

Almanac

Weekly by the University of Pennsylvania
Volume 23, Number 17 January 18, 1977

- Draft Statement on Appointment and Promotion (Stellar)
- SPEAKING OUT (Adelman, Clelland, Mendelson, Crockett)
- University Scholars • Research Report, 1975-76
- GRANT DEADLINES • Ben Franklin's Birthday
- OPENINGS • THINGS TO DO

- INSERT: PennSport, a newsletter on recreation and sports available to the faculty and staff

The University of Pennsylvania
is pleased to announce that

The first \$100,000,000 of its development campaign has been reached on schedule in eighteen months

CHAIRMAN OF THE TRUSTEES:
Donald T. Regan
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc.

VICE CHAIRMAN:
Robert G. Dunlop
Director and Retired
Chief Executive Officer
Sun Company, Inc.

CHAIRMAN,
Campaign Operating Committee:
John W. Eckman
Chairman and President
Rorer-Amchem, Inc.

PRESIDENT
OF THE UNIVERSITY:
Martin Meyerson

Development Council

The Honorable
Walter H. Annenberg
Former Ambassador to
Great Britain

Samuel H. Ballam, Jr.
President and Chief Executive
Officer
The Fidelity Bank

I. W. Burnham, II
Chairman
Drexel Burnham & Company,
Incorporated

August A. Busch, III
President and Chief Executive
Officer
Anheuser-Busch, Inc.

Leonard Davis
Founder and Director
Colonial Penn Group, Inc.

G. Morris Dorrance, Jr.
Chairman and Chief Executive
Officer
Philadelphia National Bank

The Honorable
Thomas S. Gates
Chief, United States Liaison Office
Peking, Peoples Republic of China

Philip B. Hofmann
Retired Chairman
Johnson & Johnson

Reginald H. Jones
Chairman and Chief Executive
Officer
General Electric Company

William J. Kennedy, III
President and Chief Executive
Officer
North Carolina Mutual Life
Insurance Company

John H. Knowles, M.D.
President
Rockefeller Foundation

C. B. McCoy
Chairman, Finance Committee
Retired Chief Executive Officer
E. I. du Pont de Nemours and
Company Inc.

David J. Mahoney, Jr.
Chairman, President and
Chief Executive Officer
Norton Simon, Inc.

Paul F. Miller, Jr.
Partner
Miller, Anderson, and Sherrerd

Walter F. O'Malley
Chairman
Los Angeles Dodgers, Inc.

Harold Prince
Theatrical Producer

Richard S. Reynolds, Jr.
Chairman of the Executive
Committee
Reynolds Metals Company

Adolph G. Rosengarten, Jr.
Former Vice Chairman
Merck & Co., Inc.

Robert Montgomery Scott,
Esquire
Partner
Montgomery, McCracken,
Walker & Rhoads

Bernard G. Segal, Esquire
Chairman and Senior Partner
Schnader, Harrison, Segal & Lewis

Laurence A. Tisch
Chairman and Chief Executive
Officer
Loews Corporation

Marietta Tree
Partner
Llewellyn-Davies Associates

Robert L. Trescher, Esquire
Chairman and Senior Partner
Montgomery, McCracken,
Walker & Rhoads

The Honorable
John H. Ware, 3rd
President
Penn Fuel Gas, Inc.

William J. Zellerbach
President
Zellerbach Paper Company

TRUSTEES

The two major items at the January 13-14
Trustees meeting are at left and below. Other
coverage: page 2.

SAMP RESOLUTION

Adopted at the Stated meeting
January 14, 1977

WHEREAS, After reviewing the recommenda-
tion of the Vice-President for Health Affairs, and
with the advice of the 1975-76 Steering Com-
mittee acting as an interim reallocation review
board, the University Council, the Faculty
Senate, the Undergraduate Assembly, and of a
great many other organizations and individuals,
the President and Provost have made recommen-
dations with respect to the future of the School of
Allied Medical Professions (SAMP); and

WHEREAS, On December 20, 1976, the
Trustees' Health Affairs Committee adopted a
resolution supporting the recommendations of
the President and Provost;

RESOLVED, Therefore, that the freshman
class entering SAMP in the fall of 1977 be the last
class to enter SAMP as a separate four-year
undergraduate school of the University of Penn-
sylvania;

RESOLVED, That vigorous efforts be made to
develop cooperative programs with Thomas
Jefferson University for professional training in
allied health fields so that educational options in
these fields may be preserved for University of
Pennsylvania undergraduates;

RESOLVED, That the professional education
components of the present programs of SAMP
be discontinued at this University upon the
graduation of the class entering in the fall of
1977, or as appropriate arrangements are made
for the transfer of responsibility for such
components to Thomas Jefferson University;

RESOLVED, That all reasonable steps be
taken to assure that students entering SAMP
through the fall of 1977 have the opportunity to
complete their planned undergraduate work;

RESOLVED, That all current tenure and
contractual obligations to SAMP faculty be
honored.



PROGRAM FOR THE EIGHTIES
\$255 Million for the University of Pennsylvania

Founded by Benjamin Franklin

(TRUSTEES Continued)

TRUSTEES

President Martin Meyerson's annual report, which opened the Stated Meeting of the Trustees on January 14, was abbreviated because of pressure of time and weather; it will be published as written in a future issue, sketching major problems in enrollment and support for private institutions. It incorporates parts of the "mission" statement Mr. Meyerson made at Council in November.

Provost Eliot Stellar's report on search processes and the filling of a major chair will appear next week.

ELECTED: MR. LANDAU AND MR. LAUDER

Alumni Ralph Landau, founder and chairman of Halcon International Inc., and Leonard A. Lauder, president of Estée Lauder Inc., were elected to five-year terms as Trustees.

Gustave G. Amsterdam, chairman of Bankers Securities Corp., who has served since 1967 as a Trustee, was named a Life Trustee.

Mr. Landau took his bachelor of science degree in chemical engineering here in 1937, and Mr. Lauder received a bachelor of science in economics degree from Wharton in 1954.

SPORTS: EDGING AWAY FROM IVY?

For the Athletics Committee, Trustee Robert Levy reported two proposals by DRIA Director Andy Geiger that drew startled comment from Trustees present: one to negotiate a football schedule including Army, Navy, Duke, Virginia, Northwestern and Delaware in the not-too-distant future; and one to shift basketball out of Ivy competition and seek tougher schools in their place while maintaining Big Five competition. Trustees Chairman Donald Regan referred the two items to the President.

Mr. Levy's third item, a proposal to shift DRIA priorities in the Program for the Eighties from facilities to endowment for operating income in view of a \$300,000 operating deficit, was referred to John Eckman, Chairman of the Trustees Committee on Development and Public Relations and of the Campaign Operating Committee.

WXPB . . . A CAMPUS GRID

Electronics Committee Chairman Morton Wilner gave a progress report on the WXPB license (no decision until two or three months after the administrative judge has reviewed reply findings.) His committee has heard Professor Robert L. Shayon's report on a conduit grid which is within \$150,000 of being linked up campus-wide; Mr. Regan promised to give time at an Executive Board meeting for proposals on completing the grid.

GRAD HOSPITAL: SOON FREESTANDING

A motion authorizing proxy voting between Trustees meetings was passed to make way for completion of the transfer of Graduate Hospital to its new independent board. The full document on arrangements for a freestanding hospital is available for inspection at the Office of the Secretary, 112 College Hall.

INVESTMENTS UP; BUYING A BUILDING

Investment Committee Chairman Wesley Stanger again reported gains in the University's portfolio—stocks and bonds now totalling \$108.8 million versus \$92.4 million at this time last year, with income up from \$5.7 million to \$6.2 million. For Finance Committee Chairman Henry Chance, Mr. Eckman introduced three actions advancing funds now for Graduate Hospital payback after the Hospital is fully transferred, and one action lending \$250,000 to Penn's real estate subsidiary, University City Associates, for purchase of the building at 133 South 33rd Street (Girard Bank).

ED POLICY: BLACK PRESENCE

While the SAMP resolution (page 1) was adopted unanimously by voice vote without discussion at the Stated Meeting, questions and answers were vigorous at the previous day's Health Affairs Committee meeting. A presentation made there by Acting Dean Michels, and a response document now being written, will appear in *Almanac* next week.

HEALTH AFFAIRS: SAMP DEBATE

The Trustees Educational Policy Committee canceled the second item on its agenda to devote all of its time to a report of the Black Presence Task Force after task force panelists reported disturbing statistics and trends: little change in total numbers of black faculty since the adoption of affirmative action (and of the 25 or so now here, only a quarter tenured while 70 percent of the faculty as a whole are tenured); steady decline in percentage of black undergraduate enrollment; and "very bad" numbers in graduate studies. Chairing the panel, Law School Dean Louis Pollak said the report by Professors Bernard Anderson, Houston Baker and Irene Pernsley was an interim report with a final report due late in the spring.

Trustees both asked questions and delivered opinions on black presence improvement, among them Reginald Jones of General Electric, who said industry has good results from the creation of scholarship funds to aid minorities; and Hunter President Jacqueline Wexler, who said Penn's low enrollment of Black Ph.D. candidates costs Penn opportunity to meet a national shortage. Responding to Mrs. Wexler and to Professor Pernsley's comments on Ph.D. enrollment (of 700 who entered this fall, fewer than ten are known to be black), Dean Vartan Gregorian said he agreed and that the unification of FAS, which has taken two years, will help solve the problem of decentralized recruiting. Money, he said, will be a harder problem to solve, with only \$600,000 available for over 3400 graduate students in arts and sciences.

ELIGIBLE FOR RETIREMENT ANNUITY

Partially-affiliated faculty (A-2) and part-time exempt staff (A-1) employees may now join the University's TIAA-CREF annuity plan (student-employees and employees of the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania and of Graduate Hospital are not included). Participation may be made retroactive to January 1, 1976, for those wishing to make retroactive contributions.

Minimum contributions by the participant to the retirement annuity plan are 4 percent of the benefit salary if under 30 years of age and 5 percent if over. After the completion of three years of service, the University will contribute 6 percent, 8 percent, or 9 percent, depending upon whether the participant is under age 30 or 30-39 or 40 and older.

The University will make a lump sum contribution equivalent to its share of contributions for the first three years provided the participant has made his or her minimum contributions during the entire first three years of service. TIAA-CREF contributions and deductions occur during the nine-month period beginning in September and ending in May.

Part-time employees (A-1, A-2, A-3, and A-4) who work a regular schedule may now join the TIAA-CREF Supplemental Retirement Annuities plan or the Pennsylvania Annuity plan; excluded are student-employees and employees of the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania and of Graduate Hospital. These plans provide additional income at retirement to supplement other retirement benefits. The entire cost is paid by the participant.

Participation in all plans is contingent on sufficient net pay after tax withholding to permit appropriate deductions.

Further information and enrollment forms may be secured from the Benefits Office, 116 FB/16, Ext. 7281 or 7282.

—J.J. Keller, Associate Director Personnel Relations

A new step in the appointment/promotion process was announced this fall to the Trustees and the Council: outside review at the Provost's Staff level. Below is the Provost's draft memorandum outlining the procedure.

Draft Statement on Procedures for Appointment and Promotion

Current Procedures

The current procedure for making all appointments to and/or promotions within the standing faculties at Pennsylvania has normally involved the following steps:

- 1) Initiation of a proposal by an *Academic Department* after review of its faculty needs in fulfilling academic plans and objectives.
- 2) Review by the *School Personnel Committee* to determine the academic qualifications of the candidate for membership on the faculty at the rank proposed.
- 3) Recommendation of the qualified candidate by the Dean as consistent with the academic plans, priorities, and budget of the School.
- 4) Review by the *Provost's Staff Conference* to insure that University-wide academic standards are being met, that the proposal is consistent with approved academic and financial plans, and that it is in accord with statutory provisions.
- 5) Approval by the *University Trustees*, upon the recommendation of the President and the Provost.

Documentation of current promotion or appointment proposals typically includes:

- 1) A *curriculum vitae* of the candidate, containing information on past educational and professional experience and a bibliography of published work.
- 2) *Letters of recommendation*, intended to evaluate the candidate's scholarly and teaching qualifications for the position.
- 3) An *affirmative action statement*, indicating how the appropriate pools of potential minority and female candidates were reviewed together with the *vitae* of the top minority and female candidates in such pools. In the case of promotion from within, the pools would consist of minority and female peers in the department; in the case of appointment from outside the University, the pool would consist of all minority and female potential candidates.
- 4) A *statement from the Department* or its chairman, summarizing its evaluation of the research, teaching, and service of the candidate and the academic purposes to be served, and sometimes evaluating and interpreting the letters of recommendation.
- 5) A *statement from the School Personnel Committee*, attesting to the qualifications of the candidate.
- 6) A *statement from the Dean*, indicating academic and budgetary support for the proposal.

New Procedures

Over the last four years, a continuing effort has been made to strengthen and improve these procedures and the documentation supporting them. The major reason for this effort is that opportunities for faculty appointments and promotions have become scarcer and scarcer throughout the University making more difficult the choices at each level of the decision-making process, particularly where appointment or promotion to tenure are concerned. Each appointment or promotion to tenure commits the University for up to a million dollars and for as much as thirty years. Perhaps even more important, each commitment to tenure takes the place of at least two junior faculty appointments for the

duration of that tenure. With around 70 percent of the faculty already tenured and few retirements in sight over the next decade, we foresee shrinking opportunities to bring in young faculty as fresh blood to the research and teaching forces of the University unless tenure commitments are closely controlled on the basis of demonstrated academic merit.

It is to obtain better evidence demonstrating academic merit in tenure cases that we have sought to strengthen the value of outside letters of recommendation. Over the last year, discussion in the Provost's Staff Conference and in the Council of Academic Deans has lead to the following guidelines:

- 1) A list of two to four *outside experts in the field of the candidate* to be proposed to the Provost by the Dean, working with the advice of the School Personnel Committee and the initiating department. The Provost, in consultation with the Dean and other faculty, may add a number of names equal to half of those used.
- 2) The evaluations of the outside referees to be obtained before the School Personnel Committee recommends the proposal to the Provost's Staff Conference.
- 3) The evaluations to be solicited by the Provost and Dean by a letter which provides certain information and asks specific questions:
 - a) Information provided should include: *curriculum vitae*, selected reprints or other published work, and a brief statement of the relevant academic plan of the department and school.
 - b) The specific questions should include requests: to evaluate the importance of the candidate's scholarly field for the future of the discipline in the light of the academic plan; to identify age- and field-peers of the candidate, including minority and women peers; to rank the candidate among those peers; and to add any other evaluations to indicate that the candidate is a recognized authority in his or her field.
- 4) Proposals for tenure normally to be considered by the Provost's Staff Conference during January and February so that all decisions can be complete by April 1st. In rare cases, where exceptional circumstances demand, proposals for tenure will be considered before or after the February-March period.

Conclusion

During the next year or so, the schools will adapt these general guidelines to their own peculiar academic circumstances. The purpose is not to impose new and inflexible procedures or an additional level of review, but rather to integrate the evaluations of the outside referees with other letters of recommendation and other documentation that may be included in the proposal for tenure. Use of outside referees as described here is not intended to minimize the importance of the evaluations and recommendations offered by University faculty members, especially in the cases of promotion of our own faculty to tenure. Rather we hope to strengthen existing procedures by adding the perspective of outside evaluation in response to specific questions that will yield comparable data across different departments and different schools. Our intention is to continue to improve our procedures as we learn from experience.

—Eliot Stellar, Provost

Speaking Out

WHO KNOWS WHERE OR WHEN?

Each year we spend a great deal of time trying to find out *when* course catalogs and the student directory are to be published, have been published and are to be acquired. I have talked with others in the University and they too are annoyed by the amount of time and the level of frustration involved. It seems that it is impossible to have a name or a specific office put on a distribution list so that the publications which are genuinely used as tools in such offices can be received more or less automatically.

I would therefore like to request that the *Almanac* assume the responsibility for listing (preferably in a notice box) the publication date of such publications and for providing information as to how each publication can be acquired.

The Student Directory was available at least two weeks ago. We still do not have our copy. Perhaps there are others in the University who, like the Museum Library, didn't even know that it had been published. You might want to start with a note about it.

—Jean Adelman,

Librarian, University Museum

Ed. Note: For copies of the directory, try the Registrar's Office, Ext. 6433. More about other campus printed matter next week.

MORE ON WHARTON PLAN

The Wharton faculty will vote January 25 on a proposal to lengthen the tenure-probationary period there. Below, three writers continue the discussion begun in Speaking Out December 7.

WHY TEN YEARS?

At the November meeting of the Wharton Faculty, two motions from the school's Committee on Policy and Planning were presented for faculty consideration by the Dean. The second of these suggested that term appointments at the rank of professor be made possible; it will not be discussed here. Rather, I shall try to bring out some of the rationale underlying the first motion—that aimed at lengthening the tenure-probationary period for assistant professors. I shall concentrate upon the effect of this motion on the assistant professors; I am primarily addressing this group.

At present, the review for tenure usually takes place in the fifth year after the acquisition of the terminal degree for those appointed as assistant professors after the granting of that degree. In the past, many tenure decisions were postponed until the sixth year; the University administration,

anxious to avoid tenure by inadvertence, has moved strongly to eliminate this option. Review in the sixth year is becoming very unusual and may disappear altogether.

Review in the fifth year is also undergoing change. In the past, departments and units have usually conducted their reviews in the autumn, action by the Wharton Personnel Committee has come at some time during the winter, and the case has reached the Provost's desk sometime between December and early April. This year, however, a memorandum was sent to all schools and departments of the University by the Provost stating that for the academic year 1977-78 all reviews for tenure at the department and school level must be completed by November 1, 1977, and in his hands as of that date. The purpose of this change is to allow time for an extensive external review of tenure cases at the Provost's level. So it is very clear that under the present system the tenure decision is going to be made based on a *four-year* track record in the case of assistant professors who begin here in the usual manner.

At present, University rules prohibit internal promotion from assistant professor to associate professor without the granting of tenure. This is the question addressed by Professor Mendelson's substitute motion that the faculty will discuss at its next meeting (January 25). The option presented by the substitute motion might well be a useful one, but even under the substitute motion for 1977-78 and thereafter, just as under the present rules, the tenure decision would be made in the fifth year based on a record covering only four years from initial appointment as assistant professor.

The present system also places assistant professors in direct competition with a second group—untentured associate professors hired on five-year contracts from other institutions. This group generally has from three to five years' experience prior to the Wharton appointment. Its members are reviewed in the fourth year of the appointment. Thus, the four-year record of the assistant professors is placed in competition with the seven- to nine-year record typical of the group of associate professors—usually to the great disadvantage of the former.

The Wharton administration and the Advisory Committee on Policy and Planning are both much concerned with the situation they see developing in which an assistant professor initially appointed here is given only four years to develop a resume that will satisfy standards that become more demanding each year. If the rules are not modified, tenure will rarely be granted to any assistant professor, and most tenured appointments will be filled

from an enlarged pool of external hirings at the rank of untentured associate professor. This is the oversimplification in Professor Crockett's otherwise cogent analysis presented at the December faculty meeting (below). After all, there are not too many four-year resumes that the Dean can take to the Provost's Staff Conference (which quite properly takes a "show-me" attitude) and defend in terms of near certainty of future world-class performance.

I believe the system proposed in the original motion will work in the following way. There will be a first screening after two or three years after which assistant professors who clearly are nonproductive will leave. There will be a second, rather tough review in the fifth year after which those assistant professors who have a low probability of meeting tenure standards will not be renewed after six years. (Members of these first two groups would also fail to make tenure under the existing system.) The remaining assistant professors will be those for whom the probability of an eventual tenured appointment is reasonably high; these individuals will be promoted to associate professor without tenure. Some of this group would not make tenure in the fifth year under the present system, and herein lies the advantage of the proposal to assistant professors. It provides promising candidates the time they must have to build the records of performance needed to meet the high standards that the University and the school must adopt for a lifetime commitment. Of course, there is nothing in the new proposal that prevents the granting of tenure earlier than the mandatory date; extraordinary candidates should be proposed for tenure as soon as their records warrant it without regard for age or length of employment, either under the present system or the proposed modification. Of course, an untentured faculty member can always request a tenure review at any time under either the present or the proposed system.

Assistant professors who have current appointments should understand that the proposed change affects only persons hired *after* the proposal is approved by the Trustees of the University. It is possible that assistant professors presently at the Wharton School might be given a choice between the two systems; but the new system, if adopted, would not be imposed on anyone presently at Wharton against her or his wishes. From the point of view of an assistant professor, I believe the Policy and Planning Committee's motion deserves support. It is intended to increase the probability that capable members of this group will attain tenure. It does this by allowing the same eight or nine years before

Speaking Out is a forum for readers' comment on University issues, conducted under the auspices of the Almanac Advisory Board: Robert L. Shayon, chairman; Herbert Callen, Charles D. Graham, Jr., Fred Karush, and Robert F. Lucid for the Faculty Senate; Paul Gay for the Librarians Assembly; Shirley Hill for the Administrative Assembly; and Virginia Hill Upright for the A-3 Assembly.

the tenure decision that is now enjoyed by the competing group—externally hired untenured associate professors.

A word about Professor Mendelson's substitute motion: I am indifferent as to whether it passes or fails. In my opinion, there is little hope of its implementation at the University level. The possibility has been raised many times before, and the response from the University administration has always been negative. So while internal promotion to untenured associate professor might be useful, it does not speak to the problems facing us nor is it at all likely to become policy. After the substitute is voted upon, I recommend strongly that the original motion be given thorough consideration.

The Wharton administration and the Policy and Planning Committee will be pleased to have feedback from any faculty member, but particularly from assistant professors, about the question at issue. I have mailed to all voting faculty a request for questions and comments, to be anonymous except for an indication of whether the respondent is or is not an assistant professor, and I will be happy to talk with any of our faculty individually. At the next faculty meeting, I shall summarize all of the responses and try to reply to any questions raised.

—Richard C. Clelland,
Associate Dean, The Wharton School

UNRAVELING THE UNDERSTANDING

Dean Clelland's memorandum to the Wharton faculty on the tenure track motion raises some major points that call for comment.

It is nonsense to argue that with the present probationary period the tenure decision has to be based on a four-year track record—and to argue it on the basis that it is necessary in order to avoid tenure by inadvertence. Dean Clelland knows very well that the Senate has approved the elimination of tenure by inadvertence (*Almanac* October 30, 1973, and November 6, 1973). All that is needed is for the administration to translate that motion into acceptable phraseology. Indeed, the administration is committed to providing the phraseology prior to the next regularly scheduled Senate meeting. It is ridiculous to change the probationary period to overcome such a temporary gap in the formalities. A revision of the review schedule is a far simpler and sounder reform than changing the probationary period.

The argument that the Provost's memorandum requiring reviews for tenure to be completed by November 1 effectively reduces the period in which a track record can be built is disturbing. It suggests, however, that the memorandum represents a policy change rather than a mere procedural change, and it would seem that the administration should be called to task for making such a significant policy change without faculty consultation. Once again, a modification of the review schedule is a more appropriate remedy of the problem Dean Clelland poses.

Dean Clelland's portrait of the assistant professor as an endangered species suggests that there are sounder remedies, too, to the problem of competition from untenured associate professors brought from outside. (It should be noted that it has always been possible for the scenario described to develop, but in fact it never has. Dean Clelland is speculating, and while there has been a change in circumstances, the empirical evidence is against him rather than for him.) However, a more desirable change is a modification of policy making it more supportive of assistant professors: the justification required for bringing in a senior outsider in lieu of internal promotion should be stiffened. There are times when outside appointments are clearly warranted, but biases in their favor should be attacked directly, not by circuitous measures that create havoc in the wake of partial solution.

Every member of the University should seriously consider the consequences of the proposed changes in the tenure period. Not only are they lacking in merit, but over the years the common usage and understanding of "seven years" has become more important than what was on the minds of the draftsmen of the 1940 AAUP statement on tenure. The example the University of Pennsylvania would set by adopting a longer period can create untold problems elsewhere, especially to the extent that it may encourage a general unraveling of the shared understanding of the meaning of tenure. In the last analysis, the shared understanding which represents the core of the tenure system is the protection of all teachers. It is for that reason that we should strenuously resist revisions of institutional codes away from the norm. If a lot of schools revise away from the norm, there may be no norm left.

—Morris Mendelson, President
University of Pennsylvania Chapter, AAUP

IT
REALLY
IS BETTER
IN THE
DARK!

 **Save Energy Now**
University of Pennsylvania Operational Services Center • Office 2411-0004

TEN YEARS TO TENURE?

A proposal to extend the tenure probationary period from seven years to ten is currently under discussion by the Wharton faculty. With such an extension, the tenure decision point for assistant professors would be postponed from the end of the sixth year to the end of the ninth year of employment. Tenure rules, of course, are established on a University-wide basis, so that favorable action by the Wharton faculty presumably would take the form of a request to the Provost and President to initiate a general extension of the probationary period to ten years.

Because the environment of the private University is likely to be significantly different in the future than it has been in the past, this is indeed an appropriate moment to consider changes in our traditional patterns. But any proposal tending to unravel the carefully constructed fabric that protects academic freedom carries a heavy burden of proof. To receive serious consideration, such a change should be supported by a compelling weight of evidence (a) that it will significantly increase the University's capacity to adapt to its new environment and (b) that there are no alternative measures less prejudicial to academic freedom that can accomplish similar results.

What useful purposes might be served by the extension of the probationary period to ten years? Is it intended to increase the inflow of new talent in the form of assistant professors? To improve the quality of the tenure choices made? To raise the proportion of assistant professors who are eventually granted tenure? To decrease the percentage of all faculty members who have tenure?

The last of these possible aims is not often articulated by supporters of an extended probationary period, but it sometimes seems to be implicit in their thinking. In my own mind it raises grave concern on two grounds. In a period of transition from positive to zero growth in faculty size, a reduction in the promotion rate of assistant professors is necessary simply to prevent the percentage of tenured faculty from increasing. To go beyond stabilization of this percentage and actually attempt to decrease it, an even sharper reduction in the promotion rate for assistant professors would be required, imposing a further—and I believe unnecessary—hardship on the existing junior faculty.

Even more important in the long run is the impact of a lower tenure ratio on the balance of power between faculty and administration. It is a regrettable fact of life that only the tenured faculty are really free to insist upon and undertake a strong and independent faculty role in academic decisions.

On the other hand, it is certainly not desirable to continue to increase the percentage of tenured faculty. In the long run this would reduce to unacceptable levels either the hiring rate or the promotion rate for assistant professors, and most probably both. Let us assume then that the tenure ratio is to be held constant at the present level of about two-

thirds. What are the implications of a ten-year probationary period, *vis-a-vis* a seven-year period, for the hiring and promotion rates for assistant professors under this assumption?

These effects can be demonstrated with a simple and roughly realistic numerical example. Let the size of the standing faculty be held constant at 1620, with one-third (or 540) untenured. Presumably the loss of tenured faculty through retirement, resignation and death will be the same regardless of the length of the probationary period, say 30 per year on the average. Assume further that the average number of years that a faculty member remains in untenured status is six under the seven-year rule and nine under the ten-year rule. (It can readily be demonstrated that reducing these averages to five-years and eight-years, respectively, does not much alter the outcome). Then under existing tenure rules, 90 new assistant professors will be hired each year, replacing an equal number who are either granted tenure or terminated, so that the total of 540 is maintained. Under the proposed extension of the probationary period, however, only 60 can be hired each year on the average since only 60 will be departing from the untenured group. Thus, 50 percent more new talent can be drawn in each year under the existing rules than under the proposed change. Our field of choice will be 50 percent larger if we leave things as they are. Clearly, enlarged choice is a factor favorable to the quality of future tenure appointments.

What would be the effect of the longer probationary period on the proportion of assistant professors promoted to tenure? The absolute number of those granted tenure each year must be the same in either case, equalling on average the number of tenured persons

retiring, resigning or dying. Since fewer individuals would be coming up for tenure each year under the longer probationary period, the fraction granted tenure must indeed be greater (one-half versus one-third under the assumptions made), but only because the University has a smaller field from which to choose.

Is there a real advantage to the assistant professors in the higher promotion rate, given that the number promoted is unchanged? It is instructive to ask which of the 60 assistant professors who might be coming up for tenure in a given year under the extended probationary period are likely to be better off than they would have been under the existing tenure rules. Half of them (30) will be denied tenure under the conditions of the numerical example. Presumably they would have been better off to start looking for a new job three years earlier. Another one-third (20) or more would have received tenure at the end of six years under the existing rules.¹ Presumably they would have been better off to have received their promotions three years earlier.

This leaves at most 10 who might be better off because of the extended probationary period, as against 50 who would almost certainly be worse off. It is not clear why this prospect should inspire great enthusiasm in the hearts of existing or potential assistant professors, except for those who judge themselves likely to be among the marginal cases.

What would be the University's gains and losses overall? Not more than one or two of the ten who would have been terminated at the end of six years but are granted tenure at the end of nine years can really be expected to turn out to be superstars. By extending the

probationary period the University would avoid the loss of a very small number of late-bloomers. On the other side of the scale, it would keep on, for an additional three years, thirty rather marginal faculty members who fail to attain tenure in the end; and it would lose the opportunities inherent in a 50 percent larger field of choice. The argument that an improvement in faculty quality can be accomplished in this way is less than compelling.

One point remains. If we reduce the promotion rate from about one-half to about one-third—and something like this reduction will apparently be necessary under existing tenure rules in order to stabilize simultaneously both faculty size and the tenure ratio—then the standards for promotion to tenure must necessarily become much tougher. The probability of accepting those we should not have accepted is automatically reduced, while that of rejecting those we should have accepted rises correspondingly. This will increase the incidence of truly agonizing decisions.

One device to obtain additional information in such cases would be to grant a sabbatical, perhaps during the fifth year of the probationary period, to assistant professors with exceptional promise but an inadequate publications list, permitting them to complete important research under way. This would be particularly appropriate in cases where a change in specialization has occurred. It may also be possible to arrange leave without pay, in which case, by mutual agreement of the faculty member and his school, the tenure clock can be stopped for the duration of the leave.

—Jean Crockett, Professor of Finance

UNIVERSITY SCHOLARS

DEADLINE: FEBRUARY 28

Faculty members who wish to nominate students for the University Scholars Program must forward the names and dossiers of the selected students to the Council of University Scholars by Monday, February 28.

The University Scholars Program, now in its fourth year, allows precociously talented students to enroll simultaneously for an undergraduate and graduate degree or for an undergraduate and professional degree. With the aid of advisors, each University Scholar designs a coherent program of liberal arts and graduate or professional study, then progresses at the pace best suited to his or her own needs and goals. Students may proceed faster than normal, or if study in depth or time out seem beneficial, they may take a slower route to the combined degrees. So long as the student's progress is satisfactory, a University Scholar may pursue his or her education to the highest degree sought.

The program is for students who are intellectually mature, who already have the elements of a sound liberal education, and who have very firm educational and career plans. A University Scholar may be a freshman of unusual promise or achievement, but most are sophomores and juniors. Second semester juniors and students in their senior year are not eligible for nomination because there is insufficient time remaining for integrated study.

NOMINATION AND REVIEW

Students must be nominated by members of the faculty. A student may seek such nomination, and faculty are encouraged to discuss the program with worthy students and nominate them. In all cases the faculty sponsor must be closely acquainted with the student and his or her talents and goals.

The Council, under the chairmanship of Dr. Alan Epstein, will review all dossiers and will interview the most promising candidates. The decision to accept a student into the program is made only after the Council has obtained the consent of the appropriate graduate or professional admissions group.

A dossier consisting of the following materials should be transmitted by the faculty sponsor to Dr. Alan Epstein at 106 College Hall by February 28:

1. Evidence of unusual achievement, such as pertinent scholarly or research papers, or evidence in another form;
2. A letter of endorsement by the faculty sponsor, together with other supporting letters;
3. A letter from the nominee to the Council indicating how he or she will use the advantages of the program in arranging a special study sequence, together with a statement of long-term goals and personal aspirations;
4. A high school transcript; and
5. A college transcript.

Additional information: Ida Haynes, Assistant to the Vice Provost, Ext. 6066/6081.

Monitoring the Research Environment

Selections from the 1975-76 Report of the Committee on Research

Among its responsibilities, the Committee on Research of the University Council is charged with monitoring the quality of the environment for research at the University, and with reporting its findings to the research community. With this in mind, we have extracted portions of the Annual Report (slightly modified for brevity) that we feel to be of especial importance. A copy of the complete report, which included a number of supporting documents, may be obtained from the committee chairman.

The faculty response to a questionnaire concerned with the research environment is summarized in Section I. Committee actions related to the problems discussed in Section I may be found in Sections 2 through 5.

I. Faculty Questionnaire on Problems in Initiating and Conducting Research.

On December 9, 1975, the Committee on Research distributed a questionnaire to all faculty covering major aspects of research such as research administration, the function of the Comptroller's Office, the level of indirect costs, the quality of support, general and library services and facilities, and problems related to emergency support for research. Faculty members were asked to provide evaluation and comment in these areas, in any manner they saw fit. About 85 responses were received by the Committee and these illustrate a very large area of concern about how research is conducted and supported at the University. The results are summarized in a report to the Committee by Professor Rutman. While the most frequent concern is the financial instability of research, the feeling that the Administration cares about the quality of the research environment only to the extent of a high yield for the recovery of indirect costs, does not lag far behind. On the basis of this feeling the whole administrative structure, ORA included, is viewed as relatively unconcerned with the research atmosphere. The conditions of research and the problems of investigators are such that, in general, respondents conveyed the view that there is no evidence of a University philosophy about research and no general research policy. More specifically, there is neither a University-wide approach nor a University-sponsored effort to find ways of assisting young investigators in starting up, of assisting nonfunded faculty to carry

on research, of providing simple services needed by investigators in all branches of scholarship and of assisting researchers in their effort to secure funding.

2. Indirect Costs, Special Direct Support, etcetera.

A subcommittee of the Committee on Research, chaired by Professor Sherman Frankel, has carried out several studies this year: one on changes in indirect costs of the past five years; a preliminary faculty activities survey, a study on special direct University support of research, and one on research administration. The following resolutions were included in its report. They were adopted by the full committee and forwarded to the Steering Committee of the University Council on June 9, 1976.

I. The Committee on Research recommends that the Vice-Provost for Graduate Studies and Research each fall should report to the Committee and the research community via an article in the *Almanac* on: a) the changes in indirect costs relevant to cost-of-living for the previous year; b) on the expected level of indirect costs for the present year; and c) on the estimate of the overhead rate for the next two years to follow.

II. The Committee on Research recommends that the planned Comptroller's activities survey, designed to ascertain the relative efforts in each professorial rank on research, teaching, and other activities and to identify research components versus other components that appear in departmental and general administration, be prepared with the help of a small research committee task force. Further, we recommend that the results of this survey and its analyses be made available through the Committee and the Vice-Provost for Graduate Studies and Research to the research community.

III. We recommend that the Committee on Research form a task force to meet with the Vice-Provost for Graduate Studies and Research to examine the desirability and feasibility of continuing special direct University support for research and to request the Vice-Provost to report to the Committee on the subject next fall.

IV. We recommend that the Committee on Research request the Vice-Provost for Graduate Studies and Research to meet with the Committee to provide a breakdown and discussion of the components of the Research Administration Pool.

V. The Committee on Research requests the Vice-Provost for Graduate Studies and Research to meet with the Committee and report on the functions of the Office of Research Administration and of the Vice-Provost for Graduate Studies and Research.

VI. We recommend to the Council that a permanent subcommittee on indirect costs of the Committee on Research be established.

VII. We recommend that the Council request that the Chairman of the Committee on Research be a permanent member of the University Budget Committee.

WANTED: PATENT POLICY INPUT

The University Council Committee on Research is currently investigating ways in which the patent policy of the University of Pennsylvania might be better implemented.

Recommendations on the part of the research community would be welcome and should be addressed to Dr. Edward. Effros, Department of Mathematics, DRL/EI.

3. Sudden Loss of Research Support

Last year's Committee on Research, in its 1975 Annual Report, indicated fear that sudden loss of research support could result in the loss of "responsible and capable cadres of researchers on campus . . . if short periods of time passed without support between grants." The committee recommended that the Vice-Provost for Graduate Studies and Research (VPGSR) develop a procedure for establishing a reserve of funds to deal with such situations, and passed this matter on to the current committee with "a hopeful priority."

The 1974-75 committee's recommendation to the VPGSR received no visible attention. This year's committee pursued the matter with the VPGSR and formed a subcommittee chaired by Professor Robert Rutman which developed the following resolution, adopted by the Committee on April 28, 1976, and forwarded to the Steering Committee of the University Council on June 8, 1976:

In the course of a recent survey of faculty views on research problems, many faculty members have expressed deep concern over the problem of unexpected terminations or interruptions of established research programs. In cases where an established research program represents the careful, painstaking development of a unique effort based upon the assemblage of a team of highly qualified personnel, often including senior personnel of a very high degree of specialization, the loss of such programs and the dispersal of such research teams, simply because of the unavailability of contingency funds, can only be a source of damage to the University as a whole and an impediment to its continued quest for excellence. Under these circumstances, the effect on the morale of the investigators can be profound and can damage the commitment to science and to the University. Faculty respondents therefore strongly affirmed the need to develop a University policy on this problem of "sudden death" and a mechanism for the provision of temporary support until previously guaranteed support is activated or until the affected laboratory or principal investigator has had a reasonable opportunity to develop alternate or additional sources of support.

In view of these considerations, the Committee on Research recommends that the University Council authorize the development of an equitable, University-wide procedure by which contingency funds can be provided for research programs faced with emergencies due to unexpected interruptions, terminations, or major reductions in research arrangements to implement this proposal as well as guidelines for access to emergency funding be developed by the Vice-Provost for Graduate Studies and Research, so as to furnish a preliminary proposal to the University Committee on Research during the Fall Semester 1976-77.

4. Educational Planning Committee

An Educational Planning Committee, created by the University Council this year, is charged "to verify the existence of ongoing academic planning on all levels and in all areas of the University, to monitor changes in academic planning in actions relative to these changes, and to conduct investigations on its own initiative with respect to academic planning" (*Almanac* March 16, 1975). With respect to this new committee the Committee adopted the following resolution on April 28, 1976, and forwarded it to the Steering Committee of the University Council on June 8, 1976.

RESOLVED, That the Committee on Research recommends that at least one of its members be a member of the Educational Planning Committee in order to insure that, in the oversight of academic planning by that body, there is due concern for the interests of the research community

5. Representation on Budget Committee's Subcommittee on Indirect Costs.

One year ago, in the 1975 Annual Report of the Committee on Research, Chairman Wolfgang noted that, after a full year's "communication between the chairman, VPs Langenberg and Hobstetter and Dr. Paul Taubman, there was finally agreement that . . . [a representative] of CR . . . will serve in the future on the Budget Committee's Subcommittee on Indirect Costs."

Unfortunately this has not yet taken place. The Committee is distressed by the lack of a response to its correspondence sent to the chairman of the subcommittee.

6. Conflict of Interest

This subcommittee, chaired by Professor Houston A. Baker, has found the "policy on extramural consultative activities of fully-affiliated faculty members," drafted by the Subcommittee on Conflict of Interest in 1972, unenforceable as stated. Nevertheless the subcommittee feels that the spirit of the policy is sound and should be endorsed, for it is a spirit that stresses the faculty member's commitment of his major professional efforts to teaching, research, and governance at the University of Pennsylvania. It is a critical spirit that calls for self-examination by faculty members on a regular basis. The responsibility for ensuring that this spirit prevails rests with the deans of various schools who have agreed to devise the most thorough and appropriate reporting procedures possible. In a sense, it is not "conflict of interest" (in the most commonly accepted and pejorative understanding of the phrase) that is at issue. Conflicts may well exist, but the major concern is the diversion of the faculty member's time from the essential tasks of the University. Where such diversions lower the overall effectiveness of the individual faculty member, and consequently of the University, they should be eliminated.

7. Faculty Grants and Awards

This subcommittee, chaired by Professor E.A. Palmer, reported the granting of summer fellowships or grants-in-aid to 21 of 56 applicants. The faculty fellowship award was raised from \$1500 to \$2000 this year, made possible by an additional \$10,000 provided by the President and the Provost. The total amount available was \$50,000.

Committee on Research, 1975-76

Bernard D. Steinberg, chairman (engineering)

Faculty

Edward G. Effros (mathematics)
Sherman Frankel (physics)
Shiv K. Gupta (operations research)
Marilyn E. Hess (pharmacology)
Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (folklore)
Samuel Z. Klausner (sociology)
Ezra S. Krendel (statistics)
Giuseppe G. Pietra (pathology)
Robert J. Rutman (biochemistry)

Graduate-Professional Students

Peter D. Blair (engineering)
John C. Shryock, III (physiology)

Undergraduate Student

Marla F. Peerless (FAS '77)

Ex officio

Ralph D. Amado (chairman, Faculty Senate)
Houston A. Baker (chairman, Conflict of Interest Subcommittee)
Donald N. Langenberg (Vice-Provost for Graduate Studies and Research)
Robert E.A. Palmer (chairman, Faculty Grants and Awards Subcommittee)

PENN GRANTS: LUCKY THIRTEENTH

The University of Pennsylvania ranked 13th in the National Science Foundation's fiscal 1975 report on the 100 universities and colleges receiving the largest amounts of federal funds. The top fifteen:

	Institution	Total in \$1,000
1	Univ of Washington.....	80,629
2	Mass Inst of Tech.....	80,342
3	Howard Univ.....	74,864
4	Univ of Cal-Los Angeles.....	74,818
5	Univ of Minnesota.....	73,651
6	Stanford Univ.....	70,171
7	Columbia Univ.....	65,808
8	Harvard Univ.....	65,186
9	Univ of Cal-San Diego.....	63,068
10	Univ of Wis-Madison.....	62,726
11	Univ of Cal-Berkeley.....	60,368
12	Univ of Michigan.....	58,949
13	Univ of Pennsylvania.....	58,900
14	Johns Hopkins Univ.....	56,852
15	Cornell Univ.....	53,764

SOURCE: National Science Foundation.

GRANT DEADLINES

Listed below are up coming deadlines and program announcements from several sponsors. Additional information is available from the Office of Research Administration, 409 Franklin Building, Ext 7293.—Anthony Merritt

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

- Feb. 1 Applications for all competing renewals, new Research Career Development Awards, Program Projects and Centers. National Research Service Awards for individual postdoctoral fellows (next deadline June 1).
- Mar. 1 Applications for new and supplemental research projects.
- Apr. 1 Applications for National Research Service Awards for Institutional Grants. Normal due date, Feb. 1, has been set back to Apr. 1 for 1977. Research area listing is available.

NIH SPECIAL PROJECTS/AND PROGRAMS

- Feb. 1 "Specialized Centers of Research in Urolithiasis." For information contact Kidney and Urologic Diseases Program, National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism and Digestive Diseases (NIAMDD) (301) 496-7133.
"Clinical Investigator Award, Arthritis, Bone and Skin Diseases." Contact Office of the Associate Director for Extramural Programs, NIAMDD (301) 496-7241.
"Multipurpose Arthritis Centers." Contact Office of Associate Director, Extramural Programs, NIAMDD (301) 496-7241.
- Feb. 4 "Case Control Research Program to Elucidate the Risk Factors for Sudden Infant Death Syndrome." If Request for Proposal desired, submit qualification statement by deadline. Contact Office of Grants Management, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, Landow Bldg., Rm. C-629, Bethesda, MD 20014, Attn. H. Shifrin.
- Mar. 1 "Human Infertility." Contact Center for Population Research, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (301) 496-1101.
"Studies of Diabetes Mellitus and Related Problems." Contact Diabetes Program Director, NIAMDD (301) 496-4658.
"Purification of Erythropoietin." Contact the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute (301) 496-4868.
"Special Dental Research Award." Contact National Institute of Dental Research (301) 496-7723.

"Study Pregnancies Associated Pre-diabetes Mellitus, Gestational Diabetes, and Overt Diabetes of either the Adult or Youth-onset Type and to Study the Offspring of Diabetic Pregnancies." Contact Dr. Joseph Huang, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (301) 496-1485.

"Research leading to the development and evaluation of methods for quantifying the size of ischemic and/or infarcted myocardium suitable for use in the clinical setting." For application contact Barbara Krames, M.D., Cardiac Diseases Branch, National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute (NIH-NHLBI-DHVD-77-1) (301) 496-1081.

- Jun. 1 "Pathophysiological Mechanisms Involved in the Formation of Infrared Patterns Emitted by Normal Subjects and Patients with Benign and Malignant Diseases." Contact Dr. Irvin C. Plough, Div. of Cancer Biology and Diagnosis, National Cancer Institute (301) 496-3251.

"Effects of New Anticancer Drugs on the Cell Cycle." Contact Dr. Saul Schepartz, Div. of Cancer Treatment, NCI (301) 496-6404.

"Research Teams for Antitumor Drug Development." Contact Dr. Saul Schepartz, NCI (301) 496-6404.

"Studies of Populations at Low Risk for Cancer." Contact Dr. James L. Murray, Rm. C505 Landow Bldg., Div. of Cancer Cause and Prevention, NCI (301) 496-3116.

"Mechanisms of Action of New Anticancer Drugs." Contact Dr. Saul Schepartz, NCI (301) 496-6404.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

- Feb. 1 US-Australia Cooperative Science Program, Long Term Visits.
- Feb. 1 Science for Citizens Program—Preliminary Proposals.
- 4 Instructional Scientific Equipment Program.
- 28 US-Japan Cooperative Science Program—Scientific Visits and Seminars.
- Mar. 1 Pre-College Teacher Development in Science Program. Genetic Biology Program.
Geochemistry, Geology and Geophysics Program.
Neurobiology and Psychobiology Programs.
- 4 Environmental Biology Division (Ecology Programs; Ecosystem Studies Program; Population Biology and Physiological Ecology Program; Systematic Biology Program.
- 15 Developmental Biology Program.
- Jun. 1 US-Latin America Cooperative Science Programs.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION-HEW

- Feb. 15 Bilingual Education Programs. Contact the Office of Bilingual Education, Office of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20202 (202) 245-2600.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

The NEH 1976-1977 Program Announcement has been received. Deadlines for various programs: Fellowships, Mar. 1; Public Programs, Mar. 4; Education Programs, Mar. 15, Apr. 1 and 15; Research Grants, May 2 and Jun. 1.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

The NEA's *Guide to Programs for 1976-1977*, which establishes deadlines for the various programs and areas of interest, is available at ORA.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

- Mar. 15 General Hydromechanics Research Program. Contact Stuart F. Crump, Contract Research Administrator, Code 1505, David Taylor Naval Ship Research and Development Center, Bethesda, MD 20084.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The Army Research Office (ARO) *Program for Scientists and Engineers*, dated October 1976, presents a brief description of the basic and applied research of interest to the Army. Available at ORA.

Yesterday was Ben Franklin's birthday, celebrated here as Founders Day with awards and speeches as always. Almanac's favorite Founders Day award, however, was last year's: an honorary degree to the Founder, accepted in his name by Trustees Chairman Donald T. Regan.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

The Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania, on behalf of all University members, have determined to award their honorary degree to one of their colleagues. The Trustees and the Faculty of the University wish it made known that they do not award this degree lightly. The individual receiving it must well have proved himself and over a reasonable period of time to be so honored. The Faculty, for example, have generally preferred that the person they recognize have diligently excelled in one field and must have noted, with some reservation, that the man to be honored excelled in several, and in connection with this tendency, was inclined to change jobs and professions rather often. Benjamin Franklin was, for those who may not know his career, a printer, a newspaperowner, an essayist, a politician, an educator, a scientist, an inventor, an experimenter, a diplomat, a statesman and a philosopher, among other callings. The University has further observed that he encouraged the writer of the so-called "Common Sense," which was seen as no such thing by the established authority of that time, and that he was known to have signed documents—the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States—which were at best controversial and at least one of which was basically illegal and even forcibly opposed by large numbers of his countrymen. That, in addition, during his public role as Postmaster General, he even turned the annual postal deficit into a profit, went against not only the established tradition of his day but against that of our own.

The Trustees and the University must also take note of his tendency toward the faddish in education—he increasingly ignored the traditional curriculum of classical education of his time in favor of the teaching of English and science, along with broad-based history, geography, and modern languages, in opposition to the expert opinion of his peers. Moreover, the University members have found it necessary to consider his extraordinary behavior of flying a kite in a thunderstorm, which, while scientifically useful, made his neighbors wonder and the man-in-the-street stare. Further, it was brought to their attention that he not only followed eccentric medical practices but, worse, wrote about and proselytized for them as being sensible (the University of Pennsylvania itself had not small expertise in this matter, having established the first medical school in the colonies): at night Benjamin Franklin slept with his windows open to get the benefit of fresh air; he took regular exercise, particularly swimming, until late in life, and not only enjoyed cold air baths early in the morning but bathed, with hot water, regularly, habits that lifted the eyebrows of his contemporaries.

There is yet another matter which the members of the University have found it necessary to respond to, since the incidents were public knowledge and took place before witnesses. Themselves not adverse to a lively face or dancing eyes, the Trustees have been forced, since Franklin literally thrust the matter before them in his writings, to comment on his penchant for the opposite sex. This was marked, for example, even during his years in France as Minister Plenipotentiary and in his mid-seventies where it is known that, to the dismay of John Adams, he kissed, according to the astonishing French practice, the necks of the admiring women who crowded about him in the salons of Paris. Too, with regard to women, he went once more against the accepted ideas of his day by advocating education for them.

All in all, it is not to be wondered at that the University of Pennsylvania did not wish to act rashly, considering that in spite of his pronouncements on education which firmly set the University's place in the history of instruction, Benjamin Franklin had only two years of formal schooling. True, Harvard rushed in and gave him an honorary Master of Arts degree in 1753 when he was but forty-seven, but the University must put that to Harvard's pushy desire to be first. If Yale followed suit only six weeks later in awarding the same degree (Yale was founded after Harvard), the Trustees frankly could not be surprised. And if Oxford University gave Franklin in 1762 the Doctor of Civil Laws, Pennsylvanians could only determine that Oxford, feeling her age at the six century or so mark, believed she must present the degree since her time might be running out.

Nonetheless, after due and careful deliberation, and in the 270th year of his birth, the Trustees on behalf of the University of Pennsylvania have deemed it proper, even though a charge of nepotism may be made for so acknowledging one of their members and their first head, to award their honorary degree to the founder of the University of Pennsylvania, seeing that in spite of his own special traits and actions and undertakings, Benjamin Franklin's reputation seems to have withstood the test of time and that he has remained very much alive not only at his University but in the hearts of men and women everywhere.

Thus, won finally by his legacy of wise deeds, lasting words, brave example, and generous humanity, but most especially by his leaving them the idea and substance of the educational institution that has endured and grown beyond even the measure he gave it, the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania in this 200th anniversary year of the nation he helped make sure name their founder and friend and the enduring colleague and teacher of their countrymen and the world with affection and pride for their honorary degree, Doctor of Natural Philosophy.

CITATION ACCOMPANYING THE HONORARY DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF NATURAL PHILOSOPHY CONFERRED ON JANUARY 17, 1976

IN CASES OF BANKRUPTCY

Deans, directors, and budget administrators are advised that any "Notice of Bankruptcy" or "Notice of Meeting of Creditors" in bankruptcy matters relating to vendors and others doing business with the University should be sent immediately upon receipt thereof to:

Office of the Treasurer
3451 Walnut Street
425 Franklin Building/16

If you have any questions, please call Ext. 7254.

—Harold Manley, Treasurer and Vice-president

CHIEF ADMISSIONS OFFICER

The University of Pennsylvania invites nominations and applications for the head of Admissions. This officer has a major role in the formulation of University admissions policy and has overall responsibility for the recruitment and admission of undergraduate students and for the management of the Admissions Office. Candidates should have experience in both academic and management pursuits. Salary negotiable. Send curriculum vitae and names of references to Prof. Phillip DeLacy, Chairman, Consultative Committee, 720 Williams/CU.

OPENINGS

The following listings are taken from the Personnel Office's bulletin of January 12. 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).

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF RESIDENCE UNIT (11-23-76).

FACILITIES PLANNER (9-28-76).

FISCAL COORDINATOR manages fiscal activity and assists dean and department chairpersons in program budgeting and in overall planning for the school and its departments. Analyzes monthly comptroller's sheets; payroll and accounting of time; purchases; coordinates service requests; takes custody of special accounts deposit and account for receivables. *Qualifications:* Ability to perform duties without supervision. B.A. in business or experience with budgets, preferably 2 years.

HEAD NURSE supervises and administers nursing and clerical staff of a large family planning service. Assists in educational guidance programs for nursing personnel. Supervises follow-up care of patients, including referring them to social service agencies, and needed tests and laboratory work. *Qualifications:* Excellent organization and supervisory skills. Concern for patients and staff. Pennsylvania license and accreditation. Some supervisory experience. Must have ability, willingness, and desire to adapt to a variety of situations and individuals, i.e., patient exposure and faculty-staff interrelationships. \$11,300-\$15,250.

JUNIOR RESEARCH SPECIALIST has responsibility for a large colony of wild and domestic guinea pigs, recording and analyzing behavioral data; behavioral and biological work with other animal species including humans, surgical assistance. *Qualifications:* Degree in biology or psychology, experience working with small animals. \$9,100-\$12,275.

JUNIOR RESEARCH SPECIALIST performs experiments with embryos of mice, including injections, collection of embryos, preparation of media, cultivation of embryos and embryo cells in vitro, transfer of cells into embryos, and micromanipulation of cells to alter differentiation and development. Occasionally experiments involve duties outside of normal working hours. *Qualifications:* Graduation from an approved college or university with a degree in the sciences; work experience in a laboratory; ability to work independently and to accept responsibility. \$9,100-\$12,275.

LIBRARIAN FOR RARE BOOKS (11-16-76).

LIBRARIAN II (Media Service) (11-9-76).

LIBRARIAN II in Arabic, Persian, and Turkish. (11-9-76).

LIBRARY DEPT. HEAD I (12-14-76).

LIBRARY DEPT. HEAD II (12-14-76).

SENIOR RESEARCH COORDINATOR (12-14-76).

STAFF NURSE (12-7-76).

SUPPORT STAFF

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I (12-21-76).

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT II schedules classes; knowledge of A-V technical terms, and some skill in A-V equipment operation. *Qualifications:* At least two years' experience in audio-visual center or similar work. \$7,475-\$9,350.

CASHIER operates cash register; able to get along well with people. Person may be required to work Saturdays or occasional longer hours during beginning of semesters. *Salary to be determined.*

CLERK knowledge of books. May be required to work occasional Saturdays. *Salary to be determined.*

CONTRACT ACCOUNTANT maintains all accounting and other budget-related aspects of research/training grant awards to psychology department faculty. Confers with faculty committee on grants and business administrator in setting up a complete commitment budget expenditure system for grant awards. *Qualifications:* Ability to set up grant budget system; prepare regular reports; get along with people. Degree in accounting/two years in accounting \$7,475-\$9,350.

LABORATORY ASSISTANT does routine work in laboratory, involving care and maintenance of the laboratory and equipment, particularly glassware. General housekeeping, with emphasis on washing and sterilizing glassware. *Qualifications:* Willingness to work under supervision. Training on the job. \$5,150-\$6,450.

LABORATORY ASSISTANT collects and prepares whole slide specimens and museum specimens for teaching purposes; maintaining, and cataloging of teaching materials. *Qualifications:* Graduation from high school, knowledge of biology. \$5,150-\$6,450.

LICENSED PRACTICAL NURSE (11-16-76).

MEDICAL SECRETARY (2) (12-21-76).

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN I performs standardized lab analyses. *Qualifications:* Graduation from high school and an approved course in general lab techniques; familiarity with animals. \$6,575-\$8,225.

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN II (2) 1) Preparation of solutions and maintenance of glassware; data reduction and collation; some library research; preparation of card files and research records. Must have experience in working with elderly patients. 2) Anesthetizes dogs, cats, goats, and performs simple surgery on same; calibrates, maintains, and operates simple physiologic recording instruments; assists with major experiments, analyzes data and prepares illustrative material, maintains lab; mechanical and electrical interfacing. Looking for experience in assisting with or performs animal surgery and cell counting. *Qualifications:* College courses in the sciences, some lab experience desirable. \$7,425-\$9,300.

(continued)

SUMMER HOUSING

The University's Conference Office will offer low-cost housing accommodations to transients and small conferences for the summer of 1977.

Groups will be housed in High Rise North, providing air-conditioned one- and three-bedroom suites with private baths. All apartments are furnished and carpeted, and most are equipped with kitchen facilities. Linen and towels will be provided.

If you would like more information on housing for transients or conferences for the summer of 1977, please write to the Conference Office, 3901 Locust Walk/B8, or call Ext. 6843.

— Julia Kane, Director of Conferences

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN II (3) Enzyme analysis of bacterial mutants; isolation and characterization of enzymes. (2) Biological experiments performed with blood or tissue specimens using biochemical analysis and vital staining procedures. Handles balance, blood, etc.; laboratory skills related to hematology, biochemistry, and histopathology. *Qualifications:* College courses in the sciences, some lab experience; bachelor's degree in a biological science; experience can be substituted for lack of degree. \$7,475-\$9,300.

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN III (2) 1) Cultivation of human cells in tissue culture, infection of cells with cytomegalovirus, analysis of macromolecular synthesis in the infected cells. Must have knowledge of basic laboratory techniques. 2) Tissue culture work, growth and maintenance of cell cultures, chromosome analysis, biochemical analyses, will perform karyotypes on cultured cells, experience in lab work desirable. *Qualifications:* B.A., B.S. degree in science; experience preferred. \$8,375-\$10,475.

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN III (1) Heart and liver perfusion of rats, preparation of isolated cells and isolated mitochondria, experimental material by tissue extraction and assay or metabolites by spectrophotometric and fluorometric procedures. 2) Orders electronic parts and constructs circuits from diagrams; tests and evaluates above circuits, using existing software; independently carries out analog to digital conversion, data analysis and computer plotting using PDPs and 10 computers; occasionally assists in experimental canine surgery. 3) Cultivates human cells in tissue culture. Infects cells with Cytomegalovirus. Analysis of macromolecular synthesis in the infected cells. *Qualifications:* B.S. or equivalent skills; more sophisticated techniques will be taught. \$8,375-\$10,475.

SECRETARY I answers telephone and takes messages for faculty. Types varied material via handwritten notes or dictaphone. Maintains filing system. Performs various duties as assigned. *Qualifications:* Ability to type with speed and accuracy, excellent aptitude. \$5,625-\$7,025.

SECRETARY II coordinates regional programs; bookkeeping; types extensive correspondence via handwriting or shorthand; drafts routine correspondence; maintenance of file systems; telephone contact with alumni; coordinates mailings; updates old card files, works with computer runs; arranges hotel, conference, meeting accommodations. *Qualifications:* Accurate typing, good grammar, shorthand. Secretarial experience; ability to coordinate detailed operations. \$6,050-\$7,550.

SECRETARY II (11-16-76).

SECRETARY III (11-9-76).

SECRETARY III (2) (12-21-76).

SECRETARY IV (12-14-76).

TECHNICAL MEDICAL SECRETARY transcribes medical terminology. Phone contact with clients and referring veterinarians. May have to work with animals. *Qualifications:* Familiarity with medical terminology. Accurate typing. \$6,950-\$8,675.

TYPIST I types research manuscripts and grant proposals, correspondence filing, and general office work. Other duties as assigned. *Qualifications:* Excellent typing skills mandatory. Graduation from high school. \$5,250-\$6,550.

PART-TIME

RESEARCH TECHNICIAN (3 days/week) for an immunology laboratory, working with serum and blood cells. *Qualifications:* College courses in organic chemistry, work experience in organic chemistry; work experience in a biology, immunology, or chemistry lab. \$3.50-\$4.50/hour.

THINGS TO DO

MIXED BAG

Bloom on the range: The first Morris Arboretum evening lecture of the year is *Flowers of the Friendly Mountains*; January 19, 8 p.m., Woodmere Gallery, 9414 Meadowbrook Avenue. A workshop on *The Winter Garden*, February 7 at 10 a.m., is the first of the year as well. But most of the short courses, clinics, and workshops don't start until March or April. Call CH 7-5777 for information.

This Thursday Charles Ross is on the beam at the ICA with *The Substance of Light*, an exhibit of prisms, solar burns, and celestial maps. The exhibit continues through February 22 and features a lecture by the artist and a screening of *Sunlight Dispersion* and *Arisaig, July 10, 1972*, two of his films, on February 2 at 8:30 p.m.

One Monkey Don't Stop no Shaw: Ann Premack speaks to the Faculty Tea Club about her new book, *By Jove, She's Got It!* a sequel to *Why Chimps Can Read*, on January 25; 1:30 p.m.; Alumni Hall of the Towne Building.

FILM

Stark, raving Hitchcock comes at you in *Frenzy*, January 20 at 7:30 and 9:45 p.m. The second offering of the Christian Association's international cinema series is *Children of Paradise*, January 21 at 7:30 p.m. Screenings are in the International House; admission is \$1.

Whistle Down the Wind is the January 22 University Museum children's film; 10:30 a.m. in the Harrison Auditorium.

The Night of Counting the Years, an Egyptian film, shows at 2:30 p.m. this Sunday in the Museum's Harrison Auditorium.

THEATER

Just going through the motions: Jon Harvey performs *Mime Erotica* in the opening show of the Wilma Theatre Project at the CA this weekend. Shows are at 8:30 p.m. Friday through Sunday; admission is \$2.50.

S/R/O!, Mask and Wig's 1977 production, begins January 27 at the Mask and Wig Club, 310 South Quince Street. For the January 28 cabaret, the Administrative Assembly has purchased 50 tickets (\$16 per person—dinner included). For reservations with the Administrative Assembly show, call Harold Dumm, Ext. 7260. For general information and reservations, call WA 3-4229 or Ext. 6791.

The first Noel: the Annenberg Center features a revue of the music and entertainment of Noel Coward. *Oh Coward!* plays in the Zellerbach Theatre of the Center beginning February 2. For reservations and information, call the box office, Ext. 6791.

HONORARY DEGREE NOMINATIONS

The Honorary Degrees Committee of the University Council is seeking nominations of candidates to receive honorary degrees at the 1977 Commencement. The criteria for nominations are outstanding scholarly, scientific or artistic achievement and, where possible, a demonstrable connection between the nominees and the University of Pennsylvania.

Each nomination should be accompanied by a supporting statement and a curriculum vitae. Time permitting, letters seconding the sponsor's nomination should also be provided to the committee. The chairman of the committee, Professor J. Robert Schrieffer, has asked that all nominations and supporting materials be submitted to him at 2N17A DRL/E1, no later than January 20.

—John Hunt, Secretary of the Corporation and Vice-President

ALMANAC: 515 Franklin Building (16) Ext. 5274

Editor..... Karen Gaines

Assistant Editor Duncan Williams

Distribution Karen A. Graves