

# Almanac

Published Weekly by the University of Pennsylvania  
Volume 23, Number 28 April 12, 1977

- SPEAKING OUT: *On 3400 Walnut, \$88 Crunch, Penn 95* . . .
- COUNCIL: *Report of the Research Committee (Steinberg)*  
*Response to Research Committee (Langenberg)*  
*Action item for April 13: Reallocation Review*
- GRANT DEADLINES • OPENINGS • THINGS TO DO

## TO PRINCETON INSTITUTE: JOHN HUNT

John C. Hunt, secretary of the corporation and vice-president of the University since last fall, will join the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, as a senior administrative officer, effective April 18.

President Martin Meyerson said a successor to Hunt is expected to be named on or before the Trustees' meeting June 10. In the interim, Associate Secretary Robert G. Lorendale and Assistant Vice-President Jack H. Hamilton will share responsibilities of the office with assistance from Donald T. Sheehan, secretary emeritus.

## TO WASHINGTON: LEO LEVIN

Chief Justice Warren E. Burger has announced the appointment of Penn Law Professor A. Leo Levin as director of the Federal Judicial Center, effective July 18.

Professor Levin, who coordinated last April's national conference in St. Paul on "The Causes of Popular Dissatisfaction with the Administration of Justice," will be the first non-judge to hold the post in the Center's nine-year history.

He will remain on the Law School faculty with a limited teaching schedule. He is expected to offer seminars drawing on his work in the Center, an independent agency of the federal judicial system created by Congress and charged with research, continuing education and training, and development of new technology for the administration of justice.

## TO PENN: MARIAN ANDERSON PAPERS

Contralto Marian Anderson is donating to the University her library of music, personal papers and memorabilia. The collection traces her singing career from a duet at the age of 6 in a South Philadelphia church, through her moving 1939 Easter Sunday concert at the Lincoln Memorial, to world acclaim.

Miss Anderson's gift will be highlighted at the concert in her honor tomorrow at 8 p.m. in Irvine Auditorium, where the University Symphony Orchestra and Choral Society perform Schoenberg's *Friede auf Erden* and Beethoven's Ninth under William Parberry and Eugene Narmour. (Free but with tickets: 202 Music Building at 201 S. 34th, or 518 Annenberg Center.)

Portions of the collection, which will be housed in the Van Pelt Library Rare Book Rooms, will go on display Thursday in the Library's sixth floor Rosenwald Gallery. Conductor-composer Leonard Bernstein is honorary chairman of a committee seeking funds for curatorial care and maintenance of the Anderson Collection as a scholarly resource, and to find other ways of honoring the singer. The chairman is Fredric R. Mann, Robin Hood Dell president and former ambassador to Barbados.

Among the committee members are Miss Anderson's nephew, James DePreist, conductor of the Quebec Symphony Orchestra, who holds three degrees from the University of Pennsylvania; and her niece, Sandra Grimes of New York City. Others on the committee include actor Gregory Peck, pianist Artur Schnabel, Philadelphia Orchestra music director Eugene Ormandy, producer/playwright Dore Schary, violinist Isaac Stern, Sol Schoenbach, executive director of the Settlement Music School; Charles Andes, chairman of the board of the Franklin Mint; and Mrs. Ruth Weir Miller, former executive director of the World Affairs Council.

## WXPB: APPEAL EXPECTED

President Martin Meyerson, Trustee Morton Wilner and key faculty and administrators involved in attempts to retain WXPB's FM broadcast license are in favor of appealing an FCC administrative judge's April 4 recommendation against renewal, University Attorney Stephen Burbank said Thursday.

Mr. Wilner is polling his six-member Trustees Subcommittee on Electronic Communications to reach an official decision, probably by today, on filing within the May 4 deadline.

Meanwhile, WXPB goes ahead with its April 13-24 marathon appeal for listener support to fund summer broadcasting. For information about six live benefit concerts (folk, jazz, bluegrass, classical, etc.), or just to make a pledge, call 387-5401.



Now,  
THAT's a  
Job Opening  
. . . page 8

## FAS MEMORIAL CONCERT: APRIL 19

The University Choir performs Tuesday, April 19, in the annual FAS concert in honor of those of its faculty who have died during the past year: Schilling Emeritus Professor Allen G. Chester, Emeritus Professors Francis B. Clarke and W. Rex Crawford; and Professors Wallace E. Davies, Alfred B. Harbage and John Shover.

The memorial concert begins at 11 a.m. in Room 200 CH.

## COUNCIL: BLACK PRESENCE, REALLOCATION

Council's April 13 agenda includes an information report by Dr. Lawrence Klein on the work of the Task Force on the Black Presence, which was scheduled to issue a draft report in today's *Almanac* but will publish a fuller document later.

Action items are a proposed Reallocation Review Procedure (text on p. 7) and two by-law amendments changing the charges of the Educational Planning Committee and the Committee on Research. For the March 9 Research Committee Report and Vice-Provost Langenberg's response, see pp. 4-6.

## HMO BRIEFINGS: FINAL WEEK

The Philadelphia Health Plan's information meetings on the Health Maintenance Organization being brought to West Philadelphia conclude with sessions Wednesday in the Faculty Club and Thursday-Friday in Houston Hall: 9:30 and 11 a.m., 1 and 2:30 p.m. each day.

# Speaking Out

## INCOMPLETE

Footnote the faculty/staff benefits table 4/5/77, p. 3: Penn faculty and senior administrators are eligible immediately for the \$900 "tuition away" but other administrative/professional staff have a three-year waiting period.—*Ed.*

## INCOMPLEAT

It seems my predecessor may have missed your invitation to list our publication in your Compleat Campus Reader (April 5). Rest assured that we continue to publish six times a year at a subscription price of \$18.00.

I hope we will be included if your list is reprinted in the future.

—*Alfred W. Putnam, Jr., Editor-in-Chief*  
*University of Pennsylvania Law Review*

We knew it would happen—just didn't know how many it would happen to. Below are corrections and additions from other editors who called or wrote.—*M.A.*

## JOURNALS

Unfortunately there is no student rate for *Edebiyat*. It's \$10 per year or \$5 per issue.

*Expedition* should have read *Expedition: The Magazine of Archaeology and Anthropology*. Call 224-264 (not 246).

Add *Hispanic Review*, since 1933 a quarterly journal devoted to hispanic languages and literature. Dr. Russell Sebold is general editor, Dr. Jose M. Regueiro managing editor. \$12 (individuals), \$7 (student), \$18 (institutions). Ext. 7428.

Add *Journal of Public Interest Law*, to start publication in November with student editors Jeffery Braff, Todd Collins and Timothy Cook, Law School.

Add *Law Review* (letter above).

*Edited by Penn Faculty*

Add *Journal of Finance*, the official publication of the American Finance Association, edited by Dr. Marshall E. Blume and published five times a year. Sent to Association members; \$25 for libraries. Write to Graduate School of Business, NYU, 100 Trinity Place, NY 10006 or call Dr. Blume at Ext. 7633.

Add *Language in Society*, edited by Drs. Dell Hymes, William Labov, Erving Goffman and others three times a year; Cambridge University Press (get rate from C.U.P.'s American Branch, 32 E. 57th St., NY 10022).

## STUDENT PUBLICATIONS

Add *Penn Law Forum*, a student newspaper published eight times a year and edited by Diane Celotto and Ellen Fishman. Ext. 4989.

Add *The Report*, Law School yearbook edited by David Simon. \$5.

## GROW UP

About the planning and proposal for the 3400 Walnut-Sansom land:

I object to planning by the "Sansom Committee." Philadelphia's 1965 urban renewal plan said the land was for "institutional education." The Sansom Committee, formed in 1970, has objected to all University proposals to date; in 1973 it filed suit against the RDA and HUD, alleging commercialization and "adverse impacts." (*The Daily Pennsylvanian* 11/21/75 at 1, col. 4; *DP* 7/1/76 at 2, col. 1.) Its demands include rehabilitation of present Sansom buildings and reimbursement for all costs of its interfering—approximately \$105,000 (*DP* 10/14/76 at 1, col. 1).

The Committee is chaired by one recently convicted of and sentenced to federal prison for telephone fraud (*DP* 11/26/76 at 1, col. 1); it represents, among others, a landlord court-ordered to stop racial discrimination, violation of the Landlord and Tenant Act, and violation of the Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Law (*DP* 9/10/76 at 1, col. 5); and it represents a half-block of dilapidated buildings that are eyesores from front, back, side, and above—with hazardous so-called streets and sidewalk. This is what claims a University skyscraper would have "adverse impacts" upon the neighborhood.

I also object to the present proposal, including faculty housing, an art gallery, and rehabilitation of present Sansom buildings (*DP* 3/3/77 at 1, col. 2). What have the first and last to do with "institutional education"? And what is the need for the second, given so much art gallery space at ICA and the Van Pelt-Dietrich complex, and even more a few steps in other directions?

Penn's money problems have dissolved one library (Penniman Education); are dissolving one school (SAMP); have cut administrative and support staff 11% since FY 1971; have frozen hiring, salary increases, merit increases, and until recently even merit review; and are expected by President Meyerson to cut 100 faculty within the next five years (*Almanac* 12/14/76 at 1). The proposal is an unaffordable luxury. Argument that the project is financially self-supporting is at best speculative; the University is the developer of record (*DP* 11/23/76 at 1, col. 5).

Penn's land problems include money problems, internal and external resistance to expansion, and scarcity of land to develop. All three indicate that Penn had best grow up, not out. High-rise academic or mixed land use is possible on three RDA parcels: 3400 Walnut-Sansom, 3600 Walnut-Sansom, and the northeast and northwest corners of 3400 Chestnut. The low-rise proposal is again an unaffordable luxury.

Penn needs proper housing for its University Archives: its historical materials, extending a full block under Franklin Field, are rapidly deteriorating for lack of heat and air controls. Penn also needs proper housing for the Louis Kahn Archives and future archival gifts; expansion and storage space for the present 25 and future libraries, including donors' libraries and other collections (as of, say, Braille materials); permanent housing for the Bookstore and other services; classrooms; administrative and faculty offices; storage space for administrative records and other materials; facilities for the American Law Institute (*DP* 3/31/77 at 1, col. 1), biomedical research (*DP* 3/31/77 at 3, col. 1), and future projects; and restaurants and shops. These are priorities, especially for a parcel next to the Franklin Building and the Van Pelt-Dietrich complex.

I recommend that the University file suit against the RDA and HUD if they further delay clearing the Sansom row, and that it reopen the Sansom Committee suit to recover costs. Six years is too long to deprive Penn of needed facilities and deprive the environs of consequential benefits. I also recommend use of the northeast Chestnut corner if faculty really need housing not procurable under the guaranteed mortgage program (*Almanac* 9/7/76 at 3). But would most not prefer salary increases, or merit increases, or simply more job security, for the same money the University risks? And prefer access to academic and other resources on the same land?

—*John Fraser,*  
*Clerk, Biddle Law Library*

Titus Hewryk, director of facilities development, notes that (a) the encouragement of on-campus faculty housing is an established educational goal of University planning and (b) the present plan for faculty housing at 34th and Walnut Streets is mandated to be self-financed, with no allocation of University funds.—*Ed.*

## RESPONSE TO \$88 CRUNCH

A recent letter, citing the case of a person with 15 years of service retiring at age 65 with a pension from the University of \$88 per month, requires further clarification.

Since pensions are a form of "deferred salary" they are generally related to years of service and in most university and industrial plans the maximum pension is paid to those retiring at age 65 with 35 years of service. Thus, a person who works for more than one employer accrues eligibility for pensions from more than one plan. In theory, at least, the total pension from all of these plans would approximate maximum pension. The final

*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.

employer cannot be expected to pay all of the cost.

In this case, the person worked for the University 15 years or approximately 43% of the 35 years considered to be a full term of employment for pension purposes. If the person had worked 35 years, the pension plan from the University would have been on the order of \$2,000 to \$2,500 per year. The specific earnings history might have resulted in the lower, higher or an intermediate amount. The difference between the \$1,056 per year the person received and these larger pensions is, therefore, the responsibility of previous employers and not the University.

It is of interest to note that this person will receive Social Security payments of approximately \$4,000 per year of which the University contributions underwrote one-half. A person retiring at age 65 with 35 years of service with the University and the earnings history of this case would thus receive total payments of \$6,000 to \$6,500 per year.

This person's final salary was \$9,650 per year. Thus, a comparable person who worked 35 years for the University would have retired with a total amount approximately 66% of final salary. Research studies have demonstrated that retirement pay of 65 to 75% of final pay permits the retirees to continue to live in the same manner as they lived before retirement. The validity of these studies can be demonstrated if one totals the various reduction in cost after retirement as a result of sharply reduced taxes, elimination of contributions, costs of getting to work, etc.

—Gerald L. Robinson,  
Executive Director of Personnel Relations

## OPEN LETTER

The faculty of the School of Allied Medical Professions would like to express a personal thank-you to each person on campus who assisted in the "Save SAMP" efforts. This is really not possible so we have chosen this open letter in our attempt to reach most persons who invested time and energy on our behalf.

We have learned a great deal as a result of this encounter with University Administrators, suffered some pain, and found many friends—new and old.

We thank you for your support.

Roma Brown  
Eleanor J. Carlin  
Nancy Ellis  
Charles Benson  
Eric Cocklin  
Ruth Leventhal  
Mary Ann McGuckin  
Jane DeHoff  
Johanna Barbati  
Debbie Labovitz  
Brena Manoly

Gladys Masagatani  
Marcie Scharf  
Joanne Bauman  
Barbara Bourbon  
Mary Day  
Risa Granick  
Laurie Hack  
Susan Herdman  
George Logue  
Carol Oatis  
Elsa Ramsden

## THE PENN 95

Could I just "Speak Out" about something great that Penn students have just done for the budget?

I won't ask you to print all 95 students' names but I would like to thank the

organizations that helped bring the Kite & Key Telethon Campaign up from \$30,943 (from 1615 donors) last year to \$37,876 (from 1816 donors) in 1977—and did it in a shorter time span, since this year's Telethon was only six nights long instead of eight.

This is something Penn undergraduates have been doing for three years now: calling alumni in the immediate area to talk about Penn and ask for their pledges. Every dollar they raise goes straight into the University's *unrestricted* funds where it is needed so badly.

The students live on pizza and enthusiasm while they're dialing for dollars from alumni, and all they personally get out of it are some nominal prizes, like the one to Leonard Mongiello for highest individual donor count (81) and the duplicate "endurance" award to Everette Gillison and John Keenan for putting in 18 hours each.

Kite & Key is the umbrella organization for the Telethon, but all Penn student groups are invited to join in. This year there were ten: Pi Kappa Alpha (which will have its name on a \$2500 scholarship for a freshman next year as its prize for winning the largest number of donors—637) plus Sigma Phi Epsilon, Community House, Black Pre-Law Students, Mortar Board, Penn Union Council, Penn Christian Fellowship, University Television, Amateur Radio Club and Black Wharton Undergrads.

We in Annual Giving appreciate not only the \$37,876 they raised but also the gift of their time and energy. Our sincerest thanks to them all.

—Theresa N. Ranieri, Assistant  
to the Director, Annual Giving



## A TRIBUTE AND A BEGINNING

If you were Jean Brownlee, being a dean would mean never having to say you're sorry. Not if you did it so right, even when the job requirements were shifting 180 degrees in a single academic year.

Some 335 of her friends gathered Friday a week ago to tell her how right she did it. To mark her approaching retirement they praised her both for building the College of Women's strong educational program and for smoothing its transition into the coeducational FAS. The dean who insisted on two things for Penn women in the liberal arts—access to all undergraduate subject matter and good advising to help build cohesive programs out of what could have been a resultant smorgasbord—is the dean who insisted after the merger on equal opportunity for FAS men. Thus she became FAS Dean of Academic Advising, and that is the title she takes into retirement in June.

She keeps her title as associate professor, takes a new one as coordinator of a coed FAS alumni committee being formed, and at some point soon may confront a person entitled to bear her own name: the R. Jean Brownlee Lecturer in FAS. In her jewelry box is the gold medal Governor Shapp gave her last year as "Distinguished Daughter of Pennsylvania" and on her wall is his latest gesture, sent to the dinner: a blue-and-gold heraldic citation saying "... Tonight's tribute is just recognition of the significant contributions that she has made not only to the academic community but to all residents of this Commonwealth. . . ."

Alumna for forty-three years, faculty member for eighteen, dean for seventeen, is Jean Brownlee leaving? Not really. Provost Eliot Stellar and Dean Vartan Gregorian said at dinner that they have lined up for her a few more things that need doing right—starting with the FAS alumni committee.



## Report of the Committee on Research

*Presented to the University Council March 9, 1977*

*by Bernard Steinberg, Chairman*

To begin I would like to report to you your score for action on 10 resolutions of last year's committee (*Almanac* January 18, 1976). Nine were acted upon: seven satisfactorily, i.e. accepted or partial positive action underway; two, rejected; one, no observable response. Score: regarding action, 90%, good; regarding nature of the action, 70%, fair.

We sent a questionnaire (December 9, 1975) to faculty "seeking information with which to formulate recommendations to Dr. Donald Langenberg, vice-provost for Graduate Studies and Research (VPR), regarding possible improvements in the research environment within the University of Pennsylvania. Please tell us your problems," we asked, "preferably the more important ones, so that we can define the underlying limitations which reduce research efficiency or, perhaps, seriously impede research progress."

There were 85 respondents with seven major concerns:

- (1) The most frequent concern is the financial instability of research.
- (2) The feeling that the administration cares about the quality of the research environment only to the extent that a high yield for the recovery of indirect costs does not lag far behind.
- (3) A corollary of (2) is the feeling that the entire administrative structure, Office of Research Administration (ORA) included, is relatively unconcerned with the research atmosphere.
- (4) There is the view that there is neither a University-wide approach nor a University-sponsored effort to find ways of assisting young investigators in starting up (a common complaint from senior faculty)
- (5) of assisting nonfunded faculty (who have lost support or are in research areas in which there are no traditional sources of funding) to carry on research
- (6) of providing appropriate services needed by investigators in all branches of scholarship and, for the funded investigator, services that he feels he is paying for, and
- (7) of assisting researchers in their effort to secure funding.

These seven primary complaints shaped the activity of the Committee on Research last year and still heavily influence our current choice of topics, concerns and activities, which follow.

### *Current Major Problems Engaging the Committee*

- (1) Contingency funds for sudden loss of research support—related to questionnaire complaint number one, i.e., financial instability of research.

Two years ago the CR, in the 1975 Annual Report, indicated fear that sudden loss of research support can 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 VPR develop a procedure for establishing a reserve of funds to deal with such situations, and passed this matter on to the next committee with "a hopeful priority."

The 1974-75 committee's recommendation to VPR received no visible attention. Last year's committee delved more deeply into the matter and submitted to Council a Resolution on Emergency Funding of Research Activities, from which the first sentence reads:

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.

Thus there is a strong sense of a lack of shared responsibility on the part of the administration regarding the well-being of the researchers. There is the further sense, as evident from complaint number two, that the primary pleasure with research is in the funds that result.

What the CR urges is a reserve of funds to be administered rationally to deal with sudden, unexpected and relatively short interruptions of research support (see SDUS, below).

In actuality there is evidence to counter the view that the administration doesn't care:

*Example 1*—Five years ago at a time when the overhead rate jumped suddenly the administration softened the shock by Special Direct University Support (SDUS) to grants and contracts adversely effected. During 1974-76 the direct support averaged \$225 thousand per year, which is equivalent to more than \$300 thousand per year in external support. Although it is a small fraction of the total external funds (more than \$60 million), it is a sizeable sum and if it is continued it can help significantly. This was an excellent example of a caring administration. *It also is an excellent precedent for continued direct support.* "Sudden death" (of a research project) is one such problem.

*Example 2*—Within the last few months Dr. Langenberg has proposed to the academic deans a procedure for developing funds which might be applied in cases of sudden death and unexpected loss of support. Responses have not yet arrived.

Conclusions: CR feels that this is a vital matter; is pleased at the very preliminary response of the administration; and urges application of SDUS to this problem.

- (2) Indirect costs and quality of services received for overhead charges to contracts and grants.

We are inquiring into the basis for the charges and how the money is spent.

Regarding the first matter, we now have a reasonable understanding and are pleased with the cooperation of the Comptrollers Office. However it took a year to find out. We think that the confusion is symptomatic of an undesirable looseness in the system. It is a red flag.

The second question now is our big worry: the quality and quantity of services for the overhead moneys charged to contracts and grants. Overhead is for services rendered or to be rendered. It is not a gift; it is not income. Yet we are distressed to see and hear it often viewed as general income, i.e. as funds to be dispersed as management sees fit. Fiscal data necessary for the budgetary control of a project or of a laboratory is an example. Many units at the University have parallel accounting procedures to the central accounting operation of the University because of inadequacies in the data that are dispersed. An example is the lack of encumbrance or commitment accounting (which we discuss later). Yet moneys for accounting are charged while the services are deemed to be inadequate.

This is only one example. We would like to see automatic self-improvement procedures for all service units of the University for which there are no simple measures of service quality or productivity.

For two years we have sought representation on the Indirect Cost Subcommittee of the Budget Committee. For two years we

have been stalled, delayed, frustrated, although never directly refused. Not, however, that it would have mattered; for that subcommittee, which we consider vital for a healthy institution, never met last year. We are thoroughly frustrated and chagrined on this matter.

### *Observations and a Very Mild Conclusion*

One year ago the CR chairman, had he reported to you, would have complained about the lack of clarity in the charging mechanism. Today that is no longer the case. I hope that next year the chairman will be able to react more positively (even optimistically) regarding the second question, namely the efficiency with which the overhead money is spent.

(3) Patent Policy and Procedures. It has been brought to the attention of the Committee by the VPR that the number of invention disclosures submitted to ORA is very low relative to the level of our research activity. This inattention to invention doesn't serve the University (lack of royalties, prestige), doesn't serve the inventor (lack of royalties) and doesn't serve the general public (lack of use of potential inventions). Although our examination is in a preliminary state, we can tell you the reasons which we now perceive to be responsible. (1) Patents are not pushed, talked up; a sense by some researchers of a low likelihood of anything coming of it; not an "alive" concept. (2) The University Patent Policy (page 78, IV-3, Research Investigator's Handbook) is very discouraging. It is a terrible bark, although the bite is not nearly so serious. No motivation is offered to the inventor. Also, (3) RIH tells the inventor how to file an invention disclosure but not why he should do so.

Conclusion: CR agrees with VPR that this matter is worth rectifying and will make recommendations to the VPR this semester.

(4) University Symposium on the Research Environment. This is a VPR idea. CR is working with the Vice-Provost to organize

such a symposium for purposes of:

- Examining the research atmosphere at Penn through open discussions of faculty and research staff.

- Examining the question of University's share of the responsibility for achieving a quality research environment.

(5) Possibly enlarged functions of ORA. The questionnaire responses regarding ORA ranged from abolition of ORA to enlargement of its services. The CR is considering the latter question only. One suggestion we are following is that ORA take a more active role in identifying sources of funds appropriate for our faculty. We are in the exploratory stage on this topic.

(6) Problems of large laboratories, research institutes and large-funded programs.

There is some evidence that administrative procedures (primarily involving budgeting and personnel) are geared more toward the smaller unit than the larger unit. This may or may not be an historical legacy from a period when the dominant mode in research may have been one professor and one research assistant. We don't know whether this is true or not or whether a real problem exists. We have a subcommittee examining this matter. There is no report as yet.

(7) Resolution of Encumbrance Accounting. Encumbrance accounting is commitment accounting. When you order a piece of equipment those dollars are no longer available for spending on anything else, even though the equipment has not been received and the bill not paid. It is easy for the principal investigator to remember this commitment on small projects (one professor, one graduate student), but on large projects or in laboratories with many projects, a separate and parallel (to the University's) accounting is required at the laboratory in project level. This is commonly done across the University. Yet is is an unnecessary expense for the service should be provided centrally.

Commitment on encumbrance accounting, which is the subject of our resolution, will solve this problem.

*(The accounting resolution passed at Council March 9.—Ed.)*

## **Response to the Report of the Committee on Research**

*by Donald N. Langenberg*

*April 5, 1977*

I take this opportunity to respond to the issues raised in the report of the Committee on Research to the University Council with feelings compounded almost equally of dismay and satisfaction. The dismay is due to the intractability of some of the problems delineated by the Committee, and the satisfaction comes from the time and energy the Committee has obviously spent in trying to help solve them.

As I see it, the major concerns raised by the Committee are:

1. The feeling of at least some researchers that there has been a deterioration in the "quality of the research environment" in the University, due in part to a lack of sympathy on the part of an administration primarily concerned with the financial benefits of research.

2. The "financial instability of research," and the problems caused by fluctuations or failure of research funding.

3. University support for both junior and senior investigators in their quest for external research funding.

4. Indirect costs, their mysteries and their inexorable growth.

5. The quality of the services rendered our researchers in exchange for their contributions toward recovery of indirect costs.

6. Patent policy and practice.

Each of these topics merits an essay of its own, but let me try to comment briefly on each one.

1. The research environment in this and other great universities has indeed deteriorated since the golden sixties but, I submit, not because of a lack of sympathy on the part of university

administrations. A glance at the roll of academic administrators here and at other like institutions will reveal a group of scholars and researchers, many of whom continue to be active in these roles despite the pressures of their administrative duties. That's not surprising, since no self-respecting faculty search committee would look twice at a candidate for such a position who was not "one of us." (It's amazing how brief is the transition from "one of us" to "one of them!") As for the nonacademic administrators, I never cease to marvel at the breadth of the consensus among them, at least most of them, that academic objectives are paramount.

As for the financial benefits to the University of research, these are dubious at best. The intellectual benefits are enormous, but if you're looking for a big fast return on your dollar the university research business is most assuredly not where it's at. Administrators, both academic and nonacademic, are deeply concerned with the financial aspects of research, as they are for all major functions of the University. This results from their necessary interactions with trustees, federal agencies, creditors, and other such groups which tend to display an intense interest in the financial viability and accountability of the institution.

2. I do not believe that research has been financially stable since at least the thirties. In the fifties and sixties, the instability was of a rather pleasant sort, sharply increasing. In the seventies, we have seen behavior characteristic of a servomechanism in a very noisy environment, fluctuating and hunting for some equilibrium. On



the national level, the problem is how to encourage the establishment of that equilibrium at a favorable level, in concert with our sister institutions. At the local level, the problem is how to dampen the effects of fluctuations in research funding on individual investigators and on the University as a whole. Here a look at the magnitude of the problem is illuminating. The research enterprise of the University now attracts more than 50 million dollars annually in external funding. A rather minor fluctuation of one percent in this level would thus correspond to half a million dollars. This in turn amounts to the income on a 10 million-dollar endowment. It is clear that any system for compensating fluctuations in external funding from internal University sources must involve big money.

There are several possible ways to provide such funds: (a) The Campaign for the Eighties has as one of its explicit goals the establishment of an endowment of 5 million dollars for a Research Foundation. The probability of success here is difficult to judge. My guess is that such an endowment is more likely to result from direct internal allocation of undesignated campaign funds to this purpose than from gifts designated for this purpose by the donors. However, this is perhaps a good place to reiterate my suggestion promulgated last spring by the Committee on Research that faculty contributors to the Campaign designate their gifts for the Research Foundation. (b) Increased allocations from general University funds. The University currently funds the Faculty Grants and Awards program at an annual level of fifty thousand dollars and has provided SDUS funds in substantially greater amount in the recent past. The continuation of the latter and/or the expansion of the former is possible but must be considered in competition with other needs (faculty salaries, student support, etc.) in an increasingly constrained financial environment. (c) Schemes like that proposed by Jon Strauss and me to the deans some time ago. That particular scheme would provide an incentive for faculty to recover academic-year salary from external sources and at the same time yield funds for the Research Foundation. The response so far has been overwhelming. (d) Income from patent license agreements. This very attractive possibility depends on the implementation of an effective patent program which we now lack and is likely to be realized only in the long term if at all. More about patents below.

All of these possibilities need continuing attention, as does the important but thorny problem they're meant to solve.

3. It is frequently suggested that the University should provide more assistance to faculty in seeking research funds, ranging from providing professional writers of proposals to lobbying and entrepreneurial aid in the Washington agencies. By "University" is generally meant here the central administration. Most of these suggestions deserve and receive careful consideration, subject, as always, to the realities of resource limitations. However, my personal view of this problem is that decentralized assistance is in most instances more effective than any greatly enlarged central administrative office could be. This view is based on the reality of the research funding "market." Most of the many external sources of research funding are (fortunately) staffed by persons with roots in the appropriate disciplines, often former or continuing academics. These officials frequently use the advice of a host of peer reviewers, most of them active researchers and most from the academic world. Consequently, the "buyers" who must be persuaded of the virtues of a research proposal are usually less susceptible to persuasive charm or political maneuvering than to the intellectual substance of the proposal and the ability of the proposer. Therefore, the proposer himself or herself is likely to be a far more effective proposal designer and marketer than any nonacademic bureaucratic organization.

This is not to say that art and skill (and often luck) are not required in the process of obtaining research funding. Intellectual substance and ability are necessary but not always sufficient requirements. But the art and skill ought to be acquired and used by all of our faculty researchers, not expected from some central

research "sales office." What the University should provide, both centrally and locally, are the information tools needed by the research. General intelligence on funding opportunities and advice on funding agency procedures and policies can be and are centrally provided. The more important lore specific to a given discipline is best provided at the department level. Which agencies are interested in funding what? Who are the pertinent program officers and what are their telephone numbers and their particular interests? What are the foreseeable trends in funding in the discipline? Every department chairperson ought to take as a major responsibility the creation of an environment which encourages every faculty member to exploit all available funding opportunities. One or more faculty members with experience and expertise in fund raising and a sharp weather eye for trends in the funding climate ought to be designated in each department to serve as advisors and mentors to younger or less experienced colleagues. Collegial support and encouragement at the grass roots is, in my opinion, the most effective way to enhance our research funding performance.

4. This is not the place for a lengthy discussion of indirect costs. I hope to provide that soon in these pages, in collaboration with the Committee on Research. Suffice it to say that the administration anticipates continuing to provide the Committee with indirect cost information for, to quote my colleague John Hobstetter, "Committees have no memory," and indirect cost will surely endure as a subject for collegial continuing education.

5. I suspect there is no research-related University service which our researchers find uniformly satisfactory. In some cases, complaints are based on a misunderstanding of the capabilities of our service units; in others they are justified and constructive. I have two main points to make here. First, I would like to rise to the defense of the Office of Research Administration. As presently constituted, ORA is a small group of dedicated and capable administrators devoted entirely to the handling of research proposals, grants, and contracts. It is charged with implementing applicable University policy and satisfying a myriad of University and sponsor requirements for review, reporting, data gathering and analysis, etc. A recent survey of ORA's counterpart offices in some peer institutions shows that ORA's *pro rata* operating costs are at the bottom of the group, about 0.2% of our annual sponsored project volume. MIT, for example, spends five times as much per sponsored-project dollar. ORA does what must be done and, I believe, does it very well. But it simply does not now possess the capacity to perform services some of our researchers would like. If we are to expand its responsibilities, we must expand its costs. And as an almost purely research-related indirect cost, that will go straight onto the indirect cost rate.

Second, I welcome the Committee's persistent and constructive interest in the development of an encumbrance accounting system. I believe such a system might improve the expenditure planning information available to our researchers and at the same time reduce the (indirect) cost of research accounting. The possibility of developing such a system has been under study by the administration for some months. There appears to be a consensus that it is feasible, and I expect a decision on whether to proceed within several months. It should be noted that a major modification of the accounting system of a \$300 million-dollar-a-year enterprise, while maintaining conventional operation, is not an easy task. If we proceed, it is likely to take several years. But I am very optimistic that it can and will be done.

6. Our basic patent policy is in reasonably good shape. Our patent practice is a shambles. We are currently considering several ways to improve the situation. I hope to report more fully on what might be done in the fall. In the meantime, I would simply like to proclaim to faculty inventors that they should consult with ORA. Pursuit of a patent and subsequent licenses is an expensive and risky business. But on occasion it does pay off, and the inventor can benefit handsomely.

## REALLOCATION REVIEW

*Text of Resolution Before Council April 13, 1977*

The University Council and the Faculty Senate invest in the Educational Planning Committee the responsibility of acting as a reallocation review body to advise the administration on significant reallocations of resources. When major reallocation issues arise, the Steering Committee of the University Council will refer them to the Educational Planning Committee.

The Educational Planning Committee shall have full access to all documentary information and it may consult any appropriate person. The deliberations of the committee shall be conducted in confidence. It will report to the administration within an agreed upon schedule following receipt of its charge and at the same time will inform the Council through the Steering Committee and the Senate through the Senate Advisory Committee of its recommendations.

The Provost will report his response and decisions to the University Council promptly and prior to the President's taking the decisions to the Trustees. The actions of the Educational Planning Committee shall be without prejudice to the rights of the faculty members affected.

## GRANT DEADLINES

*National Science Foundation*

- May 1 Proposals to the Biochemistry Program for research in (a) Molecular mechanisms of biological cognition, catalysis, and control; and (b) assembly and function of supramolecular complexes of proteins, lipids, and nucleic acids. Contact Dr. Frederick I. Tsuji (202) 632-4260.
- 13 Information Dissemination for Science Education. Guidelines for preparation of proposals and operation of projects is available in ORA.
- 15 Program of Analytical Awards—Science Resources Data Base and Related Studies. Doctoral candidates may be principal investigators in proposals received from universities and colleges. Contact Joe Gannon, Division of Science Resources, (202) 634-4655 for Program Announcement NSF 77-7.

Applications for Public Service Science Residencies and Internships. For application materials contact the Office of Science and Society, NSF, Washington D.C. 20550. (202) 282-7770.

Research Proposals in Biophysics. For information and guidelines contact Martin Schweizer, Biophysics Program Director or call (202) 632-4260.

Additional information is available from the Office of Research Administration, 409 Franklin Building, Ext. 7295.

—Alton E. Paddock

## HIGH BLOOD PRESSURE

At the Department of Psychiatry, Dr. Lester Luborsky's research project accepts the under-55 with pressures that don't go above 160/100 for treatments (relaxation, exercise, biofeedback or medication) on a sliding-scale fee basis. For appointments: Mr. Christoph, 227-3831 from campus phones.

## PREMATURE VENTRICULAR CONTRACTIONS

Dr. Theodore Weiss of the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania is looking for patients with premature ventricular contractions (PVCs) for therapeutically-oriented study. Two non-pharmacologic treatments—heart rate biofeedback and relaxation response—will be compared with an untreated control group. There is no charge to patients for participation in the study. If you have at least 1-2 PVCs per minute and a previous myocardial infarction or angina pectoris, call Dr. Weiss at 227-2826 from campus phones.

## OPENINGS

*The following listings are condensed from the Personnel Office's bulletin of April 5. Dates in parentheses refer to the Almanac issue in which a complete job description appeared. The full description 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

ASSISTANT TO CHAIRMAN implements and coordinates policy of graduate group in biochemistry, medical teaching program; takes minutes at committee proceedings. Experienced secretary with several years in research and teaching environment required. \$9,100-\$12,275.

ASSISTANT TO THE DIRECTOR (3-22-77).

ASSOCIATE DEAN (3-29-77).

ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR (2-1-77).

BURSAR (2-22-77).

DIRECTOR CENTRAL GIFT PROCESSING (4-5-77).

DIRECTOR STUDENT SERVICES (4-5-77).

JUNIOR RESEARCH SPECIALIST (2-15-77); (3-8-77); (3-22-77).

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

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

RESEARCH SPECIALIST I (3-8-77).

SOCIAL WORKER (3-22-77).

STAFF ASSOCIATE (20 hrs./wk.) (2-1-77).

STAFF NURSE (3-8-77).

### SUPPORT STAFF

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I (3-8-77); (3-29-77).

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I with responsibilities relating to budgets and personnel records for large department. Excellent typing; facility with figures; college degree desirable. \$6,950-\$8,675.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT II assists director in the supervision of budgets and disbursements of a campus center. B.A. or equivalent with science background; experience as administrative aide, preferably at the University. \$7,475-\$9,350.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT II has extensive financial, personnel and general administrative duties. Must have knowledge of University payroll, accounting, purchasing and systems. Types 55-65 w.p.m. \$7,475-\$9,350.

CLERK I (2-22-77).

CLERK IV receives, prepares and maintains students' files. Excellent typing, clerical skills needed. \$6,500-\$8,125.

CONTRACT ACCOUNTANT (1-18-77).

GROOM (New Bolton Center) (4-5-77).

HISTOLOGY TECHNICIAN III (3-29-77).

LICENSED PRACTICAL NURSE (11-16-76); (3-29-77).

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

PSYCHOLOGY TECHNICIAN II (2-22-77).

RECEPTIONIST (4-5-77).

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN II (3-8-77); (2) (3-29-77).

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN III (2-22-77); (3-22-77).

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN III performs experiments in rapid exchanges of red blood cells. B.S. in biochemistry, biophysics, chemistry or biology. \$8,375-\$10,475.

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN III assists in biochemical studies related to diabetes in small animals and in their isolated tissue preparations *in vitro*. B.S. or B.A. with lab training in biology or biochemistry. \$8,375-\$10,475.

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN III tests pulmonary function; analyzes blood gases and pH; assists in fiberoptic bronchoscopies.



B.S. in biology; experience with mechanical and electronic instrumentation. \$8,375-\$10,475.

SECRETARY II (3) (11-26-76). SECRETARY III (12) (12-21-76).

SENIOR ADMISSIONS ASSISTANT works with admissions processing and public relations materials; arranges recruiting and interviewing. Excellent typing; shorthand and dictaphone skills. \$7,475-\$9,350.

### PART-TIME

BOOKKEEPER processes cash receipts, travel advance forms, etc. High school graduate with course work in bookkeeping or accounting. \$3.50/hr.

PSYCHOLOGY TECHNICIAN (3-29-77).

RECORDS ASSISTANT (2-15-77).

SECRETARY (15-20 hrs./wk.) types, files, answers phone. Three to five years' secretarial experience. \$3-\$3.50/hr.

TEMPORARY EXTRA PERSON (20 hrs./wk.) types 45 w.p.m.; handles telephone and mail; files. High school graduate with a year's secretarial experience. Salary to be determined.

### HALCON CHAIR

The University of Pennsylvania invites applications for the HALCON Professorship of Technological Entrepreneurship. This Professor will hold joint academic appointments in the Wharton School and the College of Engineering & Applied Science. He or she will have broad responsibility, in the manner of a department chairperson, for the development of the Program in Management and Technological Entrepreneurship.

Please send curriculum vitae or nominations to Dr. Edward K. Morlok, 113-A Towne Building/D3.

An Equal Opportunity Employer.

## THINGS TO DO

### LECTURES

*The Rock Cut Temples of India—300 B.C.-700 A.D.:* Traveler and Lecturer Mary Binney Wheeler traveled there and she lectures on them on April 13, 5:30 p.m. in the University Museum's Rainey Auditorium; \$1.

Professor Alberto Grunbaum of the University of California at Berkeley presents *Non-Linear Inverse Problems in Random Theory* for the Department of Mathematics on April 13, 4:15 p.m. David Rittenhouse Laboratory A-5. Tea at 3:30 in 4E17.

Trippingly on the electronic tongue? The computer science colloquium for April 14 features Leon Levy of Penn on *Old Wine in New Bottles: Context-Free Grammar Revisited*. For April 19: Stanley Petrick of IBM on *Natural Language Processing*. Both at 3 p.m. 216 Moore School.

*The Raid on Entebbe—What Really Happened?* Lt. Col. Uri Yaari, air attache for the Israeli Embassy in Washington, D.C., tells the story April 15 at 1 p.m. in W-1 Dietrich Hall; sponsored by the Association of the U.S. Army.

For the final Department of Psychiatry colloquium this year Dr. Robert E. Jones paints-with-words *A Portrait of Benjamin Rush* on April 19, 12 noon in the Medical Alumni Hall, HUP.

### LEARNING

*A Symposium on Literature and the Other Arts* is sponsored by the Department of English on April 15 from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. in B1 and B2 at GSFA, followed by a reception in the Penniman Lounge, Bennett Hall. Call Ext. 5991.

You can choose from seven workshops and four movies at a day-long symposium on *New China Day: How One-Quarter of Humanity Lives*, sponsored by the U.S.-China People's Friendship Association on April 16 starting at 10:30 a.m. in Houston Hall, second floor. Call K15-3556.

The ERA seminar series concludes on April 18 with *Black Women and the ERA* 4:30-6 p.m. in 112 Logan Hall.

April 18 is the deadline date to register for *Facets: Women Viewed through the Prism of Change*, the April 21 spring program sponsored by FAS Alumnae. Tickets: \$8. Call Ext. 7811 for reservations.

### FILM

The psyche's the thing for CA with Werner Herzog's *Mystery of Kasper Hauser* on April 14, 7:30 and 9:45 p.m., and Ingmar Bergman's *Face* to

*Face* on April 15, 7:30 and 10 p.m. Both at Hopkinson Hall, International House; \$1.

*The Leopard* (1967-68) is at the University Museum's Harrison Auditorium on April 17 at 2:30 p.m.

Documentary Film Lab screens *Battle of Culloden* and *At Winter Sea Ice Camp, Part I* on April 20 at 4 and 7 p.m. in Annenberg Center's Studio Theater.

A Philadelphia premiere: *Memory of Justice* April 17, 2 p.m. in Irvine Auditorium; \$3 at the door or in advance from CA.

The Frederick Wiseman retrospective continues with *Primate* (1974) on April 20, 8 p.m. in CA Auditorium; \$1.

### ARTSFEST

If SEPTA is still in its strikefest during Inter-Acts' April 14-24 festival, bring a sleeping bag to the office. Or at least try the daytime (and mostly free) offerings between April 15 and 22:

*Dance:* Penn Dance Group uses ICA's *Improbable Furniture* for props on Fine Arts Plaza at noon April 15 . . . an Arts House troupe performs classical and modern ballet at noon April 21, Annenberg Center Lobby.

*Poetry:* Winners of the University Poetry Contest read April 18; *Sonia Sanchez* and *Ezekiel Mphahlele* April 20 . . . *Daniel Hoffman* and *William Zaranka* April 21 . . . Penn students April 22. All at 1 p.m., Studio Theatre, Annenberg Center.

*Music:* Penn Band is on the Plaza at Annenberg, noontime April 15 . . . Penn Balalaika Orchestra is in the Center's Lobby at 4:30 that day . . . Poko Puppeteers lead an excursion through jazz from ragtime to avant-garde, 2:30 April 17 at Zellerbach (\$1.50) . . . Penn Jazz Ensemble takes over Annenberg Plaza at noon April 18 . . . Penn Glee Club moves into the space at 4 p.m. Arts House sends its *Choir* and *Woodwind Quintet* to the Annenberg Center Lobby for noontime April 19 . . . Penn Gospel Choir performs there at noon April 20 . . . Pianist Hilla Khursdjli follows at 4 p.m. . . . The Leclair Chamber Ensemble performs at 5 p.m. next day . . . Cellist Ron Lipscomb's recital is in the Lobby April 22 at 4 p.m.

*Seminar:* At 3 p.m. April 18 in Studio Theater *Developing an Audience* is moderated by Patricia McFate, discussed by Peter Carnahan, Harvey Lichtenstein, Boris Sokoloff and Daniel Webster, and co-sponsored by Greater Philadelphia Cultural Alliance.

*Nighttime Highlights:* McCarter Theatre Company's *Design for Living* has "a marvelous party" (\$15) for the Coward crowd opening night April 19 and a marvelous cast discussion (free) after the April 22 performance. Tickets for the four evening performances and April 23-24 matinees are \$5 to \$9; Ext. 6791.

Other evening performances are those of Penn Players, Penn Singers, Penn Dance Group, Penn Composers Guild, the Concert Band, and Theatre Lab (one-act plays). For a complete schedule of times, places and prices see last week's ARTSFEST poster in *Almanac*.

### MIXED BAG

Morris Arboretum offers *Weekend Tours* of its special collections of rare and big trees every Saturday and Sunday at 2 p.m., starting at the Hillcrest Avenue entrance. \$1, adults; \$.50, children (includes admission to the grounds). Tours for groups of ten or more are by appointment during the week. CH 7-5777.

Reception, dinner and show are included in the General Alumni Society's *Patience theater party* on April 15. Call Ext. 7811.

### MEETINGS

Today at 1:30 p.m. the Faculty Tea Club presents Ernesta Ballard, recipient of the 1975 Gimbel Award, on *Philadelphia, An Autobiographical View*, at the Faculty Club. Tea at 3.

WEOP's A-3 Task Force meets April 15 in the Bishop White Room, Houston Hall, 1 p.m. A-1 and A-3 newcomers welcome. WEOP's next general meeting will be April 20, 12 noon in the Women's Center, 112 Logan Hall.

ALMANAC: 515 Franklin Building (I6) Ext. 5274

Editor.....Karen C. Gaines

Assistant Editor .....Marilyn Ackerman

Distribution .....Karen A. Graves