p.m. Free.

## OTHERS

*Homecoming Weekend*. Penn, defending Ivy League champion soccer team, plays Harvard at Franklin Field November 2, 8:15 p.m. Freshman football vs. Navy, November 3, 10 a.m. Penn-Harvard football November 3, 1:30 p.m. The Alumni Society will sponsor weekend events:

*November 2*. Cocktails and buffet supper before the soccer game, University Museum, 6 p.m. Reservations: \$5.

*The Threepenny Opera* and buffet; Faculty Club, 5 p.m. Curtain at 8 p.m. Dinner and theatre \$9; theatre only, \$3.

Engineering alumni dinner and seminars, Museum, 6 p.m. Information and reservations: Alumni Relations, Ext. 7811.

*November 3*. Family Day at the Palestra. Coach Daly and the team will hold a basketball open house. 10:45 a.m. Free.

College Hall Green picnic before football game, 11:30 a.m. Reservations for game only \$5, lunch at reasonable cost.

Rock party will follow the game, Faculty Club; cash bar.

*Navajo Rug Exhibition*. Auction of 75 rugs and jewelry made by a Navajo Nation cooperative. Museum, November 3, 10 a.m.-1:30 p.m.; auction, 2 p.m.

## BOOKS WANTED

The House Committee of the Faculty Club is attempting to provide literature of interest to its members. Anyone wishing to donate books and periodicals is asked to deposit them in the women's cloak room in the Club near the business office. If there are any questions please telephone either Linda Koons (Ext. 8261) or Ellen Kohler (24-212).

ALMANAC: 515 Franklin Building (16) Ext. 5274

Editor .....Karen C. Gaines

Assistant Editor .....Margaret M. McIlmoyl