

Almanac

Volume 23, Number 9

October 26, 1976

Published Weekly by the University of Pennsylvania

- SAMP: *Open Letter (Faculty) & Response (Langfitt)*
- SENATE: *Committee on Students; Committee on Academic Freedom & Responsibility*
- GRANT DEADLINES
- *Two Scenarios for Academic Computing (Crockett)*
- *When Winter Comes* • *Building Administrators*
- OPENINGS • THINGS TO DO

DAVIS: THE \$4.9 MILLION NATIONAL CENTER FOR HEALTH CARE MANAGEMENT

The University of Pennsylvania has been named the National Health Care Management Center in a national competition among established academic and non-profit research institutions.

The University is establishing the Center for research, education and technical assistance through the Wharton School's Leonard Davis Institute of Health Economics with a five-year grant of \$4.9 million from the National Center for Health Services Research of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The competition and resulting designation of the University of Pennsylvania are the result of amendments to the Public Health Service Act, passed by Congress two years ago, to sharpen the focus of health service research in relationship to the nation's health delivery problems.

Dr. Samuel P. Martin, executive director of the Leonard Davis Institute, will lead an interdisciplinary team of researchers, professors and administrators to "explore and implement knowledge that will help to improve the management and organization of the nation's health resources."

The funds provide for five years of support for a core staff and for initiation of program activities by faculty and administrative staff from:

1. *The Wharton School's* MBA program; research and continuing education programs in health care administration; and participating faculty in the management, decision sciences, insurance, marketing, statistics and other departments.
2. *The School of Medicine's* extensive clinical facilities and faculty involved in delivery of health care.
3. *The School of Dental Medicine's* dental care systems department, which develops dental health delivery research and education programs.
4. *The Faculty of Arts and Sciences'* departments of sociology, economics and others.
5. *The city and regional planning* department of the Graduate School of Fine Arts.

A large number of health systems and delivery sites will be linked to the University so that research studies can be conducted at delivery sites by the Health Care Management Center. These include the Appalachian Regional Hospitals, the Community

Nursing Services of Philadelphia, Health Planning Research Services and a number of hospitals including the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania Hospital and others in Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

The New Health Care Management Center will focus on national programs for management and organization in the health field, the training and retraining of health administrators and the development of leaders, planners and policy analysts. It will also emphasize the problems of providing technical assistance and disseminating the results of research to various types of health administrators.

University personnel for the Institute's programs are directed by a board which includes, among others, Dean Donald C. Carroll of the Wharton School, Dean Edward J. Stemmler of the School of Medicine and Dean D. Walter Cohen of the School of Dental Medicine.

In addition, the Institute will have a Regional Advisory Committee which assists in definition of programs and priorities which are directly responsive to local and regional needs.

SECURITY SPECIALIST: RUTH WELLS

Ruth S. Wells, a Philadelphia police officer since 1955 and a specialist in protection programs for women, has been named security specialist at the University effective November 8.

Mrs. Wells will be responsible for training security personnel in the handling of rape and personal safety problems; interviewing applicants for campus security to ensure their awareness of women's security concerns; conducting safety seminars with students, staff and faculty; and maintaining liaison between campus and community and between the campus and city police. She will serve on the advisory board of the Women's Center and on the Council Committee on Security.

Her appointment was announced jointly by Provost Eliot Stellar, Vice-President for Operational Services Fred A. Shabel and Security and Safety Director Donald C. Shultis. She will report to Mr. Shultis with direct access to Mr. Shabel on issues concerning women's safety.

Mrs. Wells was a juvenile officer with the Philadelphia Police Department from 1955 to 1971, working on special assignment with all divisions. Since 1971 she has been the only woman member of the Police Community Relations Division, where she has developed, coordinated and evaluated police programs for the protection of women in the community. She has also worked extensively with community groups, schools and public agencies to teach crime prevention and home and street safety.

Mrs. Wells took her bachelor of arts degree at LaSalle College in 1975. She has received numerous local and national awards including the Public service Award of the National Council of Negro Women in 1975, Governor Shapp's Pennsylvania Outstanding Citizen Award in 1974 and the Pennsylvania Baptist Humanitarian Award in 1970.

PARENTS ARE COMING: NOVEMBER 5

Friday, November 5, will be Parents Day at the University. On that day we expect up to a thousand parents of sophomore and transfer undergraduates to be our guests on the campus.

We have found over the years that the high point of the day for many parents is the experience of going to classes with their sons and daughters. The members of the faculty have always taken this friendly intrusion in good grace and have proceeded with their usual mode of teaching. I trust that they will do so again this year.

Should other opportunities arise during the day for us to make any of these parents feel welcome on the campus, I know they will appreciate it.

—Eliot Stellar, Provost

A TREE FOR MR. DAY

A tree will be planted Friday on the Class of 1951's plaza-in-progress outside the Faculty Club as a memorial to the late Trustees Chairman William L. Day. All members of the campus are invited to join Mrs. Day, the current Trustees, Class of 1951 President Bernard Lemonick and other University leaders for the ceremony at 2 p.m.

The tree-planting ceremony follows a Trustees luncheon where Dr. Baruch Blumberg, winner of the Nobel Prize in Medicine this year, is the guest speaker and where major announcements on the FAS portion of the Program for the Eighties are scheduled.

TRUSTEES: SUNSHINE SESSION OCTOBER 29

The stated meeting of the Trustees, normally starting at 2 p.m. on the second day of the quarterly full board meeting, will begin at 2:30 on Friday following the tree-planting ceremony for Mr. Day (above). The President, the Provost and the standing committees of the Trustees are expected to report; no special agenda items had been announced as *Almanac* went to press. Observers may attend the stated meeting in Council Room of the Furness Building.

SAMP

Open Letter to Dr. Langfitt

Authors' Note: *A reasonable summary of the current dialogue on the future of SAMP is that there are two options:*

- a) increase philosophical and financial support of SAMP to permit the growth and development of the programs beyond their current boundaries; or*
- b) phase out SAMP by either direct abolishment of SAMP or removal of the programs to Thomas Jefferson University.*

October 20, 1976

Dr. Thomas Langfitt
Vice-President of Health Affairs

On October 14, 1976, our Acting Dean reported to us on the meeting of October 5 which you had called to discuss your Jefferson option with him and with our Department Chairmen. As part of his report, the Acting Dean, in accordance with the request of the Department Chairmen, posed three questions to us on that option:

1. Do you wish the Acting Dean and Chairmen to collaborate at this time with the VPHA in exploring the option of transferring the SAMP programs to Thomas Jefferson University?
2. Do you wish to preclude the possibility of transferring the SAMP programs to Thomas Jefferson University?
3. Other than your responses to the first two questions, do you wish to comment as a faculty on the option and its exploration?

From the Acting Dean's report, and from the lengthy discussion which followed the posing of the questions, we learned that at the October 5 meeting with the SAMP representatives (1) you acknowledged that the transfer of the SAMP programs to Jefferson would be a *phase-out of those programs* at the University of Pennsylvania, (2) you expressed *your willingness to help Jefferson seek Commonwealth funding for the SAMP programs* if the programs are transferred to Jefferson (help which you have been *unwilling* to provide for the SAMP programs at the *University of Pennsylvania*), and (3) you admitted, when asked, that a SAMP response to the Jefferson option could seal the verdict on the future of SAMP—in other words, a SAMP

response could make a final decision to phase out the SAMP programs at this University one of *our own doing*.

Thus our response to the questions could project us into the position of validating your Jefferson option and acknowledging your contention that SAMP should no longer be totally associated with the University of Pennsylvania. This contention is your position, not ours!

The faculty is convinced that SAMP is and must remain an integral part of the University of Pennsylvania.

Our decision to make this an open letter to you is compelled by the obligation we have, as the internal faculty and clinical coordinators of the School of Allied Medical Professions, to inform the University community of our position on the Jefferson option and the reasons why we hold that position.

Sincerely,

*The Internal Faculty and Clinical Coordinators
of the School of Allied Medical Professions*

*Ms. Joanne Baumann
Ms. Risa Granick
Ms. Laurita Hack
Dr. Susan Herdman
Mr. George Logue
Mrs. Brena Manoly
Dr. Charles Benson
Ms. Carol Oatis*

*Dr. Ruth Leventhal
Dr. Elsa Ramsden
Ms. Maryanne McGuckin
Mrs. Barbara Bourbon
Mrs. Marcie Scharf
Mrs. Debbie Labovitz
Ms. Gladys Masagatani
Mrs. Johanna Barbat*

Response

October 20, 1976

*To the Internal Faculty and Clinical Coordinators of
the School of Allied Medical Professions:*

Because the option of a joint allied medical program with Thomas Jefferson University was one of the two options recommended for consideration by the Steering Committee serving as Reallocation Review Board, the Provost requested that this option be explored with representatives of Thomas Jefferson University. Discussions are in progress between the Office of the Vice-President for Health Affairs and the administration of Jefferson. While we accept the faculty's position not to have SAMP representation in the discussions with Thomas Jefferson University at this time, we do not believe we should foreclose that option for the future. It, of course, would be helpful to the discussion teams to have advice from the SAMP Acting Dean or a faculty representative especially in exploring the feasibility of various program models.

In my discussion with the Acting Dean and Chairmen I began by stating that I recognized the difficulty of their positions. However, I wished them to know that we were proceeding with our discussions with Thomas Jefferson University and invite their participation.

Should you wish to discuss this with me, please contact my office to arrange a meeting.

Sincerely yours,

Thomas W. Langfitt, M.D.

CORRECTION

In Eugene Michels's article, "The SAMP Issue and Basic Research: Another Look," in the October 19 *Almanac*, the last sentence in the left-hand column on page four reads: "Quite aside from posing an obvious contradiction with prior principle, the exception was proposed with full awareness . . ." It should read: "Quite aside from posing an obvious contradiction with prior principle, the exception requires the costly duplication of relevant basic science departments in all the professional schools. One wonders, also, if the exception was proposed with full awareness. . . ." *Almanac* regrets the error.

Final Summary Report on Living-Learning Projects

An Agenda Item for the Senate Meeting November 17, 1976

October 1, 1976

During the 1975-76 academic year, the Senate Committee on Students was charged with carrying out an evaluation of the (then seven) existing Living-Learning Projects (LLPs) on campus; specifically, to set up a uniform information base for establishing procedures and criteria for evaluating Living-Learning Projects, and to update the 1973 Boe Committee Report on that basis.

The committee gathered its information in several ways:

a. Each LLP was visited by a subcommittee of two members and a report was issued for discussion by the whole committee. These visits included interviews with masters, staff, and students.

b. A compilation of all previous reports and literature on the LLPs was made by the Office of Residential Living; these were reviewed by committee members and formed the basis for discussion.

c. On the basis of a questionnaire prepared by the committee, the Office of Residential Living compiled complete financial and operating information on each of the projects.

This body of information is included as appendices to the full committee report, which will be available shortly. On the basis of this input, the committee feels that the following points summarize its major impressions and conclusions:

1. The visitation teams evaluating each of the individual LLPs were uniformly impressed with the quality of the projects as reflected in the competence and dedication of the faculty and staff and the enthusiasm of the students. The Living-Learning Projects represent a variety of impressive programs.

2. A major concern of the Committee was the extent and variety of academic participation or the academic role in the LLPs. We found few formal academic programs such as in-house courses, but we did find that the programs promoted contact with faculty and aided in individual advising. In most cases, desire to expand formal academic parts of the program is hampered by lack of funds. The committee recommends that, although not all LLPs necessarily must have academic programs, as a general policy the University should encourage a more active intellectual role for these projects. However, formal courses should be discouraged.

3. Although the present LLPs appear to be successful and to fulfill needs shared by many faculty and students, there is a need for alternative living-learning models that will fulfill the needs of the entire undergraduate body. Not all students desire to live in a structured environment; they must not be made to be second-class citizens. This is especially important since a large part of the housing facilities in the Quad is being turned over to LLPs.

4. A formal mechanism for evaluating ideas for new programs and for setting up new programs is required. The present LLPs have exploited certain obvious themes or living modes. While successful, a large part of this success may be attributable to dedicated faculty and students with a desire to succeed. The same programs in the hands of less dedicated participants or in the case of unregulated growth might be failures. Certainly, no program should be set up without the guarantee that a sufficient reservoir of dedicated masters exists during the incipient phase of the program.

5. There seems to be a problem with involving younger members of the faculty in LLPs. Younger faculty with small children do not easily fit in the typical residential environment without considerable sacrifice. However, the committee feels that exposure to such faculty would be a valuable adjunct of the programs, and some mechanism for allowing greater involvement of younger faculty is necessary. Of particular importance is the academic question of crediting younger faculty with the time spent in the program, time which would be taken from their individual academic career development.

6. The experience of common dining was universally acclaimed by those groups in which it was a formal part of the program. In some cases, such as the arts program, where there is a great deal of other communal activity, and in DuBois, where the facilities include individual cooking facilities and the nature of the program fosters greater commonality, the lack of common dining was not felt strongly. However, as a general consideration, the Committee feels that common dining is a valuable adjunct of these programs and should be included wherever possible.

However, the cost must also be considered; since the students must purchase meal tickets, which are ever increasing in cost, we must find a mechanism to guard against the LLP with dining selecting only those students who can afford meal tickets.

7. The Committee strongly endorses the concept of live-in faculty for LLPs and in a sufficiently low ratio so that students can benefit from this contact. In general, the house master should also be a live-in faculty member.

8. The question of a theme (or none) for a house program is a difficult one and, in keeping with the idea of alternative living models, thematic houses should not be allowed to become the only mode of further LLP development. In certain cases, a house may fulfill a specific social or psychological need of a group of students as, for example, in the DuBois program, where a significant group of black students felt that the house program afforded a temporary refuge and opportunity for adjustment to life at the University which was a considerable change from their previous environment. While the committee does not encourage the proliferation of such minority programs, it recognizes the motivations behind them and the fact that such programs can lead to academic adjustments and success for students who otherwise would be in trouble.

9. With regard to cost, it is apparent that the major cost item in most programs is the provision of residence for live-in faculty. Costs range from a few dollars per student to about \$250 above normal expenditure. When viewed from the point of view of fractions of a course unit tuition, these expenditures are relatively minor, given the benefits observed. However, because of the large numbers of students involved, even a small increase per capita in operating budgets would represent a large investment by the University. The committee feels that such expenditure should be encouraged.

10. A number of potential and existing problems arose in the committee's evaluation which are all related; these are (a) what to do with the Quad; (b) Hill House; and (c) freshmen. There is a strong feeling by some Committee members that freshmen should share a common living experience and that because of changes in the nature of the Quad and Hill this opportunity is no longer available, and that the High Rise experience is not suitable for most freshmen. The problems at Hill are involved with this question plus the specific nature of Hill with small rooms and a very large student-to-faculty ratio, making it impossible for the type of interaction found, for instance, in Stouffer or Van Pelt. With regard to these problems, the Committee proposes that (a) a significant fraction of the new houses in the renovated Quad be dedicated to specific freshman programs; (b) if having freshmen living in the High Rises is still necessary, specific freshman programs be developed for those students; and (c) non-LLP places for freshmen be provided that are not High Rise.

11. While there were some differences in governance of the various LLPs and in choosing faculty and students, generally operations are smooth and are facilitated by the Council of Masters, which meets regularly. The personnel involved in the LLPs evidenced a feeling of overinvestigation, reflecting the number of groups from the administration and Senate which have looked into LLPs in recent years. This is as it should be, given the novelty and experimental nature of LLPs at Penn. Indeed, the committee feels that there should be a formal mechanism set up for the evaluation of the LLPs, review of overall goals and of goals of specific programs.

In summary, the committee was impressed by the overall quality of these programs and considers that they fulfill a definite role in the intellectual and social development of the undergraduate.

Houston A. Baker (English)
Paul Barron (business law)
Howard Brody (physics)
Frank F. Furstenberg (sociology)
Jeanne Krochalis (English)
Mitchell Litt (engineering), chairman
Lee D. Peachey (biology) (fall term)

Ex officio

Ralph D. Amado, Senate Chairman

Robert F. Lucid, Senate Chairman-elect.

On Discontinuation of Faculty for 'Just Cause'

An Agenda Item for the Senate Meeting November 17, 1976

In a memo dated 17 December 1975, Phoebe S. Leboy, who chairs the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, transmitted the following pages to the then chairman of the Senate. She noted that her committee proposed the revisions indicated on the pages pertaining to procedures for suspension or removal of a faculty member for just cause. The pages are from the document "Procedures Relating to Academic Tenure at the University of Pennsylvania" approved by the Trustees October 1959, with new material underlined.—Robert F. Lucid
Chairman of the Faculty Senate*

Procedures Relating to Academic Tenure at the University of Pennsylvania

A. The Statutes of the Corporation (revised January 16, 1959), Articles VIII and IX, set forth the basis for granting continuous appointment and outline the procedure for suspension or removal.

B. The University Manual of Policies and Procedures, Vol. 1 (pp. 1-C-13, 14)-(1957) includes a statement on the practice of the University in recognizing tenure.

C. This Statement on Procedures is in the following parts:

- (1) Definitions;
- (2) Suspension or removal for just cause;
- (3) Removal by reason of financial exigency;
- (4) Decreases in salaries;
- (5) Financial obligations of the University in the case of
 - (a) Death
 - (b) Illness
 - (c) Excessive absenteeism
 - (d) Individuals employed partly on contracts;
- (6) Miscellaneous provisions

(1) **Definitions.** As used in this Statement of Procedures:

- (a) "Administration" shall mean the President, Provost or other relevant executive officers of the University.
- (b) "Board" shall mean the Executive Board of the Trustees of the full Board of Trustees (at the discretion of the Chairman). Appeals from faculty members shall be addressed to the Chairman of the Trustees.
- (c) "Committee" shall mean the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility elected by a faculty, except that in section 3, "Committee" shall mean either a faculty's or the Senate's Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, as indicated by the context.
- (d) "Complainant" shall mean either a member of the University Administration (as specified in paragraph (2) (c) below) or a Group for Complaint (elected in accordance with paragraph (2) (d) below).
- (e) "Counsel" shall mean either an attorney-at-law or a non-lawyer adviser (either a colleague of the Faculty Member or otherwise) chosen by the party.
- (f) "Dean" shall mean the dean or director of a faculty.
- (g) "Statutes" shall mean the Statutes of the Corporation, as revised January 16, 1959.
- (h) "Faculty Member" shall mean a member of the instructional or research staff who holds tenure or an appointment for a term.
- (i) "Just cause" for suspension or removal shall mean either (i) inability or refusal of a Faculty Member to perform his or her academic obligations or (ii) such flagrant disregard of University rules or procedures as to warrant removal or suspension. Just cause shall not be found unless the acts or omissions in question would be considered just cause for removal or suspension by the overwhelming weight of faculty opinion at this and comparable universities.

*Italicized here. Brackets [] indicate deletions.—Ed.

(2) Suspension or Removal for Just Cause.

(a) Each faculty shall elect a standing Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, to consist of not less than three members, which shall represent the faculty in proceedings relating to suspension or removal. The Committee shall be elected annually; at least one third of the members shall be ineligible to succeed themselves as members of the Committee for a period of one year. The faculty shall also elect one alternate member to serve in the event of the resignation or disqualification of a member of the Committee. The Committee shall elect its own Chairman. In order to insure the continuous existence of the Committee, the members of the Committee shall hold office until new members are elected. The Dean shall report to the Provost, not later than October 15 of each year, that a Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility is in existence in his faculty and that its membership is complete.

(b) Action to suspend or remove a Faculty Member shall be prosecuted by either:

- (i) a member of the University Administration, who shall normally be the Dean responsible for the budget in which the Faculty Member is carried (or, if the Faculty Member is carried in more than one budget, the Dean named by the President after consultation with the Deans concerned) but who may, in unusual circumstances, be the President; or
 - (ii) a Group for Complaint, elected and acting under the circumstances described in paragraph (2) (d) below.
- The Dean and the President may act personally or through a delegate.
- (c) Should a question arise concerning the possible suspension or removal of a Faculty Member, the Dean or the President will normally interview the Faculty Member in the presence of the department chairman concerned, if any, and will afford opportunity for informal adjustment of the matter. Thereafter, the Dean or the President may initiate proceedings for suspension or removal if:

- (i) the matter is not adjusted informally;
 - (ii) he has conducted an investigation of the matter; and
 - (iii) he has consulted with members of the faculty concerned (other than members of the Committee) to aid him in determining whether there is substantial reason to believe that just cause exists for suspension or removal.
- (d) If a faculty has by resolution requested its Dean to examine into a question concerning the possible suspension or removal of a Faculty Member and, within two months following the date such resolution was adopted:
- (i) the Dean has not initiated proceedings for suspension or removal and neither another Dean nor the President has initiated such proceedings;
 - (ii) the Dean either has not reported to the faculty on the matter or has reported that proceedings for suspension or removal will not be initiated; and
 - (iii) the reasons, if any, given by the Dean for not initiating such proceedings are not deemed satisfactory by the faculty, the faculty may elect from its own members a Group for Complaint which, by the fact of its election, shall be empowered to take action for suspension or removal pursuant to these procedures. Members of the faculty's Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility shall withdraw from faculty meetings when the foregoing matters are considered and shall not be eligible for membership on a Group for Complaint. The Group shall conduct an investigation of the question of possible suspension or removal and may initiate proceedings for suspension or removal if it determines that there is substantial reason to believe that just cause exists therefor. A determination by the Group not to initiate

proceedings shall be reported to the faculty, with the Group's reasons for making such determination, and no further action shall be taken by the faculty.

(e) A Faculty Member shall not be suspended during proceedings involving him unless immediate harm to himself or others is threatened by his continuance. Any such suspension shall be with salary.

(f) If it is determined that action should be taken for suspension (other than suspension referred to in paragraph (2) (e) above) or for removal, the Complainant shall send to the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility of the faculty concerned a written statement which sets forth in as much detail as is practicable the grounds for the proposed suspension or removal. The Committee shall immediately consider the statement. In the process of arriving at its conclusion at this stage of the proceedings, the Committee shall afford the Complainant opportunity to present oral and written argument, but shall not hold a hearing to receive evidence. If the Committee concludes that the grounds stated, if true, would not constitute just cause for suspension or removal, it shall so report in writing and shall send to the Complainant a copy of its report. The Complainant may appeal to the faculty concerned; if the Complainant does not appeal or the faculty affirms the Committee's conclusion, the proceedings against the Faculty Member shall be discontinued. If the Committee, or the faculty on appeal from the Committee, concludes that the grounds stated, if true, might constitute just cause for suspension or removal, the Committee shall conduct further proceedings as hereinafter provided.

(g) Whenever further proceedings are taken, the Committee shall send to the Faculty Member:

(i) a copy of the Complainant's statement of the grounds for suspension or removal;

(ii) written notice that the Faculty Member may request a hearing before the Committee by submitting such request in writing to the Chairman of the Committee within 30 days from the Faculty Member's receipt of such notice;

(iii) a summary statement of the evidence proposed to be presented by the Complainant, a list of witnesses to be called by the Complainant and copies of extracts from the Statutes of the Corporation, the Manual of Policies and Procedures and other University documents relevant to the Faculty Member's procedural rights in the matter, all of which shall have been supplied by the Complainant to the Committee for that purpose.

(h) If the Faculty Member does not request a hearing before the Committee, the Complainant shall nevertheless present its testimony to the Committee. The Faculty Member's failure to request a hearing before the Committee shall be a waiver of his right to appeal to the faculty pursuant to paragraph (2) (m) below and to request the hearing before the Board provided by Article IX of the Statutes. The Committee shall make a written report of its findings, recommendations and reasons therefor and shall send a copy of its report and a transcript of the testimony to the Complainant and the Faculty Member. If the Committee concludes that the Complainant has not shown [convincing evidence of] *beyond a reasonable doubt* just cause for suspension or removal, the Complainant may appeal to the faculty concerned; if the Complainant does not appeal or the faculty affirms the Committee's conclusion, the action against the Faculty Member shall be discontinued. If the Committee, or the faculty on appeal by the Complainant, concludes that the Complainant has shown [convincing evidence of] just cause for suspension or removal *beyond a reasonable doubt*, the Committee shall send to the Board (through administrative channels) a transcript of the testimony and a copy of its report and the faculty shall similarly send to the Board a record of the faculty's action, if any.

(i) If the Faculty Member requests a hearing before the Committee, he shall accompany his request with a written answer to the Complainant's statement of the grounds for the proposed suspension or removal. Following receipt of the Faculty Member's request for a hearing, the Chairman of the Committee shall notify the parties in writing of the date and place of the hearing, which shall be held not less than three weeks from the date the Chairman shall send to the parties notice of such date and place.

(j) The Faculty Member and the Complainant shall be entitled to move to disqualify, for prejudice, any member of the Committee. Such motion shall be made in writing, which shall set forth the reasons therefor and shall be delivered to the Chairman of the Committee not later than 10 days prior to the date set for the hearing. Such motion shall be decided by the remaining members of the Committee. If the remaining members decide that disqualification is proper, an alternate member, if any, shall serve as a substitute for the disqualified member. If an alternate member is not available, the Faculty Member and the Complainant may agree that the

hearing shall be held by the remaining members or that the remaining members shall select a substitute. In the event of failure so to agree, a substitute shall be elected by the faculty.

(k) If a hearing is held at the request of the Faculty Member, it shall be private except that (i) the Faculty Member shall have the right to invite as observers representatives of national professional academic associations concerned with matters of academic freedom and tenure and (ii) other observers may be invited to attend the hearing if the parties mutually consent to such invitation and (iii) *a member of the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility shall attend as an observer*. A transcript of the hearing shall be kept by a stenographer furnished by the University. The Complainant shall have the burden of proving [by a preponderance of the evidence] *beyond a reasonable doubt* that there is just cause for suspension or removal of the Faculty Member. Both the Faculty Member and the Complainant may appear personally throughout the hearing; both may have the assistance of counsel. The Faculty Member shall have the right to be confronted by the witnesses against him and to question the witnesses personally or through counsel. He may call witnesses on his own behalf and shall receive the assistance of the University Administration in securing the attendance of witnesses on his behalf. The Committee shall afford the Faculty Members and the Complainant opportunity to present oral and written argument.

(l) After the hearing the Committee shall deliberate privately, *except that members of the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility shall attend as observers*. The Committee shall determine solely on the basis of the information adduced at the hearing whether or not the Complainant has established, [by a preponderance of the evidence] *beyond a reasonable doubt*, that there is just cause for suspension or removal. The Committee shall decide the matter as promptly as possible and shall send to the Complainant and the Faculty Member a transcript of the proceedings and a copy of its report, in which it shall set forth its findings, recommendations and reasons therefor.

(m) Either the Faculty Member or the Complainant may appeal to the faculty concerned; the Faculty Member's failure to appeal shall not be a waiver of his right to request the hearing before the Board provided by paragraph (2) (n) below and by Article IX of the Statutes. The Faculty Member or the Complainant may initiate such appeal by sending to the secretary or the faculty, within 30 days of his receipt of the Committee's report, a written request that the faculty review the decision of the Committee. The Dean shall call a meeting of the faculty for this purpose, to be held within 15 days following the secretary's receipt of the Faculty Member's request. The Committee shall submit to the faculty, in advance of the meeting, the transcript of the proceedings and its report, which shall be available to all members of the faculty and to all parties in interest. If he so desires, the Faculty Member may submit to the faculty a written counterstatement in advance of the meeting. Both the Faculty Member and the Complainant may appear personally at the faculty meeting; both may have the assistance of counsel. The Chairman of the Committee shall read the Committee's report of its findings, recommendations and reasons; the Faculty Member may read his counterstatement. Both parties may make oral statements. The Faculty Member, Complainant and Committee shall then withdraw and the faculty shall, *through secret ballot*, vote to affirm, reverse or modify the findings or recommendations of the Committee. The faculty shall decide the matter solely on the basis of the information adduced at the hearing before the Committee and the statements of the parties at the faculty meeting. *Faculty action recommending suspension or removal shall be taken only if the faculty finds just cause beyond a reasonable doubt and then only with the concurrence of two-thirds of the faculty concerned, in the case of faculties having two hundred members or fewer, or with the concurrence of a majority of the faculty concerned (but in no event fewer than 134 members), in the case of faculties having more than two hundred members. Failure to achieve the required vote to remove or suspend shall be deemed a vote not to remove or suspend.* If the faculty votes to reverse or modify the findings or recommendations of the Committee, it shall adopt a resolution setting forth its reasons for such reversal or modification. In all cases, the faculty shall promptly send to the Faculty Member a record of its action, including a copy of any such resolution of reversal or modification. If the Committee concludes that the Faculty Member should not be suspended or removed and there is no appeal to the faculty, or if the faculty so concludes on appeal from the Committee, the proceedings shall be discontinued. If the Committee concludes that the Faculty Member should be suspended or removed and there is no appeal to the faculty, or if the faculty so concludes on appeal from the Committee, the Committee shall send to the Board (through administrative channels) a transcript of the proceedings and a copy of its report and the faculty shall similarly send to the Board a record of the

faculty's action, if any.

(n) The Faculty Member may appeal to the Board directly from the report of the Committee unless an appeal has been taken to the faculty, in which case the Faculty Member may appeal on one or more of the following grounds: (i) that there has been a defect of procedure, (ii) that the Complainant has failed to prove, [by a preponderance of the evidence] *beyond a reasonable doubt*, the existence of just cause, (iii) that the term "just cause" [as used in Article IX of the Statutes,] has been misinterpreted and (iv) that the recommended sanction is unreasonably severe under the circumstances. The Faculty Member may initiate such appeal by sending to the Secretary of the University, within 30 days following his receipt of the Committee's report (or, if an appeal has been taken to the faculty, within 30 days following the date on which he was notified in writing of the faculty's action on the appeal), a written request that he be accorded the hearing before the Board provided by Article IX of the Statutes. The Board shall then afford the Faculty Member, the Complainant and the Committee opportunity to appeal personally before it and to present oral and written statements. The Faculty Member and the Complainant may have the assistance of counsel.

(o) Whenever a Committee or a faculty shall recommend suspension or removal of a Faculty Member (see paragraphs (2) (h) and (2) (m)), and whether or not the Faculty Member has appealed to the Board, the Board shall take action to suspend or remove the Faculty Member solely on the basis of the information set forth in the transcript of the proceedings, the report of the Committee, the statement of faculty action, if any, and statements of the parties at the hearing, if any, before the Board. The Board shall decide whether or not (i) there has been a defect of procedure; (ii) the Complainant has failed to prove, [by a preponderance of the evidence] *beyond a reasonable doubt*, the existence of just cause, (iii) the term "just cause" [as used in Article IX of the Statutes,] has been misinterpreted or (iv) the recommended sanction is unreasonably severe under the circumstances. The Board may direct that the proceedings be discontinued, may affirm the Committee's recommendations (unless the recommendations of the faculty on appeal shall differ from those of the Committee, in which case it may affirm the faculty's recommendations), may substitute suspension for a recommended removal or may reduce the period of a recommended suspension. If the Board decides that additional evidence should be received or that further proceedings are otherwise required, it shall remand the matter to the Committee. In that event the Committee may receive additional evidence, shall send the parties written notice of hearings at least one week before they are to be held and shall accord the parties and procedural rights provided in paragraph (2) (k) above. The parties may again appeal to the faculty and the Faculty Member may appeal to the Board as provided above. The Board shall furnish all parties in interest with copies of a report of its decision, in which it shall set forth its reasons therefor.

(p) A Faculty Member's salary shall be continued for one year from the date of his receipt of notification by the Board that he has been removed or, if the Faculty Member holds an appointment for a term which ends in less than one year from the date of his receipt of such notification, his salary shall be continued until the end of his term of appointment [unless, in either case, the Committee shall find that the Faculty Member has engaged in such gross personal misconduct as unfits him for association with students and shall include in its report a recommendation either that his salary be terminated immediately upon his receipt of notification or removal or that it be continued for some stated period less than the period stated above].

(q) A decision by the Board made pursuant to these procedures shall be final within the University.

(r) Public statements about proceedings under this section and under section (3), below, by persons within the University, whether parties to the proceedings or otherwise, should be avoided until the proceedings have been completed.

(s) *The Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility shall act as an observer at all stages of proceedings to remove or suspend a faculty member for just cause and may communicate its views on procedure or substance to the faculty or the Board.*

1975-76 Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility

Paul Bender (Law)

Adelaide Delluva (animal biology)

Murray Gerstenhaber (mathematics)

Henry Hiz (linguistics)

Phoebe S. Leboy (biochemistry/Dental), chairman

Iraj Zandi (civil engineering)

Ex officio

Robert F. Lucid, Senate Chairman-Elect

GRANT DEADLINES

Listed below are upcoming deadlines and some new programs. Additional information on sources of support is available in the Office of Research Administration, 409 Franklin Building.

—Anthony Merrit

HEW-PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

New Programs

Young Investigator Research Grant: National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases—Independent original research projects in immunology and virology with clinical relevance. Applications due November 1, March 1 & July 1. For further information call (301) 496-7820.

Special Grants for New Investigators in Anesthesiology: Contact Dr. Elizabeth M. O'Hern (301) 496-7168—National Institute of General Medical Sciences.

Special Visual Sciences Research Awards: National Eye Institute. Contact Scientific Programs Branch (301) 496-5303.

Deadlines

Nov. 1 New Supplemental Research Grants.

Feb. 1 Renewal Research Grants

National Research Service Awards for *Individual Post-doctoral Fellows*

Research Career Development Awards

Mar. 1 New and Supplemental Research Grants

Applications forms for all of above programs are available at ORA.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

New Programs

The Division of Environmental Biology announces establishment of a program in Population Biology and Physiological Ecology. Contact Dr. John Wright (202)632-5846 or Dr. Frances James (202)632-7324.

The Division of Advanced Energy and Resources Research and Technology (RANN) has established a program of research and development in Nonrenewable Resources with emphasis on non-fuel minerals. Contact Dr. Tapan Mukherjee (202)632-5726.

Deadlines

Nov. 15 Unsolicited proposals for Developmental and Regulatory Biology Program

19 Women in Science

29 NATO Postdoctoral Fellowships in Science

Dec. 1 Unsolicited proposals for Genetic Biology Program

1 Graduate Fellowships for 1977-78

1 Engineering Research Initiation Grants

1 Specialized Research Equipment for Biological Sciences

1 Student Originated Studies

3 Comprehensive Assistance to Undergraduate Science Education (CAUSE)

3 National Needs Postdoctoral Fellowships

4 Undergraduate Instructional Scientific Equipment Program (*Revised deadline*)

10 Research Initiation and Support (RIAS) Program

15 Scientists and Engineers in Economic Development (SEED) Program

31 Alan T. Waterman Award Nominations

Jan. 1 U.S.—Australia Cooperative Science Programs (Seminars)

3 National Needs Graduate Traineeships

7 Science Faculty Professional Development Program

Feb. 4 Instructional Scientific Equipment Program

COUNCIL FOR INT'L EXCHANGE OF SCHOLARS

Advanced Research in India 1977-78—Support of postdoctoral scholarly and professional (law, medicine, architecture, social work) research. Request application forms from the Council, 11 DuPont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 833-4980.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Department of Transportation

Dec. 1 Program of University Research. Brochure available, ORA.

Two Scenarios for Academic Computing: The Time is for Decision

by Jean Crockett

The sharply declining trends in computer use for teaching and research at the University were described in an article last spring (*Almanac*, May 4, 1976). Outside of Wharton, which maintained its expenditure level, purchases from UNI-COLL—our major external supplier—fell from over \$600,000 for internally funded academic purposes in the fiscal year 1973-74 to under \$300,000 last year, with further decreases budgeted for the current year. Since prices have risen, this decline understates the reduction that has occurred in the quantity of this basic academic input made available to students and faculty.

Over the summer there have been two crucial changes in the situation. The Wharton School, which previously purchased from UNI-COLL about half of the capacity of a DEC-10 on a fixed-cost basis, has now acquired that computer. The College of Engineering and Applied Science, generously aided by a development campaign gift from Sperry Rand, has arranged to acquire a UNIVAC 90/70 to replace its present, much smaller machine. As a result of these developments, these two schools will have the capability to meet their own computer needs for teaching and research in an adequate way at a cost reasonably close to what they can afford. In an environment without central University support of academic computing and without access to a low cost external source of supply, they have found a way to stem the negative trends in usage and have set the stage for a phase of renewed growth.

These events have exacerbated the crisis for the remainder of the University. A division of interest has been created between those with convenient access, at low unit cost, to an adequate facility under their own control and those without such access—between the “haves” and the “have nots.” In addition to Engineering and Wharton, the first group includes research users in the Medical School, which maintains a DEC-10, and in Rittenhouse, which houses an IBM 360/65 owned by ERDA and extensively utilized for contract research in high energy physics while serving other research purposes as well. The two latter machines are not so configured and staffed as to be suitable for student use in large volume.

What scenario does the momentum of events suggest? In the new situation, Wharton and Engineering will receive relatively little benefit from the high-speed terminals or from the University-wide coordination that was intended to be the function of the Office of Computing Activities (OCA). Since these schools have dug deeply into their financial resources to develop their own capability, it is not entirely equitable that they be taxed, in addition, for support of central facilities that primarily serve other parts of the University.

With declining demand from Wharton and Engineering, the high-speed terminal network cannot be expected to reach an

operating level sufficient to justify the cost of its continuation beyond the current year. But in most of FAS and in other “have not” schools, computer use is largely dependent on the terminals. Without them, the prospect in these parts of the University is for a decline in use from a clearly inadequate level to something close to zero.

One alternative open to FAS, and perhaps the best available in this environment, is to develop its own internal capability to the extent that its limited resources permit. It would be at a substantial disadvantage in attempting to do so. FAS does not enjoy the relatively favorable balance of earnings and costs that permitted Wharton to direct additional resources into computing. Nor does it share Engineering's ability to attract a large gift designated for computer support. With its best efforts FAS probably cannot meet its computer needs adequately, and to meet them at all will entail a considerable drain of resources. Distinguished departments with a strong computer orientation, such as economics, inevitably stand to lose much of their ability to attract both external research funds and graduate students of superior quality.

This scenario amounts to Balkanization. The predictable outcome is unfortunate in several respects: (1) a lopsided distribution of computer use across the University, with students inadequately served outside of Wharton and Engineering; (2) abandonment of the great potential inherent in the University-wide network of computer communications that is now largely completed; and (3) a wasteful duplication of facilities, with the University as a whole paying more for less computing than it could have achieved under a more coordinated approach.

There is an alternative scenario that deserves the University's prompt and serious consideration. It would require a reorientation of computer policy in the following directions:

1. *Source of Funding.* The University has moved from a policy of very strong centralization in the financial support of computing to one of almost complete decentralization. Both have proved highly unsatisfactory, although in different ways. My proposal is that the costs of academic computing be shared in a particular way between the central administration and the responsibility centers, with the latter maintaining their freedom of action and continuing to provide most of the resources. What we need to do is not to abandon free enterprise but to create incentives for suppliers and users to behave in ways that serve the general interest. Any input of University funds should be directed toward the development of such incentives.

2. *Application of Centrally Supplied Funds.* The underlying principle of University support should be to insure that a reasonably broad spectrum of basic services is made available to internally-funded users in substantial amounts at costs sufficiently

low to attract widespread use. The particular job categories that might be eligible for such support include, for example, WATFIV or some close substitute, interactive student jobs, and standard statistical packages frequently used in research. The last would be of particular value to Ph.D. candidates and junior faculty undertaking investigations for which external funding is not available.

It is in the area of relatively simple standardized jobs for research that the most severe decline in computer expenditures has occurred and academic quality has been compromised. It is here that the infusion of central funds is needed and justified. Non-standard jobs and fast turnaround, on the other hand, are inherently expensive types of service. The full service capabilities of UNI-COLL are available to projects with such requirements and with the corresponding ability to pay. These users have been and undoubtedly will continue to be UNI-COLL customers. By and large they are externally funded, and subsidization of their specialized and high cost needs by the University does not seem to be appropriate under current financial constraints.

The use of central funds in support of basic services for students and unfunded research would take two forms. One obvious approach would be to determine the most cost-effective source available for each of the selected job categories and to subsidize purchases from that source on a matching funds basis. In addition to the educational purpose served, such a subsidy would serve to stretch the purchasing power of the University's computer dollar by giving users a much stronger incentive to direct their jobs to the suppliers that can handle them most efficiently. In the present free market situation, the saving to an individual user may be too small to warrant the inconvenience and expense of comparison shopping or of shifting to a lower cost supplier; but the cumulative saving across the University of cost-effective assignment of jobs could be quite substantial.

A second highly desirable use of central funds would involve matching grants to aid the four campus installations in financing expenditures for hardware or services that would enable them to increase the effectiveness of their existing capacity. Low-cost operation in this capital intensive business is conditional upon reasonably full utilization of capacity. In return for and in proportion to the funds advanced, the recipient facility would make computing resources for the selected job categories available for general University purposes. OCA would administer the grant program, evaluate requests for grants, negotiate the kinds of services that could most usefully and conveniently be provided in exchange for grants, and allocate these services (or sell them at a low price) for internally funded academic uses. Thus each dollar of central support would serve a double purpose. It would serve the interests of the "haves" by enabling them to offer improved services to their students and faculty. It would serve the interests of the "have nots" by providing them with a very low-cost source of machine resources.

A number of potential uses for the matching grants are already visible. Any subvention required by CEAS to meet the acquisition costs of the 90/70 could be supplied through such a grant, with computer time for general University purposes made available in exchange. Auxiliary equipment is likely to be required for the Wharton DEC-10, now oriented primarily to student use, if it is to serve the School's research needs. FAS may wish to contribute hardware that would permit it to make wider use of the Rittenhouse machine. Thus a modest amount of seed money could serve to strengthen the University's computing capability in significant ways and at the same time contribute substantially to the ability of FAS and other schools to meet their computer needs within the limits of their financial resources.

3. *The Terminal Network.* Under this scenario, the communications network would be retained and a step forward would be taken in the long-range plan for its development. In order that the expanded volume of computer services provided for above can be made conveniently available to a wide spectrum of potential users, there should be a number of locations on campus at which it

is possible to communicate with UNI-COLL and with any of the University installations. This capability was part of the original design of the system, but only the connections to UNI-COLL and those between Dietrich and Vance are reliably in place.

The completion of the communications system would carry other substantial advantages. It would greatly facilitate the flow of particular jobs to the machines best able to handle them even when no University subsidy is involved. By extending connections into the residences, it would facilitate late night use by students, particularly when assignments in the large computer courses generate peak-load problems. For a relatively small investment, user convenience and flexibility would be greatly enhanced and some economies would be achieved.

4. *Documentation and Consulting.* If the various computer facilities are all to serve in some degree as a general University resource, it is highly desirable that documentation be maintained for each machine and be centrally accessible. This is a natural function for OCA. Coordination of consulting activities through OCA is also essential under this plan; needless to say, consulting for UNI-COLL users should be centered at OCA. In addition, there may be economies of scale in supplying certain kinds of high-priced services through OCA. The individual installations probably cannot each afford a first-rate statistical consultant, but it might well be cost effective to have one available for the University at large.

5. *New Acquisitions of Hardware.* One of the dangers of free enterprise within a nonprofit institution lies in the tendency toward unnecessary duplication of facilities. New hardware acquisitions should not occur without a review that considers the overall requirements and existing capabilities of the University. Such a review is, and should remain, a function of OCA.

6. *Minicomputers.* A more supportive role in the minicomputer field is to be recommended, with attention to limited technical and consulting services.

7. *Continuity of Policy.* Because lead times are long, neither courses nor research projects requiring significant computer use can flourish without the assurance of continued access to the required service at an acceptable and predictable cost. To be successful, a computer policy for the University should carry at least a three-year commitment by the central administration, with some flexibility in the time pattern of central funding over that period. Such a three-year plan, embodying the principles outlined above, has been sent to the Computer Policy Committee for its advice before submission to the Provost.

ORGANIZING THE COMPUTER COMMITTEE

Vice-Provost Donald Langenberg is completing the organization of a single University Computer Committee to replace last year's experiment in dual structure (one for policy and one for usage).

The joint faculty/administration committee will have the authority to "dispose as well as propose" in developing a coherent University-wide policy on computing. The committee composition and its charge grew out of recommendations made by an ad hoc committee organized by Dr. Jean Crockett, who has been serving as Director of Computing Activities on an acting basis.

With Dr. Langenberg on the new committee will be two members designated by the Faculty Senate (Drs. Lee Benson and Warren Seider) and four representatives who head their own schools' computing policy committees: Dr. Aravan Joshi for Engineering, Dr. John Lubin for Wharton, Dr. Martin Pring for Medicine and Dr. Walter Wales for FAS.

The charge of the new committee will be twofold: (1) the review and redefinition of University computing policy, including the organization and function of the Office of Computing Activities and of its director; and (2) the establishment of a search committee for a new director of computing activities.

When Winter Comes . . .

How well is the Energy Conservation Program working?

One figure tells the story: consumption was reduced by four percent last year.

In other words, the multimillion-dollar energy bill for 1975-76 would have been more than \$245,000 higher if not for the efforts of the faculty, staff and students in keeping consumption down.

Some of the savings were achieved by people whose jobs it is to do that kind of thing: making structural changes, installing monitoring devices, replacing bad insulation, or taking out every other fluorescent bulb in offices and corridors.

But much of the reduction came from everyday acts of people who might be called "energy volunteers." They turned off lights and typewriters and coffee pots when these weren't in use . . . they scheduled big energy-hungry jobs early and late in the day to avoid peak-load hours . . . they wore sweaters in the office during the winter and stripped down to the limit of decency for the summer. They reported what they saw in their buildings that could be eliminated or cut down.

The Energy Conservation Program is still going on. Because weather is variable and even rates are variable (pegged to those peak-load hours), the drain that energy costs can make on Penn's unrestricted funds remains one of the great unpredictables.

The Budget Office can project and pray in the fall, but when winter comes the cold facts have been known to set the Office to freezing raises and swearing instead. Thus everyone who controls even a few square feet of University space has part of the University's budget outcome in his or her hands.

The Energy Office is starting its winter push to control energy costs by controlling energy use. Among other things, the Office has identified three separate levels of activity and planned temperature levels to match. Below is the Energy Office's description of those periods and its plea for campus cooperation. A list of the University's building administrators, who have a key role in the Energy Conservation Program, begins at right.

I. NORMAL ACTIVITY PERIODS

November 1-November 24
November 29-December 22
January 17-March 12
March 21-April 15

During normal operating periods, we will follow recommended federal guidelines by maintaining temperature levels in occupied spaces within the range of $68^{\circ} \pm 3^{\circ}$. We want to emphasize that the mechanical systems in some buildings may impose real constraints on our ability to maintain these temperatures. Nevertheless, it is our goal to do so. When your building temperature deviates from this range, please contact your building administrator.

II. LOW ACTIVITY PERIODS

<i>November 24-November 29</i>	<i>Thanksgiving Recess</i>
<i>January 3-January 17</i>	<i>After Christmas Recess</i>
<i>March 12-March 21</i>	<i>Spring Recess</i>

Special building operating schedules will be developed for each low activity period to minimize unnecessary energy use. The Energy Office is working directly with all building administrators to design programs for their particular buildings.

III. CHRISTMAS RECESS

December 22-January 3

During this period, the University has the greatest opportunity for energy conservation, since a major portion of the University community will be off-campus. The Energy Office will again be working with each building administrator to establish special building operating schedules for this period.

Thank you again for your support. If you have any questions or comments on the general program, please contact the Energy Office of Operational Services at Ext. 4644.

BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS

For every building in the University there is at least one administrator or faculty member who has added the title of "building administrator" to his or her regular responsibilities. The administrators meet periodically as a Council, advisory to Vice-President for Operational Services Fred A. Shabel. They are charged to (1) monitor their own buildings for condition and smoothness of operation; (2) coordinate with the physical plant department for repairs and housekeeping; and (3) understand how such services as mail, parking, energy conservation and the like are carried on in their buildings. Any building not listed here is administered directly by Physical Plant; Betty Chaney in Mr. Shabel's office (Ext. 7241) updates the list and can answer questions.

Allied Medical Professions (School of), 3901 Pine St.—*Louise Glicksman*, 100 SAMP/H2

Anatomy/Chemistry, 3301 Spruce St.—*Joseph Bullock*, B-48 Med. Labs/G3

Annenberg Center & School, 3620 & 3680 Walnut St.—*Vernon Wattenberger*, 323 Annenberg Center/CT

Archives, North Arcade, Franklin Field—*Hamilton Elliott*, N. Arcade, Franklin Field

Bennett Hall, 34th & Walnut Sts.—*Phillip Ives*, 133 Bennett Hall/DI

Biology Building, 3800 Hamilton Walk—*Saul Katzman*, 210 Biology Bldg./G5

Biology Therapeutic Svcs. Labs., 3800 Hamilton Walk—*Saul Katzman*, 210 Biology Bldg./G5

Botanical Gardens & Greenhouse, Hamilton Walk—*Saul Katzman*, 210 Biology Bldg./G5

Caster Building (SSW), 3701 Locust Walk—*Jeanne Jensen*, 3701 Locust Walk/C3

Chemistry Complex, 3301 Spruce St.—*Robert Gelow*, 139 Chemistry Bldg./D5

Class of 1920 (First Level), 38th & Locust Streets—*William G. Petrick*, 3729 Locust Walk/CV

Class of 1920, (Lower Level)—*Frank Neithammer*, 3732 Locust Walk/CW

Class of '23 Ice Rink, 32nd & Walnut Sts.—*Bob Fink*, 32nd & Walnut Sts./P1

Class of '25 House, 3940 Locust Walk—*Carol Lazzaro*, 3940 Locust Walk/BD

College Hall, College Hall Circle—*Manuel Doxer*, 116 College Hall/CO

Colonial Penn Center, 3641 Locust Walk—*Audrey O'Brien*, 209 Colonial Penn Center/CE

David Rittenhouse Laboratory, 209 S. 33rd St.—*Jim Hobbs*, 106 DRL/EI

Dental Medicine (School of), 4001 Spruce St.—*Albert J. Mauriello*, Dental School/A1

Department of Community Medicine, 36th & Hamilton Walk—*Joseph Foglio*, Rm. 115, 36th & Hamilton Walk/GA

Dietrich Graduate Library, 201 S. 36th St.—*Charles Jenkins*, Van Pelt Library/CH

Duhring Wing (Furness)—*Manuel Doxer*, 116 College Hall/CO

Edison Building, 3221 Walnut St.—*Joseph Secor*, M54 Towne Bldg./D3

Education (Grad. School of), 3700 Walnut St.—*Peter Bent*, B-12 Education/C1

(continued)

BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS continued

Eisenlohr Annex, 3808 Walnut St.—*Dr. Howard Mitchell*, 301 W. Eisenlohr Annex/BF

Eisenlohr Hall, 3812 Walnut St.—*Dr. John E. Free*, 306 Eisenlohr Hall/B2

Environmental Studies Inst., 3400 Walnut St.—*Joseph Looby*, 104 Fine Arts/CJ

Faculty Club, 200 S. 36th St.—*James M. Lloyd*, Faculty Club/CD

Fels Center, 3814 Walnut St.—*Ada Katz*, Fels Center/B1

Fine Arts (School of), 210 S. 34th St.—*Joseph Looby*, 104 Fine Arts/CJ

Fine Arts Store (Lower Level, Furness), 230 S. 34th St.—*William G. Petrick*, 3729 Locust Walk/CV

Flower-Cook Observatory, RD #2, Malvern, Pa.—*Dr. William Blitzstein*, 4N 10 DRL/E1

Franklin Building & Annex, 3451 Walnut St.—*Arthur Hirsch*, 700 Franklin Bldg./I6

Furness Building, 230 S. 34th Street—*Joseph Looby*, 104 Fine Arts/CV

Gimbel Gymnasium, 37th & Walnut Sts.—*Robert Glascott*, Gimbel Gym/I1

Graduate Hospital, 19th & Lombard Streets—*Christopher D'Erasmus*, Graduate Hospital/X1

Harnwell House, 3820 Locust Walk—*Frank Allegra*, 3820 Locust Walk/B9

Harrison House, 3901 Spruce St.—*Candice Brung*, 3901 Spruce St./BB

Hayden Hall, 240 S. 33rd St.—*Henry Faul*, 264 Hayden Hall/D4

High Rise North, 3901 Locust Walk—*Stephen Miller*, 3901 Locust Walk/B8

Hill Hall (Lower Level), 33rd & Walnut St.—*Frank Neithammer*, 3732 Locust Walk/CW

Hill Hall Residence, 3333 Walnut St.—*Dr. Barbara Wiesel*, 3333 Walnut St./J1

Houston Hall, 3417 Spruce St.—*Thomas Hauber*, Houston Hall/CM

Houston Hall Snack Bar, 3417 Spruce St.—*Frank Neithammer*, 3732 Locust Walk/CW

Hutchinson Gymnasium, 220 S. 32nd St.—*Larry Lauchle*, Gym/E4

Irvine Auditorium, 3401 Spruce St.—*Anthony S. Coddling*, Houston Hall/CM

LRSM Building, 3231 Walnut St.—*D.S. Gelletich*, 110 LRSM Bldg./K1

Law School, 100 S. 34th St.—*Dr. Robert Maguire*, 101 Law School/I4

Law School Cafeteria, 100 S. 34th St.—*Frank Neithammer*, 3732 Locust Walk/CW

Law School Dormitories, 3428-32 Chestnut St.—*Stephen Miller*, 3901 Locust Walk/B8

Leidy Laboratories, 38th & Hamilton Walk—*Saul Katzman*, 210 Biology Bldg./G5

Levy Tennis Pavilion, 32nd & Walnut Sts.—*Al Molloy*, Weightman Hall/E7

Lippincott Building, 2429-41 Locust St.—*Bruce Jeffreys*, P-221 FBA/I6

Logan Hall, 249 S. 36th St.—*Paul Pitts*, Williams Hall/CU

Low Rise North, 3900 Walnut St.—*William Simm*, 3900 Walnut St./B7

MBA House, 3734 Locust Walk—*Vince Walters*, 111 Vance Hall/CS

Mayer Residence, 3817 Spruce St.—*Stephen Miller*, 3901 Locust Walk/B8

McNeil Building, 3718 Locust Walk—*Elizabeth Moran*, 126 McNeil Bldg./CR

Monell Chemical Center, 3500 Market St.—*Martin Bayersdorfer*, 3500 Market Street/TA

Moore School, 200 S. 33rd St.—*Dr. Harvey Garner*, 329 Moore/D2

Morgan (School of Nursing), 205 S. 34th St.—*Patrick Burke*, 100A Morgan Bldg./D7

Music Building, 201 S. 34th St.—*Dr. Lawrence Bernstein*, 204 Music Bldg./D8

New Bolton Center, RD #1, Kennett Square, Pa.—*Dr. Charles J. Hollister*, New Bolton Center/VI

Nichols House (Grad Tower B), 3650 Chestnut St.—*John Schaetzel*, 3650 Chestnut St./I9

Office of the Ombudsman, 3537 Locust Walk—*Val Gossman*, 3537 Locust Walk/CP

Palestra, 220 S. 32nd St.—*Robert Weinbauer*, Weightman Hall/E7

Psychology Office Building & Annex, 3815 Walnut St.—*Lucy Turner*, 3815 Walnut St./T3

Quadrangle, 37th & Spruce Sts.—*Russell Fulton*, 112 Bodine/G9

Ringe Squash Courts, 220 S. 32nd St.—*Al Molloy*, Weightman Hall/E7

E.F. Smith Hall, 215 S. 34th St.—*Marthenia Perrin*, 108 EFSH/D6

Stiteler Hall, 208 S. 37th St.—*to be named*

Stouffer Dining Commons, 38th & Spruce Sts.—*Frank Neithammer*, 3732 Locust Walk/CW

Stouffer Triangle, 320 S. University Ave. Ext.—*Mitch Wolf*, Stouffer, 3700 Spruce/G8

Tandem Accelerator Laboratory, 3216 Chancellor St.—*Charles T. Adams*, 2E5 DRL/E1

Towne Building (CEAS), 220 S. 33rd St.—*Joseph Secor*, M54 Towne Bldg./D3

University Museum, 3260 South St.—*Christopher B. Conyers*, 116 Museum/F1

University Press, 3933 Walnut St.—*Warren R. McGraw*, 3933 Walnut St./T8

Valley Forge Res. & Educ. Building, Howelville, Pa.—*Dr. Harvey L. Garner*, 329 Moore/D2

Vance Hall, 3733 Spruce St.—*Jeffrey Ferguson*, 107 Vance Hall/CS

Van Pelt House, 3909 Spruce St.—*Randy Miller*, Van Pelt House/BC

Van Pelt Library, 3420 Walnut St.—*Charles Jenkins*, Van Pelt Library/CH

Veterinary School & Hospital, 325 S. 39th St.—*Ann Kronfeld*, 104 Vet School/H1

Wayne Hall (WXPB), 3905 Spruce St.—*James S. Campbell*, 3905 Spruce St./BG

Weightman Hall, N., 235 S. 33rd St.—*Charles Scott*, Weightman Hall/E7

Weightman Hall, S., 235 S. 33rd St.—*Julie Staver*, Weightman Hall/E7

Williams Hall, 36th & Spruce Sts.—*Paul Pitts*, Williams Hall/CU

Parking Garages—*Hugh O'Doherty*, P-107 FBA/I6

Parking—Surface Lots—*Steven D. Murray*, P-107 FBA/I6

3533 Locust Walk—*Beryl Dean*, 3533 Locust Walk/CQ

3609 Locust Walk—*Marlane Creeden*, 3609 Locust Walk/C9

3611 Locust Walk—*Elizabeth Rappolt*, 838 Williams Hall/CU

3907 Pine St.—*Dr. Sidney Shore*, 113A Towne Bldg./D3

4015 Walnut St.—*John Losten*, P-221A FBA/I6

OPENINGS

The following listings are taken from the Personnel Office's bulletin of October 20. Dates in parentheses refer to the Almanac issue in which a complete job description appeared. The full list is made available weekly via bulletin boards and interoffice mail. Those interested should contact Personnel Services, Ext. 7285, for an interview appointment. Inquiries by present employees concerning job openings are treated confidentially.

The University of Pennsylvania is an equal opportunity employer. Qualified candidates who have completed at least six months of service in their current positions will be given consideration for promotion to open positions.

Where qualifications for a position are described in terms of formal education or training, significant prior experience in the same field may be substituted.

The two figures in salary listings show minimum starting salary and maximum starting salary (midpoint).

ADMINISTRATIVE/PROFESSIONAL

ACCOUNTANT I (2) (10-19-76).

ACCOUNTANT II (10-12-76).

ASSISTANT TO THE DIRECTOR answers inquiries from abroad and coordinates correspondence relating to admission requirements, procurement of visas, financial assistance, living quarters, permission to work, etc.; provides continuing liaison with governmental offices, private agencies, and University departments concerned with the assistance and administration of students; assumes responsibility for the accurate interpretation of immigration laws and University regulations to ensure full understanding of the terms of agreements entered into with alien students and employees; establishes and maintains necessary records; submits required reports; personal advising. *Qualifications:* Graduate from college; competence in one or more foreign languages desirable; skill in the area of human relations. One to three years of responsible educational or governmental administrative experience, preferably involving foreign relations, immigration regulations, or college admissions and/or registration work. \$9,100-\$12,275.

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR IV (10-19-76).

CAREER ADVISOR (9-20-76).

DIRECTOR OF CGS & SUMMER SCHOOL (9-14-76).

DIRECTOR OF RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (9-14-76).

DRAFTSMAN (9-14-76).

FACILITIES PLANNER (9-28-76).

LIBRARIAN II (9-14-76) with Arabic, Persian, Turkish

OFFICE MANAGER (9-14-76).

RESEARCH SPECIALIST III (10-19-76).

SECURITY SPECIALIST (9-14-76).

VOCATIONAL ADVISOR (10-12-76).

SUPPORT STAFF

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I (NEW YORK) (10-5-76).

CLERK III maintains records accurately, explains the rules and regulations of the requirements for a degree, General office work, contacts students, for various reasons, and departments in regard to grades. *Qualifications:* Accurate typing, knowledge of mimeograph and Xerox machines. Able to deal with large numbers of students and faculty tactfully; general office experience preferred. \$6,925-\$8,625.

CONTRACT ACCOUNTANT prepares journal entries on subsidiary and general ledger accounts, contract invoices on research agreements, and financial statements submitted to grant sponsors; analyzes subsidiary and general ledger accounts, files maintenance on subsidiary ledgers. *Qualifications:* Knowledge of the principles and procedures of fund accounting, federal regulations relating to research grants, and contracts is desirable. Completion of a certificate program in accounting at an accredited college or at least two years' experience with university fund accounting. \$7,475-\$9,350.

JUNIOR ACCOUNTANT (10-19-76).

LABORATORY COURSE PREPARATOR (10-19-76).

LICENSED PRACTICAL NURSE assists providers (M.D.s and nurses) with procedures; prepares patients for examination; organizes employee sick calls; performs electrocardiograms, tonometry, visual acuity testing, auditory acuity testing, venipunctures, etc. Arranges for delivery of specimens to the laboratory twice daily. Other duties as defined by the medical coordinator. *Qualifications:* Licensed Practical Nurse, two years' experience working with patients in a medical facility, demonstrated ability to perform the above tasks. \$7,525-\$9,400.

PROPERTY INSURANCE ASSISTANT stamps date received and determines category. Types letter and report statement concerning the loss, journals and transfers money from Insurance Reserve Fund to the budget of the department, etc. \$6,050-\$7,550.

PSYCHOLOGY TECHNICIAN I maintains psychologic testing records; collects, organizes, and files research data; tests patients, scores tests; verifies completion of all studies on patients, collects data; prepares data for completion of all studies on patients, collects data; prepares data for computer; prepares graphs and tables; library research; attendance at research meetings; other duties as required. *Qualifications:* Knowledge of Fortran; keypunch and typing ability. Baccalaureate in one of the social sciences. \$8,375-\$10,475.

RESEARCH BIBLIOGRAPHER I (10-19-76).

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN I assists two investigators in setting up and conducting newly activated experiments. One experiment involves working with rats and a small pressure chamber, the other, monkeys in a man-rated pressure chamber. *Qualifications:* Some experience working with animals. Experience with mechanical apparatus. \$6,575-\$8,225.

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN II (10-12-76).

LUCE SCHOLARS: A YEAR IN ASIA

Nominations are open for the 1977-78 Luce Scholars Program in Asia, but the campus deadline is soon: November 23, 1976.

The Henry Luce Foundation provides a stipend of \$9000 (plus \$2000 if a spouse accompanies the Scholar) and arranges internships or job placements in East or Southeast Asia for "an outstanding group of young Americans from fields other than Asian studies or international relations who would not otherwise expect to go there in the normal course of their careers." The Asia Society cooperates in Asian aspects of the program.

Nominees should have a strong, mature, and clearly defined career interest in a specific field (again, excluding Asian studies and international relations); a strong motivation and potential for accomplishment within that chosen career interest; a record of high academic achievement, particularly in the field of their specialized interest; evidence of an outstanding capacity for leadership, either on campus or off; and a more than usual openness to new ideas and a sensitivity to their fellow human beings. It seems clear that the Foundation hopes that in the future there will be a significant number of key people scattered throughout the country who are leaders in their fields—lawyers, doctors, educators, artists, legislators, journalists, labor leaders, bankers, scientists, businessmen, writers—and who will have the kind of knowledge of Asia that can come only from having lived there.

Nominees must be American citizens who, by September 1, 1977, will have a bachelor's degree and be no more than 27 years old. Nominees may be: current seniors or recent graduates; current or recent graduate students; or current faculty members. The competition is stiff: 59 other colleges and universities will be making nominations, and only about one in ten nominees will be chosen.

Additional details are available from the Office of International Programs. Any faculty member who wishes to nominate a student should contact the office promptly so that we can meet the Foundation's deadlines.

—James B. Yarnall, Office of International Programs
133 Bennett Hall/D1 (Ext. 4661)

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN III (7) (10-19-76).

SECRETARY II (6) (9-14-76).

SECRETARY III (2) (10-12-76).

SECRETARY IV types confidential letters and reports. Develops and maintains filing system for letters, manuals, and meeting minutes. Assesses requirements for, orders, and keeps account of supplies and materials used. Submits personnel action and time report forms to the Personnel Office. Helps to prepare and type departmental budgets; manages the petty cash fund for the department. *Qualifications:* Knowledge of accounting terminology, bookkeeping. Must be able to take shorthand. At least three years' office experience. Knowledge of University forms and procedures preferred. \$7,475-\$9,350.

SENIOR ADMISSIONS ASSISTANT responsible for Region II recruitment assistant (Pennsylvania, including small communities talent program and the twenty-school program) to the director and assistant director of this area. Correspondence; answering and routing; assisting with recruitment plans; preparation of materials, travel arrangements, and coordinating of these plans; preparation of materials, travel arrangements, and coordinating of these plans for staff, faculty, and schools. Supervision of temporary clerical and college work study students. *Qualifications:* Able to meet and greet the public. Ability to work independently. Ability to write well. Typing helpful. Good organizational ability. Experience and some college. \$7,475-\$9,350.

SUPERVISOR-MECHANICAL SYSTEMS (10-12-76).

PART TIME

CASHIER (PART-TIME) (10-12-76).

SECRETARY II (PART-TIME) (10-5-76).

SECRETARY II (PART-TIME) (10-19-76).

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN II (30 hrs./wk.) immunofluorescence microscopy. Animal cell culture, biochemical analysis. *Qualifications:* Master's degree or equivalent in biology or biochemistry. *Salary to be determined.*

CHANGE IN BUS SCHEDULE

Steven D. Murray, director of transportation and communication, has provided a correction to the campus bus schedule published in the September 14 *Almanac*: Because the bus now leaves from Houston Hall, the stops at 36th and Chestnut and at 34th and Chestnut have been eliminated.

THINGS TO DO

LECTURES

Fighting words: *Mechanism Involved in the Attack of Metals Simultaneously by Sulphur and Oxygen* is the talk by Dr. Neil Birks, senior lecturer in the metallurgy department at the University of Sheffield in England; tomorrow, 4 p.m., 105 LRSM Building.

Dr. Michael Banton, head of the sociology department at Bristol University in England, speaks to the Human Resources Center of the Wharton School on October 28. His topic: *The Career of the Race Concept*; 7 p.m., Faculty Club.

Cyclic Deformation of Pure Metals is the topic of Dr. H. Mughrabi of the Max Planck Institut für Metallforschung October 29 at 4 p.m. in Room 105 of the LRSM Building.

The founder and director of the Freedom Library Day School in Philadelphia, John Churchville, asserts *Inner City Children Can Learn to Read Above Grade Level (K - 12)* in a Graduate School of Education Colloquium October 29 at 3 p.m. in Room A-36, GSE.

The word's a stage: Dr. David Olson, professor of applied psychology at the Ontario Institute for Development Studies, speaks on *Speech and Writing—Some Formal and Informal Uses of Language*. November 1, 4 p.m., in the Colloquium Room of the Annenberg School.

Thrice wise: a joint colloquium of the history and sociology of science department and the philosophy department features *Science as a Cultural System*, three lectures by Yehuda Elkana, director of the Van Leer Jerusalem Foundation and Henya Sharef Professor of history and

philosophy of science at Hebrew University: *Images of Knowledge, Sources of Knowledge, and Historical Relativism* (310 Logan, October 29); *Images of Knowledge and some Problems in the Philosophy of Science* (107 Smith, November 1); and *Images of Knowledge and some Sociological Lessons from the History of Science* (107 Smith, November 2). All lectures begin at 4 p.m.

An informal seminar in which Dr. B. Lengeler of the Institut für Festkörperforschung der Kernforschungslage in Jülich, Germany, discusses *Experimental Studies of Vacancies and Interstitial Hydrogen in Noble Metals* Monday, November 1, in Room 105 of the LRSM Building at 2 p.m.

The ICA presents art historian and critic Barbara Rose speaking on Barnett Newman in its *Emerging Traditions* series; November 2, 7:30 p.m., Fine Arts Auditorium.

Willard Butcher, president of Chase Manhattan Bank, speaks at a program sponsored by the Wharton Graduate Finance Association; 4:30 p.m., B-1 Vance Hall, November 3.

Alan Mann, associate professor of anthropology, reveals *The Implications of Human Evolution* at the November 4 Philomathean Society lecture; 4 p.m., 4th floor College Hall. This week, the Philomatheans are sponsoring the Shakespeare symposium; for information, call Kate Hill, Ext. 6533.

THEATER

The McCarter Theatre production of *Streetcar Named Desire* is the current offering at the Annenberg Center. Call Ext. 6791 for tickets and information.

The Glass Menagerie, another Tennessee Williams play, is the Penn Players' fall drama; November 4, 5, and 6 at 8 p.m. in Houston Hall Auditorium. Bring pillows to sit on the floor and watch the action around the audience.

Co-author Bruce Montgomery directs the Penn Players' light opera, *The Amorous Flea*; November 3-13 in the Prince Theater of the Annenberg Center; 8:30 p.m. (Saturday, 7 and 10 p.m.); \$4; call the box office, Ext. 6791, for reservations and information.

FILM

The Penn Union Council presents *Straw Dogs* October 28 and *Millhouse* October 30; Fine Arts B-1, \$1, 7:30 and 10 p.m.

Free films for kids this Saturday at 10:30 a.m. in the Harrison Auditorium of the University Museum: *The Red Balloon*, *Canterville Ghost*, *Moon Bird*, *Case of the Elevator Duck*.

Free film for grown-ups on Sunday is *Stavitzky* with Jean-Paul Belmondo; 2:30 p.m. in the Harrison Auditorium.

Potemkin and *Man with a Movie Camera*, two early Soviet films, are the Annenberg Documentary offerings on November 3 at 4 and 7 p.m.; Studio Theater, Annenberg Center.

MIXED BAG

A showing of *watercolor paintings* by alumnus Jim Schaefer begins today in the Bowl Room of Houston Hall. Hours are 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. every day except Saturdays, until November 18.

Come disguised and win a prize at the Faculty Club Halloween Party Friday night from 5 to 8 p.m.; \$8.50 per person; boo.

Join the Faculty Tea Club and drink coffee with Mrs. Martin Meyerson in a special *election day* event for new members. Old members are welcome, but must be accompanied by a prospective member; 10:30 a.m. to noon.

Letitia Eldredge performs her art with *masks and costumes* November 4 at the ICA. The Philadelphia Houston Exchange program begins at 7:30 p.m. with a reception; admission is \$2.

Pennsylvania Pro Musica brings *Haydn's Creation* to Irvine Auditorium November 4 at 8 p.m.; \$3.

The Christian Association has arranged for weekly gatherings in the *Quaker manner of worship*; 2nd floor, CA; 5 to 5:45 p.m. every Monday.

Classes on *dried arrangements* are still open at the Morris Arboretum this Friday (9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. and 6:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.). Call CH7-5777 for details.

ALMANAC: 515 Franklin Building (16) Ext. 5274

Editor..... Karen Gaines

Assistant Editor Duncan Williams

Distribution Karen A. Graves