

# Almanac

Published Weekly by the University of Pennsylvania  
Volume 23, Number 22 February 22, 1977

- SPEAKING OUT • *Notes on Operational Services (Shabel)*
- *Procedures for Choosing Designers, Architects, etc.*
- *Memoranda on Staff Cuts and Salary-Setting*
- OF RECORD: *Termination Policy*
- 1975-76 COMMITTEE REPORTS, Part III: *Facilities; Library*
- COUNCIL: *Proposed Charge to Educational Planning*
- *Text of Wharton Ten-Year Tenure Resolution*
- OPENINGS • THINGS TO DO • WXP

## ON THE GOVERNOR'S BUDGET MESSAGE

The Governor's (February 15) appropriation recommendations for the University of Pennsylvania—and, indeed, for all higher education—confirm the warnings of austerity for fiscal 1977-78 which have come from the Commonwealth Budget Office.

We recognize the State's budget problems—the strain on anticipated revenues to meet legitimate needs. But we are particularly puzzled by the recommendation that current Commonwealth support for our School of Veterinary Medicine be reduced by about 45 percent.

A year ago the Commonwealth recognized that the School could not long maintain its nationally recognized quality in the face of an annual operating deficit of \$1.7 million. And the Commonwealth added that amount to the funds appropriated for the veterinary school. For the coming year, to subtract nearly that amount would put the school in even more severe financial straits, because of inflation, than it faced a year ago. (Also, once again the funds for the rest of the University represent little recognition of the erosion due to inflation.)

In addition to the service and research benefits the people of Pennsylvania receive from the veterinary school, it is noteworthy that 70 percent of the students are Pennsylvanians and 70 percent of the practicing veterinarians in Pennsylvania are alumni of the school. These benefits accrue to the Commonwealth at a cost-per-student to the state which is half that of the other veterinary schools in the nation. Ours, of course, is the only veterinary school in Pennsylvania.

A recurrent concern we have encountered in discussions with Commonwealth officials is the high cost-per-student in veterinary medicine compared with human medicine. The costs are high, but more significant, veterinary schools simply do not have income from third-party payers such as Blue Cross-Blue Shield, Medicare, Medicaid, and from private foundations and federal agencies, as do schools of human medicine.

For this fiscal year the University is receiving \$17,691,000 from the state apart from the \$100,000 appropriation to our Museum. The University's request for 1977-78 was \$22,058,800 and the Governor's recommendation is for \$16,165,000.

Both the Governor and the General Assembly in the past have thoughtfully considered appeals and pertinent data from the University in adjusting budget recommendations. Through the appropriations process, including public hearings before the General Assembly's appropriations committees, we expect to present what we feel is a persuasive case for restoring the 45 percent reduction proposed for the 1977-78 Commonwealth appropriation to our School of Veterinary Medicine and for increases in the rest of our appropriation which will more closely approach the inflationary rise in our costs.

—Martin Meyerson, President

## TERMINATION AND LAY-OFF POLICIES

Three related documents are being mailed to budget heads this week, tightening and codifying University procedures on terminations, notification of staff cuts, and determination of salary in hiring. The texts start on page 6 of this issue.

## The News From Harrisburg

Governor Milton J. Shapp has recommended a Commonwealth budget for fiscal 1977-78 that calls for a modest increase of \$212,000 (about three per cent) in funds available for general University use—but a cut of \$1,638,000 in the appropriation to the School of Veterinary Medicine and a reduction of \$100,000 in the allocation to the School of Dental Medicine. Appropriations for University-wide student aid, the School of Medicine and the Museum remain at current levels. The figures:

	1976-77 Actual	1977-78 Recommended	Change
Instruction	\$7,063,000	\$7,275,000	+\$212,000
Student Aid	3,374,000	3,374,000	0
Medical	2,882,000	2,882,000	0
Veterinary	3,772,000	2,134,000	-1,638,000
Dental	600,000	500,000	-100,000
Museum	100,000	100,000	0
Totals	\$17,791,000	\$16,265,000	-\$1,526,000

The School of Veterinary Medicine received a \$1.7 million increase in its appropriation last year, based on the University's projection of a deficit in that amount for the school. The 1977-78 recommendation almost totally eliminates that gain, and appears to be based on a three-percent increase over the 1975-76 appropriation.

The pattern of three-percent increases in line items for instruction carries through the recommendations for other colleges and universities in the Commonwealth. For the three major State-related universities—Penn State, Pittsburgh, and Temple—the February 15 budget message asked increases ranging from 2.4 to 2.8 percent.

Governor Shapp also called for a one-cent increase in the State sales tax to raise the \$295 million in new revenues to fund the proposed budget. Tax and spending proposals will be considered by the General Assembly during the next several months, but decisions on the appropriations are expected only after the tax question is resolved.

## WHARTON FACULTY ON TEN-YEAR TRACK: YES

The Wharton School proposal to lengthen the tenure-probationary period from seven years to ten, and to allow for a stage of promotion to associate professor without tenure, has been adopted by mail ballot. Tellers from the school's academic freedom committee, Drs. Robert C. Jones and Ross A. Weber, report that 117 of the eligible 157 faculty voted. The result was 82 in favor, 32 against, 3 abstaining. Full text is on page 9.

The resolution will be sent to the Provost and go through normal academic channels including the Senate. If adopted on campus it would need Trustee approval before implementation.

# Speaking Out

## BENEFITS AND OVERHEAD

I was pleased to hear that the Personnel Benefits Committee will continue their work to meet "the needs and desires" of the faculty and staff. I suspect also that most would support Professor Morris Hamburg's reasoned letter identifying erroneous conclusions, based on either false assumptions or incomplete data, and calling for a more informed analysis of costs. Moreover, I suspect that most faculty and staff would support moves to improve medical coverage and to initiate dental benefits.

On the other hand, the report deals with two major issues that are bound to be more controversial, although perhaps the main players are apt to differ in each case. First of all, I suspect that those with families and growing children to support might find some of the comments about the inequitable benefits received by families just a bit condescending. Presumably, those with children are getting more than their share of benefits because the University provides benefits in the form of free tuition, at the expense of single workers and married couples with no children.

It is interesting to note, in this regard, how quick the committee was to argue that TIAA-CREF benefits should be "de-sexed," even though this action would penalize men, who on the average receive far less retirement pay, and a greater percentage of whom support the children who will ensure the long-term viability of our social system, including the very retirement benefits the "de-sexed" seek. Apparently, benefits should be based on ability to pay and/or to receive, in one case, but not the other.

Although the newly proposed tuition regulations would apply only to newly hired faculty (and hence would not affect us old guard), it would be seriously inequitable and another blow to the University family and, over the longer term, to all of us in increased social costs.

A second major concern involves the recommendation concerning the use of benefits to pay the tuition of graduate students who serve as research and/or teaching assistants. Quite possibly, these costs do not belong in the personnel benefits budget. Several important questions must be asked and answered, however, *before* any changes are made—not *after*. These questions and answers could have a fundamental impact on every faculty member who has even had or anticipates having a funded research project. (1) How would needed tuition benefits for graduate students working on funded projects be funded? (2) Are research contracts still to be burdened with personnel benefits costs for employees (graduate students) who do not

## Q & A TOMORROW

All faculty are advised that tomorrow's joint AAUP-Senate meeting on "The Erosion of the Economic Status of the Faculty" is an open meeting and that panelists (Drs. F. Gerard Adams, J. David Cummins and John N. Hobstetter) will be available for a question-and-answer period led by the moderator, Dr. Morris Mendelson.

February 23 . . . . . 4 p.m.  
Benjamin Franklin Room, Houston Hall

receive them? (3) Other than room to work, what research benefits are those who bring in and work on research contracts to get for the 55 percent or so that they pay in University overhead? After all is said and done, the most important question is the following: *Will proposed changes reduce discretionary spending power by principal investigators in favor of administrators who benefit from such general categories as overhead, or in this case a general tuition fund controlled at the departmental or school level?*

—Joseph M. Scandura, Director  
Interdisciplinary Studies in Structural  
Learning and Instructional Science

## OUTMODED 'BONUSES'

While the furor rages over the faculty and staff scholarship part of the University's personnel benefits we are continuing to ignore other significant areas of the benefits program which have a far greater impact on the University's bottom line—the uncontrolled excesses of Penn's liberal vacation and time off policy.

Under current personnel benefit procedures, Pennsylvania grants 4 weeks of paid vacation to all employees beginning in their *third* year of employment. Under many similar areas in the private sector of the economy, it would normally require 10 years or more of full time service to obtain this benefit.

In addition, however, Penn offers a "bonus" five days of vacation between Christmas and New Year's for all A-1 and A-3 staff, which probably costs between \$1 and \$2 million in extra salary expense. (There is nothing wrong with vacation between Christmas and New Year's, but why should it not be taken as part of the 20 days of regular vacation time allowed, rather than a "traditional" extra benefit?) On top of this, as we all know, are the 8 paid holidays, 18 sick days and 3 personal days—all of which add up to a whopping 54 days, or 20% of the total potential of 260 working days per year. The University has a four-day week!

Finally, before the Personnel Benefits Committee seeks to balance the University's budget at the expense of the faculty-staff scholarship program, let us first remove one of the other vestiges of our outmoded paternalistic system—the special extra week's vacation dowry we graciously bestow on staff called "marriage leave." There, Professor Gomberg, we truly have a benefit which is obtained as the result of "family status rather than merit."

Is it not time to assess realistically the true cost to the University of this aspect of personnel benefits, and to bring it more appropriately in line with business and industry in the Delaware Valley area? Eliminating these "bonuses" for new employees will provide far greater benefit in future budgets than more restrictive application of the faculty and staff scholarship program.

—Curtis Barnes, Director of Publications

## EARLYBIRD BUT NO WORM

The University Parking Service has informed all "Patrons of Lot 13" (at 36th and Walnut Streets) that this lot "was established . . . to answer the short-term parking needs of the visitors to campus." The list includes "applicants to Admissions, HUP patients, Faculty Club guests, Annenberg patrons attempting to purchase tickets, disabled visitors, vendors and other guests."

The letter goes on to say that they have been able to "take care of some University employees via the 'Earlybird Special' arrangement before 9 a.m." but that "unfortunately this situation has evolved so that we do not currently have nearly enough spaces at midday to serve the needs for which the lot was originally intended." The purpose of the letter is to inform the "Patrons of Lot 13" that effective February 21, the Earlybird Special rate will be increased from \$1.50 to \$2.25.

They remind employees and students that parking permits are available at a "substantial discount" and that all-day parking may also be procured for \$1.50 per day at various other campus locations, including 34th & Chestnut, 38th & Spruce, etc.

In my opinion, everyone is given preference before employees in University dealings. Now we're rated *below* visitors. Why can't visitors be expected to use the outlying lots rather than employees? The courtesy bus is available to them after 9 A.M.; let them use it!

When Lot 13 charges \$2.25 per day, how long does the Parking Office think it will be before the lot at 34th & Chestnut raises its rate to \$2.25 per day?

Is the multi-level parking lot at Children's Hospital filled up? This would seem to be a

*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.

much more suitable place in which hospital visitors can park. If the University needs more visitor parking spaces, why did they do away with all the visitor spaces in front of the Franklin Building?

I think this can be counted as another example of University policy: Employees last!  
—Ethel Zavodnick, *Abstractor*  
*Information and Records*

## RESPONSE TO EARLYBIRDS

For years the most consistent complaint that the Parking Office has received concerns the lack of parking at the University for campus visitors. This problem has become particularly acute since the lot at 36th and Spruce was closed due to Silverstein construction. The complaint has constantly been reinforced by personnel in administrative and academic buildings such as Logan Hall, College Hall and the Franklin Building. Likewise, there are several semipublic buildings (Faculty Club, Van Pelt Library, Annenberg Center, Wistar, Museum, etc.) that have also suffered the same handicap. It was in this context that the decision was made to designate 100 of the 400 spaces in the parking area bordered by 37th and Sansom, 36th and Walnut for visitor parking.

The University parking system remains very much employee-oriented. Forty-two of the 45 facilities are primarily for the use of faculty, staff and students. Two are for Hospital patients and lot #13 is the only one specifically designated for campus visitors. The income from this lot (75¢ per hour) subsidizes the fee for University employee permit-holders (about 75¢ per day).

The eleven-visitor spaces in front of the Franklin Building were moved to 36th and Walnut for centralization of visitor parking and to provide more spaces in the Franklin Building lot for employee parking. The Children's Hospital Garage and HUP Courtesy Bus are partial answers to the HUP patient problem, but do not solve the other problems already identified. While we have no control over what the private operator at 34th and Chestnut does with his rates, we have no current plans to raise the \$1.50 daily rates at our transient facilities (38th and Spruce, Palestra, 33rd and Walnut, etc.).

Finally, my office is currently working with Facilities Development on a comprehensive transportation study of the University area. We recognize that the inadequacy of the public transportation system serving this area is a contributing factor to some of the parking problems at Penn. Such approaches as extension of SEPTA routes, reconfiguration of the campus loop bus and vanpool programs are being analyzed as a way to minimize the need for employees to drive to work. I would personally appreciate any thoughts or constructive suggestions on this overall subject from interested University employees. We have already received some good input on transportation from the A-3 Assembly. Please contact me on Ext. 5227 or in room 107 of the Franklin Building.

—Steven D. Murray, *Director of Transportation and Communications*

## PERSONNEL BENEFITS

### OBSERVATIONS ON THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSED REVISIONS OF THE TIAA-CREF CONTRIBUTION SCHEDULE

The University administration has proposed that the current TIAA-CREF contribution schedule be modified. The modification would apply only to newly hired faculty and administrators. No one currently participating in the pension plan would suffer a financial loss as a result of the proposed changes. In spite of this exemption for current plan participants, the Personnel Benefits Committee has serious reservations about the proposal. The intent of this article is to present the proposal in the outline form, to discuss its rationale and implications for benefit adequacy, and to express the views of the Personnel Benefits Committee with regard to the proposal.

The current and proposed TIAA-CREF contribution schedules are set forth below:

#### Current Schedule

Age of Employee	University Contr.	Employee Contr.
Under 30	6%	4%
30-39	8	5
40 and over	9	5

\*Percent of compensation

#### Proposed Schedule

Wage Level	University Contr.*	Employee Contr.*
Below Social Security Wage Base**	5.5%	2.75%
Above Social Security Wage Base	11.0	5.50

\*Percent of Compensation

\*\*The current Social Security wage base is \$16,500.

The schedule modification is based on the private-pension-plan concept known as *integration*. An integrated plan recognizes that the employer contributes to the Social Security system for earnings below the Social Security wage base. Thus, according to the integration concept, the private-pension-plan contribution rate below the wage base should be less than that above the base so that the aggregate employer contribution rate (for Social Security and the private pension plan) is approximately the same on earnings above and below the wage base. The current employer contribution rate to Social Security is 5.85 percent of earnings below the wage base.

Integrated pension plans are widely used in private industry, and several other Ivy League universities have already integrated their pension plans.

The administration's proposal to integrate the pension plan was motivated in part by the rapid increases in the Social Security wage base in recent years. (The wage base increased from \$7,800 in 1971 to \$16,500 in 1977, a compound annual rate of growth of 13.3 percent.) These increases have had a major impact on the employee benefits expenses of the University, and the proposal is designed to reduce the cost burden stemming from future increases in the wage base.

Another motivating factor behind the proposal is the allegation that the University pension plan is too generous. It is contended that some faculty members are retiring at pensions (considering both TIAA-CREF and Social Security) which exceed their final salaries. Of course, these allegations, if true, ignore the fact that most faculty members teach or participate in research projects during the summer months so that their nine-months salaries do not accurately reflect their incomes.

According to the projections conducted for the administration by TIAA-CREF, a male faculty member age 30 hired in 1976 at a salary of \$16,000 would be able to retire under the present pension plan at 107.8 percent of his five-year final average salary. The 107.8 percent is composed of 73.2 percent from TIAA and 34.6 percent from Social Security. Under the revised contribution schedule, the projections show that the faculty member would retire at 80.7 percent of the five-year final average salary, with this total composed of 46.1 percent from TIAA and 34.6 percent from Social Security. A figure of 80 percent would be in line with the target benefit levels established by most pension plans in private industry.

The Personnel Benefits Committee is currently studying the proposed pension plan modifications and the accompanying projections with regard to the adequacy of benefits. Projections of this type are extremely complex and it is our view that some of the assumptions on which the projections are based lead to inaccurate results. Accordingly, we have requested projections from TIAA-CREF under several alternative sets of assumptions. The Committee recognizes the importance of cost control in the benefits area. However, we do not believe that cost control should be achieved at the expense of the economic security of the faculty and administrators of the University, either present or future. We intend to consider the revised projections with this philosophy in mind and inform the administration of our views by mid-April. Comments from interested faculty members would be welcome and can be submitted to the chairman at 307 Colonial Penn Center (3641 Locust Walk).

—J. David Cummins, *Chairman, Personnel Benefits Committee*



*At Council on February 9, the Vice-President for Operational Services delivered a rapid rundown on the units that have been drawn together since the creation of his post almost two years ago. Afterward Almanac asked for his notes.*

## Notes on Seven Operational Services

*by Fred A. Shabel*

### *Security*

In the 1960's our University community did not want to see uniformed policemen in and around its institution.

Interestingly enough we now feel just the opposite pressure—to increase our staff and in turn have more visibility.

Can a larger staff decrease crime, or decrease theft in our community? Can a larger staff prevent the type of assaults we periodically experience? Admittedly, it's debatable but many believe the size of the staff doesn't necessarily mean crime statistics will decrease. Nevertheless we must bring this concern to some kind of conclusion. I hope that the Council Committee on Security and Safety and the *Ad Hoc* Review Committee on Safety and Security of Women will suggest some guidelines for us; that is, guidelines on our staffing.

Obviously these guidelines will have to be introduced into the normal budget process of the University. If, in fact, we can prove to ourselves that more staff will decrease crime, it is most certainly my judgment that our budget dilemma should not be a consideration.

### *The World of Physical Plant*

Murphy's law might very well be applicable—if things can go wrong, they will. Only if you don't understand the subject.

During the first three weeks our students came back for the second semester, physical plant had over 2,000 service requests in the residences alone.

If we thought our deferred maintenance of the past was a horror story, please be assured the as of late temperature changes proved the point.

From January 17 to January 21 we had 479 nonresidential service requests. These data simply allows me to bring the words "deferred maintenance" to your attention.

Our physical plant is old in many areas and getting older. Our problems are massive. Those of you who are seeking space in Bennett Hall know what I mean. The third floor of College Hall is a disaster by any standard.

Throughout the country budget committees in higher education all seem to come to the same conclusion—chop away at physical plant which in turn puts deferred maintenance once again on the back burner. As you know, we have started a small annual fund as an attempt to attack our deferred maintenance concerns. The idea is a credit to our budget office. However, please understand that the amount we are setting aside simply cannot address the magnitude of the problem.

### *Collective Bargaining Agreements*

We have collective bargaining agreements that go back for more than 30 years. Our work force compared to similar unionized ones in Philadelphia have extremely liberal work rules and benefits.

For example, most of our union labor has three or more years of service and therefore has approximately 52 paid free days a year that they are entitled to—that is vacation, sick leave, and so forth—not counting weekends. This means that on a Monday morning half of a particular trade might legitimately be at home, and this is not uncommon. And on that particular Monday morning the number of calls and problems could be staggering for our supervisory group.

Our skilled trades people in Physical Plant, have a collective bargaining agreement that pays an employee time and a half for Saturday and double time for Sunday. And we cannot assign this force Tuesday through Saturday, or Wednesday through Sunday as a normal schedule, even though Physical Plant services the University 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Nevertheless, with all of the unusual work rules, we recognize that management still has to improve its capability and if anything, these restrictions suggest we (management) have to perform at a higher level. Thus training, productivity, performance are words that are important to us.

### *A Few Energy Observations*

Many of our systems are very difficult to control. All of us have experienced extremely hot rooms and extremely cold rooms.

We will continue to invest into new equipment if the payback is clearly defined.

President Carter recently said the amount of energy now being wasted is greater than the total energy we are importing. Without a doubt his statement is applicable to our campus. In many areas we must depend on the University community to control lighting, to close windows and drapes, to keep thermostats at recommended levels and to turn off equipment when not in use. We as a community cannot grade ourselves very high in this area.

To illustrate the difficulty we have, let me tell you that in order to have *this* room ready for *this* meeting, we had to send a man over once to raise the thermostat, and once to check it; and we will probably have to send someone later today to readjust it if we want to be sure of any conservation tonight. A thought for the day: *Under the most carefully controlled conditions, utility systems behave as they damn well please!*

### *Bookstore*

Our Bookstore Committee chaired by Professor Kelly and our management group agree on the need for more space. It is not clear, however, as to the mix we should be seeking regarding pure bookstore space and department store space.

Recognizing our primary concern is to develop an outstanding bookstore, we nevertheless have to be appreciative of the financial implications. For the last nine years the Bookstore has operated at a deficit. This past year for the first time in ten years the Bookstore ended the year with a modest surplus.

But pure academic bookstores simply cannot break even. Without a department store as part of the formula we would operate at a loss to the University unless we subsidize.

Thus the space mixture has to be addressed and it is imperative to put the Bookstore in a strong financial position before we think in terms of a significant capital investment regarding new space.

By the way, a student recently criticized the decision to close the Bookstore during the energy crisis. The store is heated by gas and the city on that particular Saturday requested that we close the store.

### *Publications*

A few years ago the University was asking for continuity and graphic consistency in the area of publications. There was great disturbance over the fact that many departments were simply designing and printing on their own.

As a result of this, we developed a Publications Office and asked our schools and departments to filter their work through this office.

By not putting the cost of the operation into our indirect charges, however, we directed the Publications Office to establish a service charge in order to pay for its own operation: that is, an "O" budget. This service charge is now being challenged by a variety of departments who feel they can save money by doing it themselves.

This desire, if accepted, will put us back in the position where we lose continuity and consistency and the ability to buy paper and printing services at volume discount prices.

The feeling by some departments on this issue is a classic breakdown of our One University theme. We have many departments in many segments of our community that truly don't have the ability to put out their own publications without a professional service.

### *Dining Service*

In 1972 our Dining Service closed its books at a loss of one million dollars to the University.

It is our hope that by June 30 of this year our deficit will be under \$100,000 and from this point on it is our objective to offer a break-even operation to the University.

Even though we have completely reversed the deficit spiral, we nevertheless have a need to take soft money and make it somewhat harder, for a variety of reasons:

1. to eliminate the drain on University Resources.

2. to prevent future increases. In fact, one of the ways we have closed the gap is by virtue of the charges we have imposed on students during the past few years.

3. to support the house systems and their desire to have discrete dining.

The Undergraduate Assembly has stated that our Dining Service management would lose its incentive by instituting a mandated freshman contract. How wrong they are! If we truly desire to sell contracts to sophomores, juniors and seniors on a voluntary basis, we have all the incentive we need to give freshmen a positive dining experience.

If it is important to Penn to put frosh in the high rises (with kitchens)... if a mandated frosh plan simply does not appeal to us... if our Council of Masters doesn't think ten meals should be part of their program... then, please understand that our Dining Service will not break even in the future.

\* \* \*

In closing, we truly believe Operational Services must be a service oriented organization. We also recognize that we are servicing a large community: a community with all the needs and problems of a small city.

Your thoughts, your complaints, your suggestions, your help, are needed.

*Following are two recent memoranda from Operational Services.*

### **CHOOSING DESIGNERS, ARCHITECTS, ETC.**

Responsibility for coordinating all interior design projects for the University has been assigned to the Department of Facilities Development, 748 Franklin Building.

Interior design services apply to space planning and to the specification of furnishings, lighting, carpeting, fabrics, and colors.

In order to service interior design requests and develop design continuity, the following procedures have been established: (1) All requests will be received and coordinated by the Department of Facilities Development, assuming funds have been identified (Please contact Peter Kohn, Ext. 5831). (2) A designer will be selected from a list of approved interior design firms. The selected designer will work in consultation with the requesting department and the Department of Facilities Development. (3) The Engineering and Construction Department will provide final estimates and construction supervision of the project. (4) The Purchasing Department will order all furniture and materials as specified in the contract documents.

\* \* \*

A systematic process has been established for selecting architects, engineers and other professional consultants for University building programs managed by Operational Services. The selection shall be made on the basis of criteria related to professional and managerial capability. This selection process shall apply to all University schools, activities, and to the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania projects managed by Operational Services regardless of the source of funding.

#### **I. Procedure for Projects over \$500,000**

A. *List of Professional Candidates:* The Director of Facilities Development shall submit a final list of three professional candidates for review by the Selection Committee. The President, the Vice-President for Operational Services, the Dean of the Graduate School of Fine Arts, the client, school or activity shall be given the opportunity to suggest candidates for review.

B. *Selection Advisory Committee:* The Selection Advisory Committee shall consist of no more than five members including the chairman, who is the Director of Facilities Development. The nature and stage of the project shall determine the makeup of the Committee to be named by the chairman. Members of the Committee may include representatives from the involved department, the Faculty, the Administration, and appropriate Operational Services departments. In the selection of an architect the membership of the Committee shall include the Dean of the Graduate School of Fine Arts. The Committee shall rank candidates in order of preference, and the summary report shall be submitted to the President for final selection and nomination.

#### **II. Procedure for Projects under \$500,000**

A. *Projects from \$100,000 to \$500,000:* Projects with a total cost of \$100,000 to \$500,000 shall not be subject to the Selection Advisory Committee procedure. The selection of candidates shall be made by the Vice-President for Operational Services in consultation with the Directors of Facilities Development, Engineering and Construction, the Dean of the Graduate School of Fine Arts, and the appropriate client, Dean or Director. The President of the University shall be advised of the results of the selection process and be requested to provide his approval/disapproval in writing.

B. *Projects up to \$100,000:* Projects with total costs of less than \$100,000 shall normally be managed by the Department of Engineering and Construction and are not intended to be within the scope of this procedure.

#### **III. Exceptions**

There may arise exceptional circumstances where it is desirable to (1) retain an architect or consultant who had previously been associated with a building, (2) maintain a team of consultants who are working on sister or allied buildings, (3) alter procedures because of funding agency requirements, or (4) take into consideration other special circumstances. The exceptional circumstances shall be brought to the attention of the Vice-President for Operational Services and to the Senior Vice-President for Management by the Director of Facilities Development, for appropriate action.

—Fred A. Shabel

Following are the texts of two memoranda being issued this week to all deans, directors, department heads and business administrators. The Termination Policy at right is also being sent to them by the Personnel Office.

#### OF RECORD



#### STAFF REDUCTION/FILLING WITHIN

February 14, 1977

Because of the severe financial difficulties facing the University, many departments may have to reduce their staffs. This means that many experienced University employees will be available for consideration as candidates to fill any position vacancies which may occur within the next several months due to normal attrition.

While staff reductions are taking place in many departments, retirements, resignations and other factors may cause vacancies to occur in other areas of the University. Too often in the past, some departments with vacancies have gone outside the University family to fill open positions without considering candidates from among those being laid off. Therefore, before any commitment can be made to a candidate, the Personnel Relations Service Office must certify that no candidates are available from the University's layoff list.

To insure that the correct procedure is followed when laying off employees within your department, please refer to Personnel Department Bulletin No. 169, entitled *Termination Policy* [published herewith].

#### OF RECORD



#### RULES FOR SETTING SALARIES

February 14, 1977

The Personnel Relations Department has specific responsibilities for the protection of the University of Pennsylvania from potentially severe liabilities under various local, state and federal laws which regulate salary, wage and benefits arrangements between the University and its employees. These regulations cover equal employment opportunity, affirmative action, and pension plans and deal with the *relationship* of salaries or wages paid to individuals in comparable positions as well as with certain minimums, modes of pay and overtime provisions. The University's responsibilities in these matters must be met regardless of the source of funds from which individual salaries or wages are paid.

In order to meet these responsibilities, every salary or wage offer (except those established under collective bargaining agreements) must be approved in writing by a member of the Office of Personnel Relations Services before the offer is made. Advance, written approval is required before salary and wage offers are made to current University employees or to prospective new employees. Salary or wage commitments including promotions, made without such advance written approval from the Personnel Relations Office will not be honored. Departments which make unauthorized wage and salary arrangements will be required to bear any additional expense charges resulting from legal processes, penalties and equity settlements assessed against the University.

General—"across the board"—salary and wage adjustments which follow University-wide guidelines for budgeted scale changes need not be individually approved in advance. However, individual adjustments which are at variance with the general guidelines will require written approval in advance from a staff member of the Office of Personnel Relations Services. Individual adjustments made without such advance approval may not be sustained.

Salary and wage adjustment procedures relating to reclassifications remain unchanged.

The Office of Personnel Relations Services is located in Room 130, Franklin Building/16. This office is under the direction of Ms. Odessa McClain.

—Gerald L. Robinson,  
Executive Director of Personnel Relations

## OF RECORD



## TERMINATION

Following is the text of the termination of nonacademic to all deans, directors, depts  
February 14, 1977

### INTRODUCTION

The University of Pennsylvania has specific responsibilities and potentially severe liabilities under local, state and federal laws which relate to the conditions under which individuals are terminated from employment. These responsibilities must be met by the University regardless of the source of funds from which individual salaries are paid.

This statement sets forth the policy and procedures for terminating the employer-employee relationship between the University and administrative and support staff personnel. Procedures governing termination of unionized employees are set forth separately under the various collective bargaining agreements.

### DEFINITION

Termination of employment may either be *voluntary* or *involuntary*. *Voluntary* terminations include resignations, early retirements, and quits. *Involuntary* terminations include layoffs due to lack of funds or lack of work, completions of contracts, and discharges for just cause such as unsatisfactory job performance, unexcused absence, lateness or misconduct. (A list indicating some of the Reasons for Termination is incorporated in the Human Resources Management System procedures manual, part 5.5.5.1).

### POLICY

NO UNIVERSITY EMPLOYEE MAY BE TERMINATED BY A SUPERVISOR WITHOUT PRIOR REVIEW BY THE PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT.

NO EMPLOYEE WITH FIFTEEN OR MORE YEARS OF UNIVERSITY SERVICE MAY BE INVOLUNTARILY TERMINATED FOR ANY REASON EXCEPT WITH THE EXPRESS PRIOR APPROVAL OF THE PRESIDENT OR THE PROVOST OR THE SENIOR VICE-PRESIDENT FOR MANAGEMENT OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT FOR HEALTH AFFAIRS. UPON THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF PERSONNEL RELATIONS.

Any termination must be discussed with a representative of the Personnel Department before implementation.

Discharge for just cause is a grave action and should occur only after thorough and judicious consideration of all reasonable alternatives. It is University policy to assure that terminations for cause are administered fairly and only as a result of due process. The purpose of this policy is not only to insure equitable treatment for employees but also to avoid embarrassment to a supervisor through possible reversal of his or her decision, and the possibility of reinstatement of the discharged employee with back pay. When misconduct by an employee poses a threat to the safety of other persons or severely disrupts operation, or involves a criminal act, the offending employee may be immediately suspended by the supervisor unilaterally. Such suspensions, upon review by the Director of Personnel and Labor Relations and, as required, other appropriate University officers, may result in termination. Such



# POLICY

*University of Pennsylvania policy on  
staff, issued by the Personnel Office  
department heads and business administrators.*

terminations may be challenged in the grievance procedure for non-academic employees.

## PROCEDURE

### *Involuntary Termination: Just Cause*

Termination for just cause may occur only after the following procedure has been followed and documented.

1. Discussion between the employee and the supervisor in which the supervisor tells the employee what is unsatisfactory about his or her job performance or conduct. The objective of this discussion is to correct misunderstandings, prevent repetition of the unsatisfactory performance, and improve performance. The supervisor records such oral notices showing date, action taken, and summary of discussion, and furnishes a copy to the employee.

2. If conduct or performance has not improved as a result of the first notice, a second, written warning is given to the employee. This written warning specifies in detail the nature of the misconduct or unsatisfactory performance. It advises the employee that continued misconduct or unsatisfactory performance may result in further disciplinary action up to and including termination. It sets a period of time (usually in terms of weeks) in which the employee must achieve acceptable levels of conduct or performance or be terminated. The length of this probationary period should be determined jointly between the supervisor and a member of the Personnel Relations staff. A copy of the warning is forwarded to the Personnel Relations Office and is placed in the employee's file.

3. At the end of the probationary period, a final evaluation of the employee's performance is made by the supervisor. If the employee's conduct or job performance has remained unacceptable, the supervisor in consultation with the Director of Personnel and Labor Relations will make the decision to terminate. Written notice of termination setting forth the reasons for the action will be given by the supervisor to the employee. A copy of the notice is forwarded to the Personnel Office to be placed in the employee's file.

In any instance where an individual is terminated from University employment either voluntarily or involuntarily, care should be exercised to assure that the termination action is correctly described and entered into the records. Persons terminated involuntarily due to lack of funds may be entitled to receive unemployment compensation which is paid by the University. Persons who terminate as a result of voluntary action on their part generally are not entitled to receive unemployment compensation. In fairness to both the University and former employees, it is necessary to keep the records straight. When in doubt, administrators should consult a member of the Personnel staff. Any involuntary termination action may be challenged through the grievance procedure for non-academic staff.

## PROCEDURE

### *Lay-offs*

This procedure applies to lay-offs affecting non-union administrative and support staff personnel. (Lay-offs affecting union employees are governed by the terms of their respective collective bargaining agreements.) When lay-offs are contemplated, budget administrators and supervisors must contact the Office of Personnel Relations Services for assistance. Personnel Relations Assistants will advise administrators

and supervisors of the procedures governing lay-offs. A lay-off is a separation necessitated by financial exigency (e.g., lack of funds) or lack of work. Lay-offs may not be used for disciplinary purposes. A termination for disciplinary reasons should be administered apart from a lay-off.

1. In determining whom to lay-off, budget unit heads should first decide which functions may be reasonably reduced or discontinued. Persons performing those functions should then be considered for lay-off with reference to each individual's total University service. The rule: the person with the least amount of University service would be the first to be laid off, and so on.

Departures from the length of service rule may subject the action to grievance. If consideration of job performance is used as a basis for laying off more senior people and retaining less senior people in the same job category, supervisors must be prepared to justify the decision to a third party or reviewing panel.

Before any full-time personnel are laid off, departments should first lay off part-time personnel or student employees (except work-study students) before laying off full-time employees. In lay-offs of part-time personnel, the rule of University-wide service should also be applied.

2. Notice of lay-offs should be given to employees as far in advance of the lay-off date as possible. Persons with more than six months of University service who are to be laid off should be given one month's notice. Persons with less than six months' service should be given two weeks' notice. The notice of lay-off should be in writing with a copy sent to the Office of Personnel Relations Services for the employee's file. The reason for lay-offs should be stated as "lack of funds" or "mandated budget reduction."\*

3. Temporary lay-off occurs when the releasing department intends to re-employ the individual in the same or similar position at a specified time in the near future. A temporary lay-off may not involve a separation of more than six months. In the case of a temporary lay-off, the releasing department will provide the employee with a letter specifying the date for reinstatement and forward a copy to the Personnel Office with the Personnel Action Form effecting the lay-off. When no re-employment date can be indicated the lay-off will be treated as an indefinite (or permanent) separation.

4. Individuals separated from the University service because of lay-off would be entitled to receive pay for unused vacation. In addition, severance pay will be granted based upon the following table:

Years of Service	Payment
Under one year	No payment
1 - 5 years	1/2 month's pay (11 days)
6 - 10 years	1 month's pay (22 days)
11 - 15 years	1 1/2 months' pay (33 days)
Over 15 years	2 months' pay (44 days)

The Personnel Relations staff will make every effort to find alternate placement within the University for individuals being laid off. Every member of the University's academic and administrative staff has a responsibility for cooperating in this effort. Wherever possible, staffing of new positions and filling of vacancies should be accomplished through internal transfer on a University wide basis.

\*Pay may be given in lieu of notice up to a maximum of one month.

# COUNCIL

The reports below complete the series of annual reports for 1975-76 by Council, University-wide and operating committees. While Council is conducting a study of all such committees with special attention to reporting structure, the staffing of committees for 1977-78 goes forward; the Committee on Committees expects to deliver nominations to the Steering Committee starting March 1. Send names of nominees to Dr. Williams Stephens c/o the Office of the Secretary, 112 College Hall.

COMMITTEE \_\_\_\_\_  
CANDIDATE \_\_\_\_\_  
TITLE OR POSITION \_\_\_\_\_  
CAMPUS ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

## COMMITTEE REPORTS, 1975-76 (Part III)

### FACILITIES

The Committee held six meetings during the year. Several of these were attended by members of the University administration, by invitation, when matters within their jurisdiction were discussed. One meeting was also attended by a representative of the Undergraduate Assembly.

The present charge given the Committee by Council is as follows:

The University Facilities Committee shall have cognizance of the planning of operation of buildings and grounds and associated services, including transportation and parking. It is understood that the Committee will have a subcommittee on transportation and parking.

The Committee started its year's work by examining its own position, particularly in the light of the establishment by the President at the beginning of the year of the University Space Committee. The Committee noted that there were several *ad hoc* bodies besides the Space Committee which had responsibilities overlapping its own. These include:

Energy Conservation Committee  
Board of Design Consultants  
Committee on the Visual Environment  
*Ad hoc* building committees (e.g. the  
Quad Committee and the Medical  
Education Building Committee)

This list is probably not exhaustive.

The bodies mentioned above have fairly narrow and well-defined roles. The Space Committee, set up as an administrative committee of the University, has broader impact on the role of the Council's Committee.

The Space Committee's constitution and guidelines were published in *Almanac* April 27. It "has the primary responsibility for the allocation of the University's space resources" and it also "reviews proposals for new building projects and major building renovations." It has been apparent for some time that there was need for some person or group to have the authority now vested in the Space Committee, and a body of this kind was recommended in the Facilities Committee's annual report for 1974-75, though with significant differences as to the group's composition and with somewhat narrower terms of reference. The Space Committee's full agenda and the time that it has already devoted to it since its establishment are convincing evidence of the need for such a body. Inevitably there will be winners and losers in the space allocation process; but the University community as a whole must gain if it can be carried out more effectively.

The Facilities Committee has been concerned to see that the Council's authority should not be eroded by these developments, while avoiding undue redundancy. It believes that a workable arrangement between the two committees has been found, though time will tell whether or not this is so. Liaison between the Space Committee and the Facilities Committee is to be maintained primarily through the chairman of the Facilities Committee, who is *ex officio* a member of the Space Committee. The Space Committee's guidelines provide that its policies and procedures and any changes therein will be submitted to the Facilities Committee for review and comment.

Also, before reaching a final decision on a major matter such as a change in use of an entire building, the relocation of a department or the planning of a new facility, the Space Committee will refer the matter to the Facilities Committee for review. In addition, of course, the Facilities Committee can at any time take the initiative, through its chairman, in bringing some specific matter before the Space Committee for action.

With the establishment of the Space Committee and the changed situation resulting therefrom, the Facilities Committee has reviewed its charge from the Council and recommends that, to take account of the new situation, it should be revised\* as follows:

The University Facilities Committee shall be responsible for keeping under review the planning and operation by the University of its physical plant and all services associated therewith, including transportation and parking. The chairman of the committee, who is *ex officio* a member of the Space Committee (an administrative committee of the University), shall be responsible for bringing before the Facilities Committee for its review any matter dealt with or to be dealt with by the Space Committee which he considers to be of major importance and therefore to warrant such review.

It is clear that the Facilities Committee, with no staff of its own, meeting relatively infrequently and made up of persons with limited expertise in the many technical aspects of facilities management, cannot be a decision-making body. The Committee sees itself as having a useful role to play in three capacities:

1. as a forum where representatives of the faculty, student body and administrative staffs can review Space Committee proposals before final decisions on them are made or where such decisions can be reviewed *ex post facto*;

2. as a group with a special interest in and concern for the campus environment which can take the initiative in bringing to the attention of the Space Committee, the Vice-President for Operational Services or other University administrators, matters affecting the environment which call for investigation or action;

3. as an advisory body to be consulted by the Vice-President for Operational Services on matters within the Committee's purview where an expression of campus opinion would be helpful to him.

During the past year, the Committee has in fact functioned in all three of these capacities, as will be described later in this report. A fourth role might be added to the above list, namely, that of a watchdog for the Council on matters affecting the campus environment. However, the magnitude of the task of keeping itself informed on everything concerning facilities that is happening on the campus from day to day limits the Committee's capacity to perform this function effectively.

In this context, it is perhaps appropriate to draw attention to what seems to us to be a regrettable lack of contact between the Council and its committees, if this committee is typical. This position could easily be improved. As a minimum, one meeting a year at which the Steering Committee of Council or its chairman sat down together with the chairman of the Council's committees would do something to dispel the sense of separation from its parent body which is felt by this Committee at least.

#### The Committee's Agenda for 1975-76

The Committee during the past year concerned itself principally with five matters.

1. The Space Committee's guidelines and operating procedures were reviewed. General approval was given to the draft prepared by the Space Committee, subject to a few suggested minor changes. The Committee felt that its position as a monitor had been safeguarded by the draft.

2. Two matters referred to it by the Space Committee or reported to it as being on the Space Committee's agenda were discussed.

a. The Committee discussed the proposal to relocate SAMP in the Smith Building to make room for the Veterinary School's new Small Animal Hospital. As a result of this discussion, the Space Committee gave renewed consideration to the claim of the History and Sociology of Science Department to remain in the Smith Building.

b. The Committee also discussed the rival claims of the Day Care Center and the Cooperative Society to occupy the Furness Carriage House (behind WXP) if the Day Care Center has to move out of its present quarters in the Class of 1920 Commons to make room for a new catering facility there, and it heard representations from the Undergraduate Assembly and from the Assistant to the Vice-President for Operational Services on this subject. After considerable discussion it was

\*Revision adopted November 10; see *Almanac* October 12 for text.



decided to take on formal action but to convey to the Space Committee its sense that while a reconstituted, truly student-run cooperative would have a claim to space on the campus, the present organization appeared to have little if any affiliation with the University.

3. Consideration was given to the use to be made of three parcels of Redevelopment Authority land on Walnut Street. One of them (Parcel 1A) is the land west of 34th Street. The second, Parcel 2A, is the Pagano site. The third, Parcel 9, is the site running west from the Gimbel Gym to 38th Street. The principal purpose of this discussion was to give the Committee an opportunity to inform itself about the nature of the problem and to enlist its support in channeling ideas from the University community to the Administration.

Favored proposals at the present time for the use of these sites appear to be:

Parcel 1A. A faculty housing condominium with shopping facilities at street level.

Parcel 2A. A multi-purpose development, combining shops, restaurants and cafes, professional offices, and perhaps an interior garden. "Pennsylvania's Harvard Square" is one description of this proposal.

Parcel 9. Recreational and athletic facilities to complement the Gimbel Gym, Superblock and Graduate Towers.

In addition to these sites, it should be remembered that the single-story commercial establishments on the south side of Walnut Street west of the Social Science block and on 38th Street between Walnut and Locust, and the University Bookstore on Locust Walk, are all temporary structures already ripe for demolition. In the next ten years, therefore, the face of the campus will undergo further radical change. A great opportunity will be lost if development proceeds in a piecemeal fashion, site by site, with no over-all plan drawing all of these developments together.

4. A proposal was brought before the Committee that dining facilities should be made generally available outside the hours when food is being served, and especially at night for social gatherings and "rap sessions." This matter was explored with the Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Studies and University Life and evoked no enthusiasm there, on the ground that there was no demonstrated evidence of need. It was estimated that it would cost about \$6,000 in wages, plus some expense for utilities, to keep one dining facility open four nights a week after normal dining hours through the school year. There was not enough support for the proposal in the Committee to lead it to put pressure on the administration to finance such an experiment.

5. Parking rates. The Committee approved a seven-percent increase in parking rates for 1976-77. This increase had been authorized for 1975-76 but was not implemented this year. Parking rates have in fact been stabilized for the past three years. During the next few months, there will be heavy expenditures to surface new parking lots on the Sergeant Hall site and on Walnut Street and about \$115,000 of income from transient traffic will be lost through the closing of the lot behind the hospital. Operating costs have also risen. The increased rates which have been authorized for next year will enable the parking operation to break even.

—David Solomons, Chairman

## LIBRARY

A fall meeting of the Committee was held on November 21, 1975, and was largely devoted to two major concerns: the strike and the budget.

The nonprofessional library workers' union struck for three and one-half weeks in October and November in support of a strike called by the Operating Engineers and other campus unions. The Director reported that Van Pelt and most of the other libraries were forced to close during evening and certain weekend hours, but thanks to their loyalty, versatility, and exceptional efforts, the professional librarians and student employees were able to operate all essential public service functions at nearly normal levels during the daytime hours throughout the strike. Technical services operations were somewhat disrupted and curtailed but most backlogs were eliminated shortly after the strike ended. Although there were some incidents of broken windows and other acts of vandalism, no irreparable damage was done to the library and no injuries were sustained by library personnel. The remainder and major part of the meeting was devoted to discussion of the library's deteriorating budgetary situation and how it can continue to maintain services and collections at acceptable levels while suffering severe cuts in personnel (16 positions in 1975-76) and diminishing purchasing power in book funds caused by a 15-20 percent annual increase in book and journal prices. Comparisons were made between Penn's library statistics and those of its peer group and it appeared that most of its peers were faring somewhat better. It was agreed that the library's budget

problems would be the main agenda item for the next meeting and that the Director would provide proposals and data for consideration.

The winter meeting of the Committee was held on February 5, 1976, and was largely devoted to consideration of operating most effectively within the financial givens of our situation. Programs for cutting cost which have already been initiated were reviewed, and proposals and suggestions for further cuts were analyzed. It was generally recognized that there would be some erosion of the libraries' holdings and services, but that every effort was being made and would continue to be made to cut nonessential expenses so as to maintain standards as well as possible under the present unfortunate circumstances. Finally, the Committee considered the Director's report to University Council scheduled for February 11, and the report of the Committee's chairman on the same occasion, and supported both. Both reports were made on schedule, and are to be found in the minutes of the Council, as well as in published form in *Almanac*.

On February 27, Corey Shanus, an undergraduate representing the Committee on Committees, visited the chairman of the Library Committee to discuss the operations of this committee. He was brought fully up to date, and it was arranged for him to attend the next meeting, as he did. Also in February, Miss Betty Rosenkranz (FAS '79) was recommended for appointment to the Library Committee for the academic year 1976-77. The chairman then held a long conference with her in which she was familiarized with the work of the Committee, and it was arranged that she too would attend the spring meeting, in preparation for her formal association with the Committee beginning in the fall of 1976.

The spring meeting of the Committee was held on April 8, 1976. That meeting was devoted to a thorough analysis of the proposal for "rationalizing collections and reallocating resources" by the Director of Libraries (*Almanac* April 6, 1976, pp. 4ff). As the members of the Committee had thoroughly studied those proposals beforehand, the meeting effectively analyzed these and unanimously endorsed the proposed reorganizations. Also discussed were other economy measures, such as the possibility of future consolidation of departmental libraries, but these did not appear feasible or desirable at this time, for various reasons.

In addition to the formal meetings outlined above, the Chairman has met on a number of occasions for discussion with interested undergraduate students, graduate and professional students, and faculty, concerning the situation and service of the library. Due to the constriction of funds and consequently of resources, such meetings have probably been more frequent this year than in past years.

In conclusion, the Library Committee this year has been primarily and consistently concerned with the steady erosion in our libraries both of collections and services, due to the pressures of inflation. No one feels that there is any villain or group of villains in the present crisis, and as chairman of the Committee I am aware of no exception anywhere to the concern which all here at the University of Pennsylvania feel about these problems. But the problems continue to exist; they must be recognized and should be solved.

Finally, I am confident that I speak not only for the entire committee but also for the University community in expressing appreciation for the effective, imaginative, and responsible direction of the libraries which has been given by Richard De Gennaro, and which fortunately we can look forward to his continuing to provide.

—Roland Mushat Frye, Chairman

## TEXT OF THE WHARTON RESOLUTION ON TEN-YEAR TRACK (See page one)

Resolved: Appointments to the rank of assistant professor shall not exceed six years in total. The first appointment shall normally be for three years followed by a second appointment of three years. Initial appointment of four years followed by second appointments of no more than two years are permissible. Consideration for promotion to associate professor (without tenure) will normally occur in the fifth year of service. The maximum term as untenured associate professor will be five years with consideration for tenure occurring no later than the ninth year of service.

In exceptional cases, consideration for promotion to associate professor can be delayed until the sixth year of service. If promotion is granted, the term as untenured associate professor shall not exceed four years. If promotion is not granted, an additional, terminal appointment of one year as assistant professor must be granted.

In the event of early promotion to untenured associate professor, a second term appointment may be granted provided that the total untenured service entailed does not exceed ten years.

# COUNCIL

*Following is the proposed change in by-laws introduced at the February 9 meeting of Council for action on March 9. Almanac incorrectly reported (February 15) that the text would be returned to Steering Committee for resolution of questions raised about its status as a Council committee (reporting to Council) or as a University committee with direct lines to the administration. This question will instead be part of the March 9 Council discussion when the resolution is voted upon.*

## PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO COUNCIL BY-LAWS

### *(New charge for Educational Planning Committee)*

5. **Educational Planning Committee.** The Educational Planning Committee shall verify the existence of ongoing academic planning on all levels and in all areas of the University, monitor changes in academic planning and actions relative to these changes, and conduct investigations on its own initiative with respect to academic planning.

It shall receive via the Provost regular reports from responsibility centers summarizing their own academic planning as a basis for University-wide decision-making. In order to conserve effort while serving as aids to the functions of academic planning and oversight, these reports shall be limited insofar as possible to indicators of change and deficiencies in the academic planning process. In examining these reports and those of the central administration, it shall be especially aware of the possible harmful effects of the results of responsibility center budgeting on the academic mission of the University. The President and the Provost shall, in other than routine instances, seek the committee's advice regarding proposed changes in resource allocations or budgetary procedures, the expansion or contraction of units within the University, the needs of the University with respect to inter-school programs, and the general conduct of academic planning. Acting as a reallocation review board, the committee will review initiatives by the central administration to abolish or to reduce the operations of a school or any academic program whose operations have a significant impact on activities outside the program. Reallocation review procedures are established by Council and approved by the Senate.

The committee, together with the advisory committees within the responsibility centers, shall be concerned with: generating guidelines for planning activities and for the measurement of excellence to be used in their own work and in the work of other units of the University; the identification of instances where academic planning seems to be inadequate; and the identification of cases where actual or proposed decisions by deans or other administrators appear to conflict with the goals and priorities of the responsibility centers and of the University. In cases where inadequate or conflicting planning has been identified, representations will be made to the appropriate administrators in an attempt to solve the problems. Failing this, a report will be made to the appropriate faculty body or bodies. The committee itself shall be primarily concerned with decisions having effects that reach across the boundaries of responsibility centers; with the planning of such general research facilities as the libraries, the computer center, and the language laboratory; with the planning of educational enterprises often considered to be outside the principal University structure, such as continuing education and living-learning groups; with allocations at the level of the responsibility center; and with the procedures that are used by the University administration in making, eliciting, or effecting its decisions. However, on its own initiative, as well as at the request of the administration, the Committee may review any current policies in its own domain. The committee should also have cognizance of inter-institutional cooperation, whether local, national or international.

The ongoing planning work of the departments and programs, the schools, and other responsibility centers and the offices of the Provost and the President should each at their respective levels establish a record of decisions and performance appropriate to subsequent audit and monitoring of specific events, when they may become necessary, and adequate for administratively checking performance against proposals as the development of programs proceeds. In the event that the information alluded to above should not be available when requested by the Educational Planning Committee, this fact shall be reported by the committee to the Senate Advisory Committee and the Steering Committee of the University Council with the request that they investigate the matter.

The committee will assure that administrative officers submit new academic plans—before implementation—to the appropriate faculty and

student committees for their information and their comment. If these plans are University-wide the appropriate faculty body to be informed shall be the SAC. Plans which apply only to one school should be submitted to the faculty of that department for their information and comment.

The committee shall be selected by June 1 of each academic year as follows:

a) Nine faculty members chosen from nominations made by the Senate Advisory Committee. These shall be for a three-year term and staggered so that in each year the Senate Advisory Committee shall nominate six from which the Steering Committee will choose three.

b) Six faculty members, administrators, or students chosen from nominations made by the President. These shall be for a three-year term, staggered so that in each year the President shall nominate four from which the Steering Committee will choose two.

c) Five students—three graduate and graduate-professional students, and two undergraduates—each nominated by the appropriate student groups. These shall be for a one-year term. Six graduate and graduate-professional students shall be nominated, from which the Steering Committee will choose three, and four undergraduates shall be nominated, from which the Steering Committee will choose two.

The Associate Provost for Academic Planning shall be an ex-officio member of the committee. In case of a vacancy the Steering Committee will fill the unexpired term from nominations made by the appropriate person or group. These nominations shall be for twice the number of vacancies to be filled. The Steering Committee will select the committee chairman from the membership. The chairman or his designee shall be a member of the Budget Committee.

Note: The final paragraphs regarding the selection and makeup of the committee are identical to the corresponding paragraphs in the charge adopted by the Council on November 10, 1976. The preceding paragraphs describing the work of the committee are new, with the exception of the first sentence.

## GRANT DEADLINES

Listed below are program announcements and deadlines from several NIH units. Additional information is available from the Office of Research Administration, 409 Franklin Building, Ext. 7293.—Anthony Merritt/Alton E. Paddock

### National Institutes of Health

- Apr. 1 "Identification and Quantitation of Cystic Fibrosis 'Factors'." Contact Mrs. Catherine Bailey, National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute, 6A03 Westwood Bldg., NIH, Bethesda, Md. 20014. Tel.: (301) 496-7034. Reference RFP No. NHLBI-HR-77-3.
- Apr. 15 "Development and Evaluation of Self-Management Systems for Children with Asthma." Contact Mrs. Catherine Bailey, National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute. Tel.: (301) 496-7034. Reference RFP No. NHLBI-HR-77-14.
- Apr. 15 RFP available for "Development of Orally Active Dosage Forms for Steroids." Contact Paul Duska, Contracting Officer, Contracts Management Section, Office of Grants and Contracts, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, Landow Bldg. Rm. C625, Bethesda, Md. 20014. Reference RFP No. NICHD-CD-77-5.

*The National Cancer Institute (NCI) is interested in contracting for 1977 the following projects:*

- Apr. 11 "Immunoprophylaxis of an Occular Solid Malignant Tumor in Cattle". Reference RFP No. NCI-CB-74155-31.... "Antigenicity in Premalignant Lesions in Humans". Reference RFP No. NCI-CB-74156-31.... "Identification of Persons Exposed to Carcinogens Using the Methods of Immunology". Reference RFP No. NCI-CB-74157.... "Immunoprevention of Malignant Solid Tumors in Animals". Reference RFP No. NCI-CB-74158-31.

RFPs may be obtained by written request to Contracting Officer, CBDCS, Tumor Immunology, Research Contracts Branch, National Cancer Institute, Landow Bldg. Rm. C-437, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md. 20014.



## CAREER DAY: MARCH 1

The Placement Service sponsors its annual Career Day, March 1, in the Annenberg Center lobby, from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. and from 2:30 to 4 p.m.

Alumni/alumnae and friends of the University will be there to discuss career options: government. . . banking. . . television. . . radio. . . social services. . . personnel. . . journalism. . . sports management. . . advertising. . . accounting. . . engineering. . . environmental protection. . . retailing. . . marketing. . . curatorships. . . health care.

Separately there will be 45-minute seminars on business, government and communications careers in Harold Prince Theater. For information: Mrs. Rosette S. Pyne, placement officer, Ext. 7533.

## OPENINGS

*The following listings are taken from the Personnel Office's bulletin of February 16. 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).

ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR (2-1-77).

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR (2-15-77).

BURSAR creates and supervises student accounts-receivable system for control, coordination, credibility and efficiency in tuition/fees management. Issues, corrects, reports and collects bills. Coordinates central control of all University student financial transactions. *Qualifications:* Graduate of a college or university with a degree in business administration and/or accounting. Five years' experience in the accounting and data processing fields. *Salary to be determined.*

DIRECTOR develops and provides programs for women; coordinates counseling services; establishes a support system for women; meets and consults with University offices and departments on matters relevant to the needs and interests of women. *Qualifications:* Graduation from college or university. At least 5 years' administrative experience desired. Ability to supervise others and deal effectively with University community. *Salary to be determined.*

FACILITIES PLANNER (9-28-76).

FISCAL COORDINATOR (2-8-77).

JUNIOR RESEARCH SPECIALIST (1-25-77).

JUNIOR RESEARCH SPECIALIST (2-15-77).

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

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

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

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

RESEARCH SPECIALIST II coordinates and plans research project, with responsibility for data collection, organization, processing and management; prepares progress reports, project staff meeting minutes and other

records. Supervises research assistants. Reviews literature and analyzes project-related research. *Qualifications:* Master's degree in health services research or related field. Previous experience in health services research, especially emergency medical services research. Experience with large scale data processing, management and organization. (*Funding for this position is guaranteed through 6/30/77. Additional funding is contingent on acceptance of resubmittal of grant.*) \$11,300-\$15,250. STAFF ASSOCIATE (20 hrs./wk.) (2-1-77).

### SUPPORT STAFF

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I (New York) (12-21-76).

CLERK stocks trade book shelves; checks stock; assists customers; handles inquiries and orders at information desk. *Qualifications:* Interest in books and people; retail experience preferred. Must be available for an occasional Saturday and evening hours until 6:30. \$4,900-\$6,125.

CLERK I acts as receptionist, filing, and keypunching. Accurate typing necessary. \$4,900-\$6,125.

CLERK IV (6) (2-15-77).

COMPUTER TERMINAL OPERATOR operates 2922 and 3777 I.B.M. computer terminals, computer forms decollator, burster, data graphix 4500 micro-filing system. Maintains a log on equipment. Occasional heavy lifting. *Qualifications:* High school graduate. Background in data processing. *Salary to be determined.*

CONTRACT ACCOUNTANT (1-18-77).

LICENSED PRACTICAL NURSE (11-16-76).

MEDICAL TECHNICAL SECRETARY (4) (2-1-77).

PSYCHOLOGY TECHNICIAN II writes FORTRAN programs to conduct experiments in perception; writes assembly language I/O routines; maintains software and peripheral devices. *Qualifications:* Familiarity with PDP 11/RT-11 dis-based system. Experience in assembly language and FORTRAN programming. Experience with electronic instrumentation helpful. \$10,800-\$13,525.

RECEPTIONIST receives incoming telephone calls for counselors; sends all written reference inquiries and follows up their return; types. *Qualifications:* Graduation from high school and further training, some college or secretarial school. Two years' office experience as a receptionist. *Salary to be determined.*

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN II for laboratory analyses involving samples of blood/gas and tissues; concerned with lung function in shock states in animals, and people. *Qualifications:* Good eyesight and manual dexterity; physically active. College graduate with science major, no experience necessary. \$8,475-\$10,625.

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN III for cardiopulmonary function tests; in pre-operative, intra-operative and post-operative patients; calculates results with programmed Wang 720C System; assists in post-operative care. *Qualifications:* Training in cardiopulmonary respiratory therapy or pulmonary function testing. Eligible for registration by NBRT or equivalent desirable. Experience necessary. \$9,575-\$11,975.

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN III cultivates lymphoid and bone marrow cells in culture; performs tissue culture experiments and radioisotope work; calculates and analyzes data; performs chromosome analysis and assists in surgical procedures on laboratory animals. *Qualifications:* Experience in sterile techniques, tissue culture and hematology necessary. B.A., B.S. degree in science, preferably in biology. Some direct experience as a research laboratory technician. \$9,575-\$11,975.

SECRETARY II (11-16-76).

SECRETARY III (11-9-76).

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

SENIOR COLLECTION ASSISTANT (2-8-77).

VETERINARY ANESTHETIC TECHNICIAN I (2-15-77).

### PART-TIME

CLERK/TYPIST (2-15-77).

DENTAL ASSISTANT II (6 months) (2-15-77).

GENERAL OFFICE WORKER (4 months) (2-1-77).

LABORATORY ASSISTANT (5 months) (2-15-77).

LABORATORY ASSISTANT (7 months) (1-25-77).

RECORDS ASSISTANT (2-15-77).

TECHNICAL TYPIST (20 hrs./wk.) (2-15-77).

TEMPORARY EXTRA PERSON (2-15-77).



# THINGS TO DO

## LECTURES

Tonight at 8 p.m. in Irvine Auditorium Alex Haley, author of *Roots*, gives a *Connaissance* lecture. Admission, primarily limited to University students, faculty and staff, is by ticket only, available from the Office of Student Life (Ext. 6533).

Dr. Robert Maddin, professor of metallurgy, tracks *Mysteries in Prehistoric Times*, today at a meeting of the Faculty Tea Club, 1:30 p.m. in the Alumni Hall, Towne Building. Tea at 3 p.m. in the Faculty Club.

*Bubble-person* is what Dr. Norman I. Badler, assistant professor of computer and information science, calls his lecture February 24, 3 p.m., Room 216, Moore School. We didn't dare ask why.

Political Scientist Edie Goldenberg of the University of Michigan talks about *Typeset Politics—the Impact of Newspapers on Public Confidence in Government* as part of the Annenberg Communications Colloquium Series, February 28, 4 p.m., Colloquium Room, Annenberg School.

Post-cataclysmic science fiction novels for children are analyzed by Dr. Margaret P. Esmonde, of Villanova's English Department at a meeting of the Center for Research in Literary Communication March 2, 4-6 p.m., Room C-34, Education Building.

## ON STAGE

After Princeton, *The Physicists* come to Penn February 22: preview and regular performances of the Durrenmatt mindbender are February 23 through March 6, Annenberg Center. Box office information: Ext. 6791.

Penn Contemporary Players, under Richard Wernick, perform works by Davidovsky, Jola, Fauré, Loeliet and the premiere of Robert P. Morgan's *Correspondences for Cello and Percussion* (1976). February 23, 8 p.m., Harold Prince Theater at Annenberg Center.

*The Britton Sisters Sing the Blues* for Aunt Wilma's cabaret crowd at CA February 25 and 26, 10 p.m. *Elsinore* is in its second week (February 25-27) in Wilma's Mainstage Space, 8:30 p.m.; \$3 (\$2 for students with I.D.). Call 382-0334 for reservations.

Where does dance fit into society, or even into Penn? Manfred Fischbeck and Brigitta Herrmann teach it weekly in Weightman Hall but move to Harold Prince Theater at 8 p.m. March 2 for *Dance Here and Now*, a lecture-demonstration on functions of dance with their professional troupe, Group Motion Multi Media Dance Theater. Group Motion's choreographic and improvisational techniques are taught, demonstrated and (potentially) tried out by the audience. Admission free.

## ON FILM

Women and healthcare are subjects of two films (*The Chicago Maternity Center Story* and *Healthcaring from Our End of the Speculum*) in the CA's Real to Reel series, February 23, CA Auditorium, 8 p.m., \$1.

*M*, the film that "made" Peter Lorre, and *Tokyo Story* by Yasujiro Ozu, one of Japan's great directors, are screened by CA at International House, Hopkinson Hall, \$1. *M*—7:30 and 9:30 p.m., February 24; *Tokyo Story*—7:30 and 10 p.m., February 25.

PUC's shows *The Godfather* February 24 at FA B1; *Godfather II*, February 25 at Irvine; and *Romeo and Juliet* February 26, FA B1—all 7:30 and 10 p.m. For *The Maltese Falcon* February 26 you have to grope your way to FA B1 by midnight.

The University Museum's children's film February 26 is *Missouri Traveler*, Harrison Auditorium, 10:30 a.m.

A two-part film *Napoleon* (Bonaparte et la Revolution) by D. Abel Gance opens February 27, Harrison Auditorium, 2:30 p.m. Part Two is on March 6.

## MIXED BAG

*Paintings and Works on Paper*, by Aissatou Mijiza and Edward D. Hughes of Philadelphia College of Art, hang in the Philomathean Society Galleries, (fourth floor College Hall) from noon to 5 p.m. weekdays February 28-March 9. Opening bash 7 p.m. this Friday.

*Penn goes to Princeton* March 1 on a round-trip bus ride with sandwiches and unlimited beer. Game time for Penn-Princeton hockey is 7:30 p.m. Tickets: \$10 each for travel, food, drinks and game. Call Ext. 7924 for reservations and further information.

The first *Symposium on Archaeometry and Archaeological Prospection* to meet outside the United Kingdom will be held at the University Museum from March 16 to 19, co-sponsored by the University and the Museum. Information: Dr. Robert Maddin, 400 LRS/M/K1: Ext. 5241.

Mental marathon: Forty-three hours of *Thinking Out Loud* lectures by world-famed inventor-designer-author Buckminster Fuller are presented

in a video seminar from May 30 through June 11, Language Lab, Logan Hall. Contact the Fuller Archives, 3500 Market St., 387-2255, for information and applications for the seminar.

Brown-bag it on Wednesdays to the *Penn Women's Center's A-3 luncheons* from 12 noon to 2 p.m., 112 Logan Hall. Topics are assertiveness, awareness, job options, how to get ahead in the system. Coffee on hand. Call Ext. 8611 for information.

## WXPX 88.9 FM—THE SPRING SCHEDULE

### Mondays through Fridays

- 6-9 a.m. *Crossroads*, wake-up music from rock to traditional folk, plus news, weather and information.
- 9 to noon *Homegrown*, all styles of acoustic folk music from old-timey to contemporary, often performed live.
- Noon to 1 p.m. Mondays, *No Subscription Necessary*, a public affairs magazine of the air.
- Tuesdays, *Women's Consciousness-Raising Hour*.
- Wednesdays, *Penumbra*, a weekly documentary special.
- Thursdays, *Women's Music Hour*, with interviews and performances.
- Fridays, *Relax with Alpha*, meditation and spiritual/psychological exploration.
- 1-4 p.m. *Aeolia*, unusual classical music programming with interviews and commentary.
- 4-5 p.m. *Pictures of a Gone World*, an hour of readings from Tolkien to Castaneda.
- 5-8 p.m. *Diaspar*, a synthesis of high-energy music from African drums to European avant-garde.
- 8-10 p.m. Tuesdays and Thursdays: *Diaspar* continues. Mondays/Wednesdays/Fridays: *Directions in Music*, 20th Century avant-garde in the fine arts tradition, except:
- 9:30-10 p.m. Wednesdays only: *Up Against the Law*, community legal education with assistance of the Free Law School.
- 10 p.m.-2 a.m. *Blue Genesis*, progressive sound born of the blues. Live performances on Thursdays.
- 2-6 a.m. *Mosaic*, free-form all-night radio from call-ins to thematic specials.

### Saturdays

- 6 a.m.-1 p.m. *Sleepy Hollow*, all kinds of mellow music.
- 1-2 p.m. *Spoken Word Hour*, live and recorded readings by poets and authors, usually from Philadelphia area.
- 2-4 p.m. *Rhythm and Blues*, music of Black vocal groups of the fifties.
- 4-5 p.m. *Salt Peanuts*, postwar "bop" in the Parker/Gillespie tradition.
- 5-8 p.m. *Sunnyside*, country/western from bluegrass to pedal steel.
- 8-9 p.m. *Cherry Tree Hour*, music from a West Philadelphia musicians' collective by that name.
- 9 p.m.-1 a.m. *The Blues Show*, urban and rural, electric and acoustic
- 1-6 a.m. *Star's End*, a morning of interstellar music.

### Sundays

- 6 a.m.-noon *Sleepy Hollow* (see Saturdays).
- Noon-1 p.m. *Penumbra* (see Wednesdays).
- 1-2 p.m. *Amazon Country*, Lesbian feminist-oriented news, features and music.
- 2-3 p.m. *Sunshine Gaydream*, music and information of special interest to the Gay male community.
- 3-4 p.m. *Third World News*, news and information.
- 4-5 p.m. *Revival*, traditional and contemporary gospel music.
- 5-6 p.m. *International Folk Music Hour*, music from a different part of the world each week.
- 6-9 p.m. *Unicorn*, Irish and British traditional music.
- 9-10 p.m. *Funday Sunnies*, live and recorded comedy.
- 10 p.m.-1 a.m. *Roots of Jazz*, from ragtime to swing.
- 1-6 a.m. *Sunday Night Mosaic*, all-night discussion/call-in.

ALMANAC: 515 Franklin Building (16) Ext. 5274

Editor..... Karen C. Gaines

Assistant Editor ..... Marilyn Ackerman

Distribution ..... Karen A. Graves