

Almanac

Published Weekly by the University of Pennsylvania
Volume 24, Number 2 September 13, 1977

- TRUSTEES: *Report on Administrative Structure: Comments of Chairman Donald Regan*
- SENATE: *SAC Statement on Administrative Structure President's Reponse to SAC Statement*
- *America's First University: Its Character and Mission; September 1977: A Financial Analysis (Meyerson)*

INSERT: *PennSport*

SENATE

SPECIAL MEETING OCTOBER 5

There will be a special meeting of the Faculty Senate on October 5 from 3 to 6 p.m. in Room 200 College Hall to formulate Senate response to the Trustees Report on Administrative Structure, published in this issue. Also published here are a statement prepared by the Senate Advisory Committee, a resolution which will be introduced by SAC at the meeting, and related documents.

SAC urgently requests that the faculty attend this meeting.

—Robert F. Lucid, Acting Chairman

ACTING CHAIRMAN: DR. LUCID

At its meeting of June 23, 1977, the Senate Advisory Committee accepted the resignation of Senate Chairman Britton Harris, who left to become Acting Dean of the School of Public and Urban Policy, and elected Past Chairman Robert F. Lucid as Acting Chairman. Chairman-elect Irving Kravis was unable to assume the chair because of binding previous commitments. Robert Lucid was to serve until the Nominating Committee, convened immediately by Chairman Morris Mendelson, could search out a qualified candidate for Chairman for 1977-78.

By the start of the fall term, despite a vigorous search, the Nominating Committee had found it impossible to locate a substitute candidate for the coming year, and proposed instead that the Past Chairman continue as Acting Chairman for the first semester, at the end of which Chairman-elect Kravis would, as provided in the bylaws, assume the chair, serving both the remainder of the current year and his originally designated 1978-79 year. SAC endorsed the recommendation at its meeting of September 7, 1977, acting on behalf of the Senate.

—Helen C. Davies, Secretary

PRESIDENT'S REPORT: MISSION OF THE UNIVERSITY

At the winter Trustees meeting, President Martin Meyerson delivered a summary of a manuscript in progress on "the mission of the University." His full text appears on pages 6-11 of this issue. His statement on current financial conditions is on page 11.

REPORT/RESPONSE: ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

On pages 2 through 5 are several documents relating to the July 21 report of a Trustees committee on administrative structure of the University: the Trustees' full text of July 21, with an introductory statement by the President; Chairman Donald Regan's comments in a memorandum to the Executive Board August 24; a statement by the Senate Advisory Committee approved at its September 7 meeting; and a response from the Provost to the Senate Advisory Committee. These documents and other correspondence related to administrative structure (being sent to Senate members by campus mail) are the subject of Senate's special meeting October 5.

EXECUTIVE BOARD: SEPTEMBER 15

The next meeting of the Executive Board of the University Trustees will be in the Faculty Club on Thursday, September 15, 1977. The Open Session will be held from 2:45 p.m. to 3:45 p.m.

LABOR DISPUTE: HOUSEKEEPING

At press time Monday, picketing continued on the campus in the labor dispute between the University and Teamsters Local 115, the union representing 343 former housekeeping employees who were terminated August 4 when the University went out of the housekeeping business and hired outside contractors for custodial work. *Almanac* has issued a series of special bulletins, paid for by the Office of Personnel Relations, since August 4; these are available to any member of the University who may have missed them (Ext. 5274). Additional bulletins will be issued as needed. In the meantime, Personnel's hotline for current information is Ext. 4537; the Security number to call in case of difficulty is 7297.

SEPARATION OF GRADUATE HOSPITAL

Graduate Hospital has now become an independent corporation with its own board of directors, Senior Vice-President for Management and Finance Paul Gaddis has announced. With the success of a \$38 million Hospital Authority bond issue in August, and the filing of articles of division on September 1, the hospital has assumed financial and legal responsibility for all of its obligations. Details of future academic affiliations and of payback arrangements for Penn's recent advances to the hospital will be in next week's *Almanac*.

SEVEN POLICIES ON PUBLIC SAFETY

The President's Task Force on Public Safety has drafted seven resolutions on issues raised by the Report of the Committee on Open Expression last spring, including proposed policies on confidentiality of security records. All seven will be published for comment in next week's *Almanac*. Tests are also being released this week to *The Daily Pennsylvanian*.

SECRETARY OF CORPORATION: MS. SOMERVILLE

Janis Irene Somerville has been appointed Secretary of the Corporation, the first woman to hold that position in the 237 years since the University was founded. Before joining Penn September 1 Ms. Somerville was secretary of the Graduate Record Examinations Board of the Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J., and program director with ETS.

From 1972 to 1976 Ms. Somerville served as Salem College's first director of a presidential commission on curriculum planning, then as its chief academic officer. She was associate academic dean, planning director and assistant professor of education at Newton College, 1970-72, and director of the North Carolina Human Resources Development Program, 1969-70. Earlier she worked in student affairs and planning at Ohio. Completing her Ph.D. at Duke, she received an M.B.A. from Harvard in 1968 and B.A. from Penn State in 1963.

FELLOWSHIP IN MEMORY OF SOL WORTH

The Hon. Walter H. Annenberg has established a fellowship at the Annenberg School of Communications in honor of the late Professor Sol Worth, who died August 29 of a heart attack in Boston.

The report that follows is the work of an ad hoc committee of trustees chaired by Robert Trescher, Esq., and appointed in March by Trustee Chairman Donald Regan to examine and make recommendations for the University's administrative structure. The report made two major long-range recommendations. First, it recommended creation of a new post of chief operating officer, most likely with the title "provost," to complement the president, who would remain chief executive officer. Such a proposal adds a second officer with responsibility for both academic and administrative functions. The chief operating officer would be selected through a search process with trustee, faculty, and student consultation similar to that used in filling the provostship previously. Details for the organization of the central academic administration under a chief operating officer (provost) were left to be worked out by the administration with advice from the faculty.

The second long-range recommendation addressed simpler and more effective deliberative procedures, especially in filling administrative positions. Implementation was again left to the president and provost, with advice from the faculty.

The report also contained several short-range recommendations. First, the responsibilities currently attached to the provostship were to be broadened to some extent, although still falling considerably short of the range expected of a chief operating officer. Second, the report recommended the designation "deputy provost" for Vice-President for Health Affairs Thomas Langfitt. This designation reflects his status as senior academic officer after the provost and his authority in emergency situations to act as president in the absence of both the president and provost. Third, Bruce Johnstone was recommended for a new post, "vice-president for administration." Finally, Paul Gaddis' title was revised to read "senior vice-president for management and finance" in order to better reflect his responsibilities for University financial operations.

The report and its recommendations were discussed by the Executive Board on July 21, 1977. The Executive Board endorsed the general principles of the report; approved recommended changes in titles for Thomas Langfitt, Bruce Johnstone, and Paul Gaddis; and directed the president and the provost to proceed, in consultation with faculty and others, to implement the aims of the long-range recommendations.

—Martin Meyerson

Trustees' Report on Administrative Structure

July 21, 1977

BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURES

The *Ad Hoc* Committee on Administrative Structure was established on March 10, 1977 by Chairman of the Trustees Donald Regan at the request of President Martin Meyerson to advise the president and the chairman on alternative organizational structures for the executive functions of the University.

The committee has met several times, one of those times by itself to consider how it might best organize its task, and all other times with President Meyerson, twice as well with Chairman Regan. The chairman of the *ad hoc* committee also met on several occasions with the president. On May 10, Franklin Lindsay, a consultant to the president on organizational and managerial matters, joined us. After that meeting, we issued a progress report, the main features of which President Meyerson discussed with key members of his executive staff.

The committee further deliberated on May 19, 1977. A few days prior to that meeting, Committee Chairman Trescher and President Meyerson agreed that it would be advisable to obtain the views of Paul Gaddis, Curtis Reitz and Eliot Stellar. The Committee Chairman talked to the latter two individually prior to the meeting. With the approval of the Committee, they were invited to attend the meeting and meet separately with us. Each provided valuable insights; Reitz illustrating some of the key elements that must be considered in any reorganization; Gaddis stressing the mission and values that must be served by an administrative structure and principal achievements and yet unsolved problem areas (enclaves); and Stellar, as well as Reitz, emphasizing the political constraints that must be considered in reorganization (for example, the difficulties at Pennsylvania in interposing another office between the president and the provost, and the importance of not separating the budget function from the academic functions of the University).

The sessions with Messrs. Reitz, Gaddis, and Stellar were followed by a session just with the president at which certain agreements began to be formed. A long subsequent meeting between Chairman Trescher and President Meyerson refined a draft that was sent out on May 31 and that formed the basis of a meeting on June 6 with Chairman Regan in New York. We have

had increasing agreement on both the long- and short-range proposals, described below. A brief report on our key recommendations was made by Robert Trescher at the meeting of the Educational Policy Committee of the Trustees on June 9. Our final discussion was a conference call on June 27.

PRINCIPLES

The members of the committee are aware that a university, in many ways, is unlike a business organization in administrative structure. A business executive, through hiring, firing, promotions, conferring of benefits, and other incentives, and with the clear goal of making a profit for the shareholders, can exercise a far higher degree of control than can a university executive.

At our University, the president and the provost and the academic deans should have time for leadership, for reflection and planning, and for the development of new ideas, as well as for administration. Unfortunately, at most universities, including ours, the top officers suffer from overload and are bogged down with a host of problems that should be solved at lower levels. The achievement of their top priorities is often impeded because of too many publics to deal with, too many persons reporting to them, and a complex history of academic governance by consensus and committee.

Early in our work, we determined that our advice should not be directed to organizational details; that we should give priority to long-range structural principles; and that we should be cognizant of, but not unduly constricted by, political and personal sensibilities. (However, we wished to make sure that changes in structure would not upset the key period ahead for the Program for the Eighties.)

We agreed that any proposed structure should be one with which the president agrees. We recognized, too, that what appear to be eminently reasonable administrative structures on paper may have problems upon implementation, and that existing features which seem merely arbitrary or accidental may have reasons for being that are not immediately obvious. At the same time, we have identified a number of principles and suggestions for change that we believe to be sound and that are shared by the president. It is our further belief

that support from the chairman and other key trustees may be crucial to their eventual realization.

The need for a strong administration might seem obvious. Yet universities have not always been hospitable places for effective administration. Principles of collegial governance and of faculty primacy over such matters as the content of the curriculum are not always easy to reconcile with the need for strong leadership. But the sheer size and enormous complexity of an organization like the University of Pennsylvania demand strength and control. The end of rapid growth, the serious financial problems, the impending decrease in the size of the traditional college-going age group, and the need in all parts of the university to get more for less (all of which conditions are being felt by all comparable universities) demand even more than in the past an administration that is organized most effectively for the most pressing tasks.

CURRENT ADMINISTRATION

The administration of President Martin Meyerson can count among its achievements the following:

- A larger number of effective deans;
- Closer ties among the separate faculties;
- The formation of a unified faculty of arts and sciences;
- The installation of a decentralized budget system that has led to increased attention to the undergraduate as well as to the graduate student, increased revenue raising activities, and more careful financial scrutiny over appointments and plans;
- Improved controllership, management information, and personnel and labor relations;
- A fund-raising campaign successful to date;
- A financial situation that is precarious, like the situations elsewhere, yet one which has retained at the University of Pennsylvania a rough balance between the pressure of needs and the limitation of resources.

At the same time, President Meyerson and others have pointed to a number of weaknesses in current structure and procedures. The overall problem is best described as one of excessive tasks for both the president and provost. Though some faculty and students see an administration that is too large, we conclude ours is understaffed at the top. More specifically, we perceive the following structural problems:

—The absence of a second officer, in addition to the president, with line authority over the internal operations of the University and able both to initiate change and to resolve problems short of the president;

—A generally "flat" organizational structure, with minimal delegation of responsibility among top officers, particularly among those officers reporting directly to the provost, and with far too many (about 30) persons reporting to the provost;

—An unfortunate division between academic and non-academic administration and the absence of a single senior financial officer responsible for fiscal control centrally and in relation to the schools;

—A cumbersome and excessive system of internal checks and balances, including committee reviews, with respect to such matters as generating and approving academic plans, reallocating resources from programs of less centrality and quality to programs that rank highest on these two criteria, and selecting key academic administrative officers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Long-Range. Our principal long-range recommendation is that there be created a position of chief operating officer under the president as chief executive officer. We prefer that the chief operating officer be called "executive vice president" but, given the importance at Pennsylvania of the title of provost, it would be simpler having him or her called "provost." Such a post would be able to share many of the responsibilities of the president. It would add a second officer with clear line authority over key operations, both academic and non-academic. It should free the president's time for those future planning, budgeting, communications and other activities that only the chief executive officer can perform and

allow him to focus on those special opportunities and problems that seem to arise so frequently within a university.

The provost or executive vice president must be an academic leader. But the person must also be an efficient administrator, knowledgeable and interested in matters of finance, management, and other facets of the University's operations.

It is our recommendation that this long-range arrangement be in effect by no later than 1980. The number of senior officers responsible for the three basic functions of academic affairs, development, and management and finance, may well be more than three, but we recommend that all of the academic functions (currently embracing student affairs, residences, and the registrar as well as the schools, faculties, institutes, libraries, and other activities) would report to the chief operating officer through a new senior officer, an academic affairs vice president. Further division of labor and delegation of responsibility will also be desirable, and might take the form of several academic divisions (e.g., arts and sciences, health affairs, and other professional schools).

Short-Range. For the short-range, we recommend that certain steps in the direction we have outlined above be taken by the start of the coming fall term. We recognize that these recommendations have yet to be reviewed in detail with the senior officers. The key elements of our recommended short-range arrangement, leading to the long-range one, are the following:

- The provost would become more of a deputy president and would broaden his range of responsibility, although keeping his principal attention on the academic sectors and not assuming the degree of responsibility over all operations expected of a chief operating officer.
- The vice president for health affairs would serve as deputy provost, adding to his present cognizance over the health schools a responsibility for certain other academic affairs as assigned by the president and the provost.
- The vice president and director of the office of the president would shift to a line role with a change in title with responsibility for coordinating and expediting academic and non-academic administration; for preparation of the executive staff agenda; and for liaison between the president and provost and other administrative officers.
- The associate provost has asked to be able to relinquish his post in a year, opening a post as a general aide to the provost.
- The senior vice president for management would assume the title, "senior vice president for management and finance," and would concentrate not only on the offices and operational services that come under his direct supervision currently, but also pay special attention to the quality of finance and management in the schools and other decentralized units.
- As we approach the half-way point in our Program for the Eighties, we must consider a possible transition from the present development department direct reporting relationship to the president and some future arrangement in which a new chief operating officer might be involved.

We recommend that the president take immediate steps to implement the short-range recommendations above and report his proposals to the Executive Board on July 21 and periodically thereafter as may be desirable to keep the Trustees informed. At the same time, we recommend that the president begin working with the appropriate persons within the University, including faculty representatives, and with Chairman Regan to plan the movement toward a long-range organization as summarized above. As part of this process, we would like a complete organization chart, extending in particular to the many officers now reporting to the provost. We further recommend that the president and provost and their colleagues with those same faculty leaders and with Trustee leaders begin moving toward a simplified committee system within the University. Specifically we ask them to develop a pattern where, in academic administrative searches, the president and provost recommend candidates for review by consultative committees. We also ask them to recommend for the future how a chief executive and chief operating officer should best be appointed. Finally, we recommend review of both our interim and our long-range organization proposals by the *ad hoc* Committee on Trustee organization chaired by Charles Dickey with the aim of relating administrative and trustee structures and functions including trustee committees in the most effective ways.

*From a Memorandum of Donald T. Regan to Executive Board,
University Trustees, August 24, 1977*

The *ad hoc* committee on administrative organization completed its work in time for our last meeting on July 21. Its immediate proposals were modest but valuable. Their aim was to help reduce the tremendous overload on the President and the Provost. President Meyerson and Provost Stellar have implemented them promptly as we asked them to do. I am especially eager that Martin, as our chief executive, be more free in the years ahead to devote himself to combined planning for academic and non-academic resources, both short- and long-term. I also expect Eliot to take more of a lead in improving curricula as well as in integrating key features of educational programs and University management, with the collaboration of Bruce Johnstone and others. On the committee's and the Board's proposal to sharpen

the search process for major administrators, I understand Martin has asked Eliot and Curtis Reitz to work with the chairman and the chairman-elect of the Senate in developing better procedures. As for the long-term orientation of the committee's report, I expect Martin to report back to us periodically on how best to implement it.

Our Program for the Eighties has been slowed somewhat by summer and by the sluggishness of the stock market. As we approach the two-year mark of our formal announcement of the drive in October, we might think most carefully about the final three years. Martin has asked John Hobstetter to work closely with the deans, the development staff, the provost, and him between now and the January Board meeting to see what revisions in direction and what sharpening of educational proposals and development prospectuses we require.

Statement by the Senate Advisory Committee On the Trustees Report on Administrative Structure

September 7, 1977

A report on "Administrative Structure" was approved by the Executive Board of the Trustees on July 21, 1977, and forthwith delivered to President Meyerson for implementation.

The changes in university governance that the report directs are as basic in nature as those proposed seven years ago by the Task Force on Governance, a body of trustees, faculty and students whose recommendations were subjected to full and open review, and were in the main approved by the Senate and the University Council. But the present report was prepared without faculty consultation of any kind, although its architects did consult Paul Gaddis, Curtis Reitz and Eliot Stellar, and had the benefit of President Meyerson's presence at all but one of their meetings. It has already been implemented in part.

The Senate Advisory Committee views with concern the procedures that were followed, in particular the lack of faculty input, the absence of broad review, and the haste in implementation. With respect to content, we have the following comments:

1. The report recommends that the Office of the Provost be redefined, so that its occupant takes responsibility not only for the full area of academic administration, but for large areas of the non-academic as well. "Deputy president," "chief operating officer," and "executive vice president" are some of the terms the report uses to characterize the office.

While there may well be need for a high level operating officer to relieve the President of relatively routine decisions bridging academic and nonacademic areas, the present proposal downgrades the academic function of the Provost and leaves the faculty without an intellectual leader solely concerned with academic responsibilities. To legislate on such a matter without consulting the faculty, through any of several established mechanisms, is certainly unacceptable. More unacceptable still is the fact that the recommendation has already been implemented, and Provost Stellar's duties revised.

2. The report recommends the creation of a Deputy Provost, designated as the third ranking officer in the University, who, besides his not very clearly specified regular duties, would serve as President in the absence of the President or the Provost.

The President, in consultation with the Provost, has proceeded to fill the new position by appointing Dr. Thomas Langfitt, who will retain his earlier title of Vice President for Health Affairs.

Longstanding procedures, heretofore amended only with careful attention to due process, specify consultation with faculty and students in the filling of all the University offices with major academic responsibilities that existed before July 21. Almost six pages of the University Council Bylaws (mailed to Senate membership) deal with these procedures. The failure to consult in any way before filling a newly created office which is to be the

third ranking position in the University, is tantamount to a flouting of the whole University Council-Senate system.

3. While the report deals in part with the assignment of nonacademic administrative duties, which are not directly relevant to faculty concerns, it also deals with the subject of faculty consultation itself.

It recommends that, in the future, the established procedures for consultation be "simplified" so that the President and Provost may act as the search committee for senior academic administrative appointments, and that their nominees simply be reviewed by consultative committees. To legislate this, without even conferring with the University Council or its Steering Committee, destroys the concept of shared responsibility of faculty and administration and in effect reduces the faculty to the status of employees.

There is a challenge embedded deep in the rhetoric of the report, where we find references of the following kind:

We are told that one impediment to achieving desirable administrative goals is "a complex history of academic governance by consensus and committee."

We learn that "principles of collegial governance and of faculty primacy over such matters as the content of the curriculum are not always easy to reconcile with the need for strong leadership."

And we find identified as a major weakness in structure and procedure: "A cumbersome and excessive system of internal checks and balances, including committee reviews, with respect to such matters as generating and approving academic plans, reallocating resources from programs of less centrality and quality to programs that rank highest on these two criteria, and selecting key academic administrative officers."

The challenge to the faculty which is implicit in the report, as approved and thus far implemented, is one which must be taken up. Already some preliminary steps have been taken, but it is crucial that the faculty assemble in plenary session to address the problems which the report poses. We have scheduled a special meeting of the Faculty Senate for Wednesday, October 5, from 3:00 to 6:00 p.m. in 200 College Hall to consider an appropriate resolution.

Senate Advisory Committee

<i>Jean V. Alter</i>	<i>Irving B. Kravis</i>
<i>Ralph D. Amado</i>	<i>Barbara J. Lowery</i>
<i>Peter A. Cassileth</i>	<i>Janice Madden</i>
<i>Peter J. Conn</i>	<i>Seymour J. Mandelbaum</i>
<i>James W. Cornman</i>	<i>Ann R. Miller</i>
<i>Helen C. Davies</i>	<i>Daniel D. Perlmutter</i>
<i>Gerald E. Frug</i>	<i>Thomas A. Reiner</i>
<i>Robert Inman</i>	<i>Robert A. Zeltin</i>

Robert F. Lucid, Acting Chairman

Provost's Letter to the Senate Advisory Committee

September 9, 1977

Dear Colleagues,

I am writing to express my concern over the response of the Senate leadership to the Trescher committee report and the Trustee action on it. While issues and actions may be controversial and certainly deserve discussion, I do not believe they call for the intense response they received. I also regret that the response was written a few days before the President and I were scheduled to meet with the Senate Advisory Committee.

First of all, to say that the changes in administration taking place are as fundamental as those which came from the 1970 Task Force on Governance Report is a great exaggeration. Second, to assume that most of the changes proposed or implied in the Trescher report are now taking place without consultation is simply not true. Only the changes in titles of Tom Langfitt, Bruce Johnstone, and Paul Gaddis were official Trustee actions.

I can understand the concern over the designation of Tom Langfitt as Deputy Provost without faculty advice and I regret that it happened that way. "Deputy Provost" is a designation reflecting Tom Langfitt's status as the senior academic officer after the Provost and therefore as the one who should act as President, if need be, in the absence of both the President and the Provost. The immediate reason for so designating Vice-President Langfitt was the decision of John Hobstetter, who has been authorized to act as President in both our absence, to resign from his post of Associate Provost for Academic Planning sometime this academic year. The designation of Tom Langfitt as a deputy provost could have occurred with no change in title; indeed as Vice-President for Health Affairs, he had been acting in many ways as a deputy to the Provost before this summer. This action, however, is not intended as a signal that we do not want faculty consultation. We need it and want it.

My biggest concern is the assumption that the Provost's duties have been changed without consultation and that I am willing to dilute and impair the academic responsibilities of the Provostship. Neither is true. As some of you know, when I became Provost in 1973, I declined to continue the additional title of Vice-President which Curtis Reitz had. Recently, I also said I did not want the additional title of Deputy President. "Provost" by itself was title enough, signifying as it does the primacy of my academic responsibilities. I did agree, however, to explore taking on a few responsibilities from the President, such as working more closely with foundations. That exploration is just getting under way and will be discussed with faculty colleagues and colleagues in academic administration. I will not allow it to impair my carrying out my academic responsibilities.

One way to prevent impairment of my academic responsibilities is to rely heavily on Bruce Johnstone and Paul Gaddis for nonacademic responsibilities I take on. That way I not only can avoid heavy nonacademic responsibilities, but I can also help make sure that academic priorities are uppermost in all administrative policy-making. The other way is for me to delegate more to my academic colleagues John Hobstetter, Patricia McFate, Don Langenberg, and Tom Langfitt. I believe I can do this without either adding to a hierarchy or giving up direct contact with deans, faculty, students and academic issues. We

work in a collegial fashion, and my colleagues in the Provost's office serve to facilitate my interactions with deans and faculty as well as greatly helping in the decision-making process.

Another misunderstanding of the Trescher report is the statement that the search and consultative procedures will be changed so that the President and Provost will carry out the search process and consult faculty afterwards. While this kind of possibility was mentioned in the report, it has not been decided upon; in fact, Donald Regan in his August 24 memo points out that the President has asked me to work with Curtis Reitz in seeking faculty advice on our search and consultative processes in the hopes of making them more effective. That we are about to undertake, using the 1970 Task Force on Governance Report and the current Council By-Laws as our starting points.

Finally, in the faculty leadership's complaint about the rhetoric of the Trescher report and in my complaint here about their response, I hope that we have the making of a healthy dialogue. If there are dissatisfactions and perceptions of inadequacies, they ought to come out and we should find remedies for them. But we should not let them fester beneath the surface or explode upon us in destructive ways. The University and our academic values are too precious and too vulnerable in these difficult years to jeopardize.

—Eliot Stellar

DIRECTOR OF ADMISSIONS

The search for a Director of Admissions has been reopened with an Admissions Search Committee comprised of Dr. Joseph Bordogna (Engineering and Applied Science), Dr. Morris Hamburg, Chairman (Statistics and Operations Research), Dr. D. Bruce Johnstone (Vice-President for Administration), Dr. Thomas Reiner (Regional Science), and Betty Rosenkranz (FAS '79). The following description of the position has been placed in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*.

The Director of Admissions is responsible for recruitment and selection of students in the University of Pennsylvania for undergraduate schools: Arts and Sciences, Wharton, Engineering, and Nursing. Approximately 10,000 applications are handled, eventually yielding an entering class of about 2,000 freshmen and 500 transfers. The Director heads a staff of 35 with an annual budget in excess of \$650,000.

The Director should be familiar with, and committed to, private, selective higher education. As one of the most visible spokesmen for the University, he or she should be an accomplished speaker, an effective writer, and a sensitive participant in and interpreter of the University's academic mission. As head of a large office, the Director must be a skilled and experienced leader and manager.

Send vita, references, and a letter setting forth a few ideas on the challenges perceived in a post such as this to: Admissions Search Committee, 102 College Hall, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 19104. An equal opportunity employer.

The Admissions Search Committee invites recommendations and applications for this position.

—Morris Hamburg

America's First University: Its Character and Mission

by Martin Meyerson

*A Report Prepared for the Meeting of the Trustees
of the University of Pennsylvania
January 10, 1977*

Last year, in reporting to the Trustees and our University community on the state of the University, I reviewed the first five years of my administration and touched on the issues I believed to be critical to the University of Pennsylvania's future. This year again, I intend to depart from the format of chronicling the significant events, accomplishments, and problems of the year just past. Instead, I should like to share with you some thoughts on the character and mission of the University of Pennsylvania—the first center of learning in America to be titled a “university.” These will reflect the significance of that designation as well as our place in the history of universities. We should consider in what ways we are like the 50 other great centers in the world (perhaps half of them in America) that combine the highest levels of achievement in research and in teaching over a broad range of disciplines and professional fields. In what ways are we different? How ought we to be different—perhaps more so than we are today? What can we do to reinforce those qualities most distinctively ours—qualities which result from our traditional strengths, our location, our history, and our other assets? To what degree is it possible for the character and mission of a university to be purposefully shaped? And insofar as they can be shaped, what direction should this process take, and in what ways ought we to be evolving?

Delineation of Character and Mission

Defining and articulating the character and mission of a university is a responsibility of the president; but it is not his alone. The views I share with you have been molded in the course of my almost seven years at Pennsylvania in that special crucible, the University's deliberative process. The ideas I put forward in 1970 and 1971 built upon the work of my predecessors. The wealth of proposals by the University Development Commission, co-chaired by Eliot Stellar (now Provost) and Robert Dyson (now Associate Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences) and reviewed by the Senate and Council, and the findings of many other groups including a special working conference on undergraduate education, all contribute to the evolving character of the University. All of these sources helped shape this statement of our mission.

In 1973, I drafted a working statement on the University's mission as part of the planning for the Program for the Eighties. In this effort, I was assisted by the deans, an *ad hoc* committee of the Faculty Senate, and a group of Trustees responsible for organizing the campaign. Then, in response to a request from some of the members of University Council, I went further in its meeting last November in outlining the elements I believe to comprise the character and mission of our University. Here again I had the benefit of comments, both critical and supportive, from our colleagues.

The delineation of a university's character and mission involves an exercise in balance: of leadership with consensus, of substance with acceptable generality, of what is with what might be. For example, the essence of this, as of any university or other complex institution, is derived to some extent from the sum of its parts. Since these parts are diverse, some of their objectives will seem diverse, and even divergent. And, just as the University is made up of schools, departments, centers, institutes, and programs, so these parts in turn are composed of individual staff and students each having an individual set of goals. To some, the character and mission of the University is no more than the result of adding together these individual aims—always diverse, only sometimes articulated, and rarely extending far beyond the experience and interest of the individuals involved. But a university is much more than the sum of the aims of its individual members. To make sound use of its resources in people, space, tradition, and funds, a great university requires a set of guiding principles. That set, that mission, must partly derive from, but in turn must transcend, the goals, beliefs, and experiences of individuals and component parts.

The quest for a balanced statement of mission is necessarily delicate. We treasure collegiality in universities. Yet an attempt to reach a statement of consensus is likely to end up either as no more than a listing of goals—a kind of common law mission by accretion—or as a set of statements so vague as to be trivial.

In this quest, we must also strike a balance between conservation and innovation, preserving what we are and what we have been—with so much from the last two decades and even the last two centuries worthy of preservation—and seeking new directions and standards. Our character and mission must take into account our past (what we have been), our present strengths and weaknesses (what we are) and our aspirations (what we wish to be). While the past and present are no longer ours to shape, they give circumference to our future. Thus, at any point in time, our mission is partly developed and partly awaiting development through the application of our minds and, even more, of our wills.

The Context: The Condition of American Higher Education

The mission of a university must be bounded by the demographic, economic, and social context of American higher education. I shall therefore summarize the main conditions that presently pose a formidable challenge to all universities, including ours.

- *The Declining Pool of Potential Undergraduates in the United States.* One of the few things we know with certainty about the future is the maximum number of 18-year-olds there will be for the next 17 years. It is also possible to estimate roughly the numbers going on to college in each year as well as their distribution by ability (S.A.T. scores) and by

approximate family income. We know that there is a small pool of potential students who combine the academic ability we seek with the ability to pay our tuition. According to Humphrey Doermann for the College Entrance Examination Board, in June, 1976, a national total of 39,000 students—or little more than one percent of all high school graduates—achieved a high measure of academic aptitude (600 verbal S.A.T.s and above) and came from families in the top 10 percent of United States income. This group represents financial resources which would permit a family to send children to an independent institution such as ours without financial aid. In the somewhat lower range of S.A.T. scores (550) there were still only 63,000 students last year whose family incomes were in the top 10 percent or over \$35,000. And this number will decline by as much as 16 percent in less than a decade. Most of these students who go on to college (not all do) will attend public institutions.

This is a demographic challenge to which we must respond—in one or more of a number of ways. With a significant expenditure of financial aid we can, for example, retain our share of this tiny and dwindling market (in itself a challenging task) and reduce our faculty and staff proportionate to the decline in the undergraduate student body. Or, again, we can reach further into the potential pool and admit students with far lower S.A.T.s but still well above the median, who can pay the Pennsylvania tuition. Another possibility is to expand applicant pools by including more adults, mid-career professionals, students from abroad, promising high school juniors, and transfers from the public sector. Finally, we can and ought to try to “outperform the market”—that is, to increase our share of the small pool of high-ability/high-income students by presenting and making known an undergraduate experience demonstrably richer here than at other schools.

- *The Weakening Link Between Education and Employment.* The extraordinary expansion of American higher education in the years following the second World War was largely a result of the conviction that higher education was a sound investment for the individual as well as for society. Expenditure on higher education, it was presumed, whether by the student and his family or by the government, would bring a return in the form of better paying jobs, greater productivity, and other societal benefits. However, the erosion of income differentials between jobs which do and those which do not require a college education; the saturation in many regions of professional fields such as architecture, surgery, or the law; and the constriction of the teaching market at all levels have combined to weaken this former link between higher education and the certainty of a well-paying job. In response, many students have turned from the arts and sciences to professional schools which, for a time, seem to offer a more secure route to good jobs. But already signs of “softness” are appearing nationally in the professional markets. The situation regarding the graduate arts and sciences is already almost a national disaster, and America’s research achievements of the last quarter century are being compromised and eroded. While some of the current problems are undoubtedly a function of the sluggish economy, there can be little question but that a fundamental—if not wholly clear—shift is taking place in the relative values of higher education as a public investment, as a private investment, and as a consumer goal.

This shift has several implications for the future of the University of Pennsylvania. Given our strengths in traditional professional areas, we can be gratified by the current surge of interest and enrollment in Wharton, Health, Engineering, Law, and other areas. But we must not rest content with our advanced professional education as it now exists, or become overly dependent upon it. Nor should we forget that education in the liberal arts and sciences was once the proper and only preparation for entry into many of the noblest professions and that it is still the most stimulating, useful, flexible, and indeed “preparatory” of all forms of learning. The challenge to the University of Pennsylvania involves keeping our professional programs an “educational experience” in the broadest sense rather than “training” in the narrow sense, ceaselessly reinvigorating the undergraduate liberal arts and sciences curricula, and reorienting graduate education in the arts and sciences away from its preoccupation with training a future professoriate toward advanced education for a wide variety of roles that include business, government service, the professions, and simply learning at its most rigorous. These are part of the substance of our quest, and I shall return to them later.

- *The Financial State of Higher Education.* Colleges and universities everywhere, public and private alike, continue to be squeezed by costs which rise more rapidly than revenues. There are many reasons for this dilemma, beginning with the fact that unit costs always rise faster in a labor intensive enterprise than in organizations and industries that can substitute capital for labor. Universities have been hit especially hard by

inflationary trends in the cost of goods and services, such as energy, paper, books, and laboratory equipment. Pressures to enroll needy students and to increase financial aid (pressures that are mainly self-imposed and that are both academically and ethically worthy) have further increased costs, especially in the private sector. On the revenue side, government support at both the federal and state levels has declined in real terms, reflecting a combination of fiscal pressures in the public sector, rising costs for other competing functions, and a diminution of the political appeal that expenditures on higher education once had. In the private sector, the poor performance of investment portfolios has added to the financial squeeze.

Pennsylvania, like all universities, struggles with this squeeze and has had to do so since that fiscally disastrous academic year beginning in 1969. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, we wound up with a small surplus achieved, in part, through more cuts in cost (mainly in reduced real salaries and in fewer staff). We also had the opportunity of a capital gain taken in fiscal 1975 and applied in fiscal 1976. A large portion of the costs of the development office were shifted from the operating budget to advances on campaign proceeds. These measures were taken for good reasons (other than their short term value) and ought not to detract from the real improvements made in our financial situation. But a deficit in the current year, ending June 30, 1977, is almost certain, and a balanced budget for fiscal 1978 will be difficult. Our financial condition is tight and will remain so as long as certain non-tuition sources of revenue—for example, the unrestricted portion of the Commonwealth appropriation—fail to keep pace with inflation and with our necessary and minimal increases in salaries and wages, energy costs, and other expenses, or until our fund-raising brings an increase to our unrestricted operating budget. Furthermore, increases in tuition must be limited. Although colleges and universities have almost never been free from financial worries, the conditions of the years of this decade, coupled with the prospect of continuing inflation in the economy, indicate that the future of the University of Pennsylvania will depend on current actions necessary to preserve financial well-being.

- *Planning and Austerity: A Challenge to Governance.* Purposeful planning, which allocates resources according to principles and standards and a sense of the University’s mission, is a difficult art in the best of times. It is vastly more difficult in times dominated by uncertainty and austerity. This is so in part because of the enormous complexity inherent in teaching and learning and scholarly creativity. Little is really known about the ways students learn and the results of various methods of teaching, even less about the conditions under which great research and scholarly work flourishes. Even were there unanimity on the goals of a university, on the priority of these goals, and on the ways to measure the “success” or “benefit” of each goal, there would still be conflicts over the proper way to proceed. As Kenneth Boulding, the social economist, likes to point out, planning is most feasible and functions best in simple organizations with clear-cut aims—rather than at universities.

What makes planning in a university more difficult is that we treasure the principle of collegiality. Yet that often means agreement can only be reached on the most general goals. At some universities authority and responsibility have been uncoupled, with serious consequences. Particularly in times of austerity, when development in some areas may bring with it a reduction in others, the principle of collegiality can turn into a force for defending particular domains.

The University of Pennsylvania has suffered somewhat less from this divergence between authority and responsibility than have certain other universities. We have preserved the principle that the faculty is primarily responsible for certain matters vital to our academic direction and have avoided the intense preoccupation with rights of turf that have paralyzed some institutions. Even so, decisions here remain hard to effect, particularly when they touch upon the reallocation of resources. As we consider the future of the University, it is with the hope of encouraging faculty to work collegially but with a broad vision of the University as a whole.

The Character and Mission of the University of Pennsylvania

In the context of these challenges faced by all of higher education in America, and with a caveat about the very process involved in giving expression to the elusive qualities of a university, I shall describe what appear to me to be the major elements in the character and mission of the University of Pennsylvania.

1. *The University of Pennsylvania is a major research institution whose central aim is to generate new knowledge, new insights, and, in the arts, new forms of creative expression.*

The University of Pennsylvania is one of a small number of institutions (perhaps two dozen in America and an equal number elsewhere in the world) that since the second World War have virtually remade almost every scientific field, enormously expanded our knowledge in the humanities, and given new tools, new knowledge, and new direction to nearly every profession and creative art. This allegiance to scholarship forms the basis for teaching as well as research; it underlies the character and mission of the professional schools as well as the liberal arts and sciences; it points to ways of serving the public as well as our students and our professors.

Although this pattern holds true of all great American research universities and most elsewhere in the world, it is not the case everywhere. In some countries, such as the Soviet Union and other socialist states, universities have little obligation to create knowledge, and this function is left mostly to research organizations. Students at such universities, unlike those here, are thus cut off from the stimulus of receiving their education in an atmosphere of creative endeavor in the sciences, the arts, and the professions.

2. Scholarship at the University of Pennsylvania extends to the applied and professional as well as to the basic and theoretical.

Pennsylvania has traditionally maintained allegiance to both theoretical and applied scholarship and study. Ever since the 18th century, Pennsylvania has cultivated the practical as well as the scientific and humanistic, maintaining a creative tension between them. The attention given to the utilitarian stems in part from the genius of Benjamin Franklin and in part from the Scottish origins of the University of Pennsylvania. In contrast to some of the old universities of New England modeled on the English college, Pennsylvania with its line of educators influenced by the Scottish enlightenment, was responsive early on to the emergence of scientific curiosity. From such origins came the first American medical school, the first university lectures in law, the first collegiate school of business—all at the first institution outside Europe to be titled a “university.”

If some institutions have congratulated themselves on their traditional learning to the exclusion of the applied fields, this has not been the case at Pennsylvania. Comparable emphasis here has been placed on both, and the University has been particularly distinguished by some of its professional schools. Each area is enriched by the presence of the other. Workers at the forefront of scholarly research benefit from the new challenges, the natural laboratory, and the social purposefulness provided by the professions and the applied fields, while faculty and students in these professions and applied fields benefit in turn from the methods and perspectives of scholarship provided by their colleagues in the basic disciplines.

Of vital importance and by no means simple to effect is our tenet that all our professional and applied education must be based on allegiance to scholarship. In other words, the professions we teach ought always to be learned ones. Formerly, the term “learned professions” referred narrowly to those few professional guilds, such as medicine and law, that were entered mainly through a rigorous scholarly apprenticeship. Our view today should be much broader. A learned profession, whether ancient or modern, should be a calling based on the extension and exploration of knowledge as well as on a set of principles for the conduct of its members. At Pennsylvania, all professional education should be “learned,” that is should draw on a rigorous and powerful body of knowledge, the advancement of which is deemed not merely appropriate but essential for its continuation. The professions of law, medicine, engineering, dental and veterinary medicine, management, city planning, social welfare, and others at Pennsylvania all must reinforce this objective of being learned. The University is attempting to occupy the forefront in newer and more rapidly changing professional fields as well as in the historic ones. What Pennsylvania can bring to these fields is not only the preparation of

leading practitioners, but also the preparation of those whose research and teaching will change the professions themselves.

3. With its unusual range of basic disciplines and professional schools on a unified campus the University of Pennsylvania has a special opportunity to link the theoretical with the applied through cooperative ventures between departments and disciplines. We should take advantage of our capacity to generate and apply new knowledge at the boundaries among disciplines and professions.

The great range of our schools and departments on a single, close-knit campus gives us special opportunities to develop new relationships among them, making use of advances made in the disciplines and the applied fields. The disciplines and professions are in a continual process of change and development, from which emerges the reformulation of disciplines and professions, and sometimes entirely new fields. In this process, Pennsylvania should be and is a leader, as evidenced by its contributions to such evolving subjects as ethnography, American civilization, medieval studies, Near Eastern studies, bioengineering, law and public policy, environmental medicine, comparative (animal and human) medicine, health care management and economics, transportation, regional studies, and the application of materials science to dentistry.

4. The arts and sciences must continue to be strengthened, since these disciplines must be at the center of scholarship and teaching. It has only been since 1974 that the arts and sciences at the University of Pennsylvania were joined in a single faculty.

The University of Pennsylvania has, in general, been better known for its professional schools than for its arts and sciences departments. While this may continue to be the case, we must remember that the reputations of some of our professional schools have drawn in no small measure on strengths in the arts and sciences disciplines.

The critical place of the arts and sciences was well stated by the Committee on Educational Policy and Planning, chaired by Dean Keedy of the Law School, in a report to the University prepared in 1946.

By a fallacy which it seems easy for the mind to fall into, it is often assumed that because the College of Liberal Arts does not, like the more technological schools, prepare the student for a particular vocation whose label it wears, it prepares for none. Nothing in reality is further from the truth; indeed the College prepares for a greater variety of professions than does probably any other school. . . . We need to make it clear that the best foundation for almost any career is a broad education that develops the character and intellect to the fullest, and that a disciplined mind and a capacity for hard work are more important than the study of any particular subject.

In these words, the report defended the value of an arts and sciences education for those who intended professional careers at the time. The College of Liberal Arts—the closest thing to an arts and sciences faculty—lacked the social sciences and many of the other disciplines we include today.

5. Undergraduate education at the University of Pennsylvania strengthens, and is strengthened by the proximity of graduate programs and research.

No contradiction exists between the twin allegiances to scholarship and to undergraduate education; the two ought properly to complement one another. Our undergraduate education in all fields should reflect the scholarly orientation of a “university college,” giving opportunity for many undergraduates to collaborate on the research of members of the faculty. The faculty, in turn, ought to be continually broadened and renewed by the task of synthesizing for undergraduates the changes taking place at the edges of their disciplines. I recall, for example, a Nobel prize winner in chemistry who insisted on giving introductory chemistry courses at the universities where he taught, because it gave him an opportunity periodically to integrate the advances

made in his field through an overview that he could not have achieved otherwise.

The research university allied to the undergraduate college is a peculiarly American institution. In fact, with the exception of Rockefeller no university in this country has built a distinguished and balanced center for scholarship in the absence of undergraduates. Pennsylvania, like other American universities, is derived from three models: the British college, itself descended from the medieval monastery with its emphasis on the undergraduate, on the residential experience, and on individualized instruction; the uniquely American devotion to the applied, the practical, and the popular (a direction further advanced by the nineteenth century land-grant university); and the German university, which first emphasized research, publication, and an orientation toward the disciplines. Some of the astonishing success of the American university in the last fifty years can surely be attributed to this fusion and to the mutual reinforcement of undergraduate and advanced work under the aegis of a common faculty.

Given today's emphases and interests, it is not surprising that at Pennsylvania and comparable institutions undergraduates concentrate primarily in professional or pre-professional programs such as those for law and medicine. Contrary to what is widely believed, however, few undergraduates at Pennsylvania in the last 30 or 40 years prepared for advanced work in the arts and sciences. Pennsylvania never sent on to graduate work in the arts and sciences the proportions of students that were produced by a Columbia, Chicago, or Swarthmore; however, today at these institutions too fewer arts and sciences students go on to graduate study in those subjects). Relatively few undergraduates aim to be the poets or philosophers or wide-ranging intellectuals of the next generation. These kinds of undergraduates are important to the character of a research university, and one of our goals should be to create the intellectual as opposed to the more narrowly academic ambience that will attract them to our campus in greater numbers.

6. The size, breadth, unity, and professed values of the University of Pennsylvania provide special opportunities for tailoring the education of students to suit individual needs: a customized and personalized education at all levels.

By a "customized" education, I mean a set of experiences—courses, internships, special seminars, individual reading and research programs—designed to suit the interests and needs of the particular student. A "personalized" education suggests a level of individual attention, and of understanding, that goes beyond the customization of a program. Both traits are part of our present character. Both ought to become more prevalent and more known, inside and outside the University.

The ways in which undergraduate education is individually molded at Pennsylvania include individualized majors, courses given through the college house system, freshman seminars, independent study, and opportunities to share directly in the research projects of the faculty. As was suggested several years ago by myself and Curtis Reitz, then Provost, we ought also to provide and encourage more "self-pacing." In such an option, students would be given the opportunity to demonstrate competencies through comprehensive examinations rather than by accumulating course units which, when completed, lead to a degree much as a book filled with trading-stamps can be exchanged for a premium. Thus far, however, self-pacing—though not disputed in deliberation—has been little received in practice.

Among the advances in Pennsylvania's program for individualized education is the University Scholars program. It permits undergraduates, under faculty sponsorship, to begin their advanced education perhaps as early as their freshman year, by a commingling of undergraduate and advanced programs. Our aim should be to extend the University Scholars program, small at present, to a larger number of students, but with no diminution in standards or in the attention given to individuals.

One characteristic of graduate education in the arts and sciences has always been its individually tailored quality. An encouraging sign, and one that may well become a special mark of the University of Pennsylvania, is an increasing tendency to combine graduate with advanced professional education, particularly through joint degree programs that cut across disciplines and schools, such as our programs combining public policy and law, medicine and management, linguistics and education, and engineering and social science. The social value and intellectual fertility of such programs suggest their further development.

7. Like all universities that offer a wide range of educational choice, the University of Pennsylvania must guard against the twin dangers of over-specialization and aimlessness. Curricula must provide for breadth and coherence as well as freedom of choice.

For three decades, in a process which may have been halted only very recently American educators were increasingly hesitant to define what it is students ought to know beyond their concentration or major. At the time I returned to the University of Pennsylvania in 1970, I was serving as chairman of the Assembly on University Goals and Governance established by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. In the Assembly's First Report we stated:

General education, which is in retreat, needs reformulation....To point out that a curriculum should make place for the affective no less than for the cognitive and the objective is only to open the argument. To recommend that facts be respected, but that general theory not be scanted, that a concern with Western culture be tempered by a concern with Eastern and other cultures as well, that contemporaneity be stressed, but that the past and the uncertain future also be studied, and that literacy be achieved not simply by studying one's own language but by knowing others, including that represented by the symbolic languages of the sciences, is to give a measure of the complexity of the problem.

Most universities coped with the difficulty of stipulating what students ought to know by giving students free selection, slightly modified by a set of distribution requirements. More recent efforts at Pennsylvania to move away from random selection, to establish links among courses, and to work toward improving a general education deserve praise. The University's general honors program is not without limitations, but it can help provide a fine general education. The Faculty of Arts and Sciences, through a committee headed by Professor Robert Schrieffer, is currently addressing the question of breadth in the arts and sciences curriculum. In Engineering, the degree Bachelor of Applied Science gives special attention to range. In the Wharton School, the undergraduate program is increasingly methodological rather than directly vocational and leans on the arts and sciences. Throughout other disciplines and schools, students should be provided a broader-based intellectual exposure than they now have while introducing them to the methods of a specialized concentration.

There is also a further need to assert the virtues of breadth in graduate education in the arts and sciences. Probably no part of American education became so narrowly vocational during the last half century as education for the Ph.D.—an education all too well suited to preparation for narrowly defined posts in research or graduate teaching at the University. The Ph.D. frequently indicates great competence in a single field but little intellectual range even in the chosen discipline, much less in related fields in which an academician should be able to move with ease. That a solid state physicist understand how his particular specialty fits into the spectrum of the physical sciences and of contemporary technology is surely not too much to ask. Without intellectual range, career opportunities at universities are going to become increasingly difficult to find. Just as important, without such range, scholarship and research will themselves suffer.

As we address the need for breadth and concentration in undergraduate and in graduate education alike, and in the characteristics of faculty as well, we must find ways of nurturing the intellectual as well as the academic life of the University. For such

an ambience attention must be paid to the kinds of students we recruit and enroll, as well as to the faculty we appoint and promote. We need to find new ways to reward intellectual breadth in addition to academic competence in our students and faculty. We must also remember that the intellectual life of the campus depends heavily on opportunities for faculty and student interaction outside the classroom and beyond the normal teaching day. Finally, we must attend to the environmental nuances that encourage cultural vitality: the bookstore, the offerings in the surrounding commercial and residential areas, the students' living accommodations, the congeniality of the campus toward the visual and performing arts.

8. The University of Pennsylvania is an urban University. Its character should build upon the attributes of its situation.

Pennsylvania is an urban campus. Located near the heart of the nation's fourth largest city, with much cultural, economic, and social vibrancy within easy reach, the University has barely tapped these resources. We also stand near the core of a much larger urban concentration—the largest in the world—which stretches from Washington to New York and beyond, most of it easily accessible. The propinquity of the University to the central cultural, governmental, and commercial activity of America presents special opportunities to faculty and students. Finally, the University is itself like a city: large, complex, diverse.

We have no pretensions to being a small liberal arts college. Yet, the University does provide a personal atmosphere, with places and activities that are intimate and sheltered—as for example, college houses, seminars, and close advising relationships. At the same time, the University shares the quality of the city in its respect for privacy, even anonymity. In this way, we seek to encompass some of the virtues of the small college while making the most of our richer, more cosmopolitan setting.

9. The University of Pennsylvania enjoys a unique combination of private and public support. This mixed economy presents the University with special opportunities, particularly with regard to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The University of Pennsylvania is an independent, privately-controlled institution. It relies heavily on support from students and their families, alumni, and friends, all of whom believe there is something of value not only in Pennsylvania as a University, but in the vigorous independent sector of higher learning which Pennsylvania represents.

But the University is also a public institution. It serves the needs of the state, the region, and the nation in both its teaching and research. Its library, museum, hospitals and clinics, recreational and other facilities, and to a considerable extent the talents of its faculty and students are widely utilized by the community. In recognition of these public roles, Pennsylvania receives support from the federal government and from the Commonwealth.

It is the University's special role within the Commonwealth that most distinguishes its mixed economy. The Commonwealth provides support to the University's health schools, to needy students from Pennsylvania, to the museum, and to the general operations of the University. While not large as a percentage of the University's total non-hospital operating expenses, this support is a key component of our general instructional revenues, and we depend on it. But we believe that we return full measure to the people of the Commonwealth and that this unique system of mixed public and private support can serve as a model for other independent universities and their states.

10. As a University, Pennsylvania has a special obligation to advance the highest standards of institutional responsibility and morality.

Universities are entrusted above all to protect free and open inquiry. There can be no compromise with the freedom to teach, to study, to learn, and to profess. But other obligations arise as well.

Pennsylvania is a place where morality and individual and social responsibility are treated seriously, both within and outside the curriculum and should be more so. Similarly, we should be at the forefront—more than we are—of the great contemporary move to extend opportunity for women and for minority groups.

There must be no confusion, however, between our clear obligation to act always with the most judicious standards and the obligation to provide resources and direct services to social causes, a responsibility which belongs for the most part to other agencies. For us to provide free education to all who are in need is impossible. Nor are we in a position to provide day care, community housing, or other services. Having said as much, we can and should encourage our faculty, students, and staff, as caring citizens, to offer their talents and energies in the service of the community.

11. The University of Pennsylvania is an international institution. Our scholarship and teaching are enriched by study abroad, by visiting and permanent faculty from other countries, by an international student body, and by exchanges of students and faculty with universities abroad.

Our international character provides a great opportunity for our faculty and students. But it is also an obligation, as universities everywhere experience financial strains that make them turn inward, as barriers are erected to discourage the free movement and employment of scholars in other countries, and as academic freedom is so widely threatened throughout the world.

Our exchange program with the University of Edinburgh, funded in part by a Ford Foundation venture grant; our Thouron Fellowship program, the largest British-American student exchange; our Penn-Israel program of faculty and student exchange; our ties with universities in France, the U.S.S.R., Egypt, and Japan; our historic relationship with Pahlavi University in Iran; and, of course, our strong language and area studies programs—all are examples of the University of Pennsylvania's international character. We should protect and build upon these ties. We should continue to attract expert faculty from other countries. In the face of countervailing forces both here and abroad, we should uphold the principle of academic internationalism, upon which the American research university was virtually founded.

12. The University of Pennsylvania must increasingly change and improve through reallocation rather than through the addition of resources.

In all that we do, we must strike a balance among pride in what we have achieved, ambition to do better, and prudence in the commitment of our scarce resources. In the past, planning sometimes included dreams of the new resources needed to go beyond building upon past attainments. This can no longer be the case; in the future we must do more and do better with what we have. In short, we must maintain our rigorous standards and lofty ambitions on more modest resources than in the past.

This necessity, of course, implies choice: we can and must be selective. There is no single criterion for selection. Excellence, of course, is one; so is the promise of excellence; so, at times, is centrality or central significance, even in the absence of excellence or its promise.

It is comforting to think that, for the most part, we can select for an activity. But selectivity also means substitution—something that we are now doing and must now do less of, or that we could do, but will now forego. Most selection takes place within schools and is mainly the task of the deans and the planning bodies of the individual faculties. But some selection must occur between schools; this task I share with the provost and his associates in consultation with the Educational Planning Committee and other bodies, including, of course, the ultimate actions by the Trustees.

Along with this emphasis on difficult choice, I want to stress still more highly the need to maintain our imagination, our creativity, and our ambition. Once before I read to you a passage from a letter

by Edmund Burke to the Duke of Bedford, on the subject of "economy." It bears repeating:

It may be new to his grace, but I beg leave to tell him that mere parsimony is not economy. It is separable in theory from it, and in fact it may, or it may not, be a *part* of the economy, according to circumstances. Expense, and great expense, may be an essential part in true economy. If parsimony were to be considered as one of the kinds of that virtue, there is, however, another and a higher economy. Economy is a distributive virtue, and consists, not in saving, but in selection. Parsimony requires no providence, no sagacity, no powers of combination, no comparison, no judgment. Mere instinct, and that not an instinct of the noblest kind, may produce this false economy in perfection. The other economy has larger views. It demands a discriminating judgment, and a firm, sagacious mind. It shuts one door to imprudent importunity, only to open another, and a wider, to unassuming merit.

* * *

These are some elements that, in my perception, delineate the character and mission of the University. Some are descriptions, others exhortations, and yet others aspirations. Many are shared by all research universities; others are special to Pennsylvania, whether as the result of history, geography, accident, or choice.

Much of what I have said either has been articulated in some way by faculty bodies or has been endorsed by actions that support or implement it. Thus the character and mission of the University, as I have suggested them, may seem familiar. I believe there are within these points principles to help us select among the many futures open to us. Most of all, I hope you share with me the belief that these points do generally depict our character and mission, for we can move ahead efficaciously only as these directions reflect the perceptions and aspirations of trustees, faculty, staff, and students.

September 1977: A Financial Analysis

In the fiscal year ending this past June 30, the University had a deficit of about \$400,000 in a total budget of about \$330 million. That contrasted with a surplus of about the same amount in the previous year. Though our deficit, in percentage terms, compares well to the performance of other institutions, the accumulated total of over \$10 million must give us pause.

In the year just completed, our efforts once again were directed to maintaining superior quality; despite careful management, the cost of quality is high. Student aid for undergraduates, for example, is provided to more than half of our student body. Nonacademic wages and salaries are geared to the local marketplace and compare favorably. As the accompanying table shows, faculty salaries in 1976-77—geared to the national marketplace—reached the highest comparative point ever. Although Duke, the fifteenth university in our list, did not submit information, among these comparable comprehensive independent universities Pennsylvania ranked second for full professors, first for associate professors, and fourth for assistant professors.

Comparison of 1976-77 Academic Year Compensation for Full-Time Faculty at Major Private Universities

Rank	Full Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
1	Harvard	Pennsylvania	Rochester
2	Pennsylvania	Rochester	Stanford
3	Columbia	Stanford	Chicago
4	Yale	Chicago	Pennsylvania
5	Hopkins	Columbia	Northwestern
6	Stanford	Harvard	Cornell
7	Rochester	Northwestern	Columbia
8	Chicago	Cornell	Harvard
9	Princeton	Princeton	Hopkins
10	Cornell	Vanderbilt	Vanderbilt
11	Northwestern	Dartmouth	Brown
12	Dartmouth	Yale	Dartmouth
13	Vanderbilt	Hopkins	Princeton
14	Brown	Brown	Yale

Our achievement is cause for some pride, yet we must realize that the real income of the American professoriate in general is declining, especially in comparison to the compensation of other major professions.

Moreover, we probably cannot keep up the standards we have attained. The most depressing news is that the General Assembly achieved a balanced budget for the coming year by failing to fund

any of the state-aided and state-related institutions, including our own. Thus a highly unpopular tax increase must be levied if the requirements of those colleges and universities are to be met. Under the best of circumstances, we will once again suffer a significant decline in real income from state funds. Meanwhile, the poor market for securities means that we, like other universities, receive a return from our portfolio considerably less than just a few years ago. Our fund drive has been slowed more by the summer than by anything else, but there, too, pledges are not turned into gifts as long as the stock market remains in depressed circumstances. Yale and other institutions with major fund drives, I notice, are having identical experiences.

In a labor-intensive set of activities, the principal savings we have been able to realize are reductions in staff. Administrative and other nonacademic salary savings this past year were large. Among the saddest of current problems is the strike now going on. Our housekeeping bill has been running about \$4 million a year. By almost any norm that we have applied, that cost is excessive. The housekeeping staff of almost 350 had been receiving wages and benefits somewhat better than those available for comparable jobs anywhere else in Philadelphia. With a previous union and then with the Teamsters, we attempted to see whether our aim for savings in this area could be achieved without turning to maintenance contractors. An impasse was reached in everyone's view, including the union's, and therefore we brought in four maintenance contractors who can provide for the University the very significant savings we sought, savings that we will dedicate to our principal educational objectives. The human costs of such an action are high. As was the case when we closed our printing plant and contracted out our printing a few years ago, however, our goal has been to see that those with any considerable seniority here would receive jobs roughly comparable to those they have held. If we have not succeeded in that aim in this case, it has been due in good measure to intimidation by the union of those who have received such offers.

As we start this fall term, we are faced financially not only with the immediate problems I mention, but with a possible deficit for fiscal year 1978-79 on the order of \$5 or \$6 million. Any actions such as those in the labor area must be understood in terms of that prospective deficit. Of all comparable universities, we have among the lowest endowments, and thus in no way can we lean heavily on those endowments for covering deficits. To do so is in any case poor practice. I am very proud of what the deans of the faculties and the heads of our various administrative offices have been able to accomplish in maintaining educational and scholarly quality at lower unit costs in real terms. But I can only promise more of the same economies.

—Martin Meyerson

GRANT DEADLINES

Information on grants available from the National Institutes of Health, National Science Foundation, ERDA, Department of Transportation, National Endowment for the Humanities, Rockefeller Foundation, and the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association Foundation can be obtained from the Office of Research Administration, 409 Franklin Building/16, Ext. 7295.

—Alton E. Paddock

Note: A listing of grant deadlines will be included in the September 20 issue of Almanac—M.A.

RELIGIOUS HOLIDAYS

I would like once again to affirm the University's policy regarding the observance of religious holidays. As in the past, no classes will be cancelled by the University because of such holidays. However, no student or faculty member is required to attend classes on a religious holiday or holy day associated with his or her religious beliefs. Further, no documentation or proof of religious conviction should be required by any University official or faculty member. No penalties shall be imposed for absence for the observance of one's religious beliefs. Students who do not attend classes on religious holidays are, of course, still responsible for any work assigned.

I would ask that faculty avoid scheduling examinations or requiring work to be finished in class on these days.

—Eliot Stellar, Provost
September 9, 1977

JOB BULLETIN BOARDS

Almanac will resume weekly listing of job openings in the September 20 issue. In the meantime, jobs are posted on bulletin boards outside the personnel office at 130 Franklin Building and at 12 other campus locations. The list normally changes each Thursday.

Bulletin board locations:

College Hall, first floor next to room 116
Towne Building, mezzanine lobby
Veterinary School, first floor next to directory
Leidy Labs, first floor next to room 102
Anatomy-Chemistry Building, near room 358
Rittenhouse Labs, east staircase, second floor
LRSM, first floor opposite elevator
Johnson Pavilion, first floor next to directory
Logan Hall, first floor near room 117
Social Work, first floor
Richards Building, first floor near mailroom
Law School, room 28 basement

DIRECTOR OF COMMUNICATIONS

The director of communications is responsible for internal and external communications, relations with news media, and coordination of University-wide public relations and publications. The director reports to the vice-president for administration and works closely with the president and other senior officers. Communications experience, strong speaking and writing skills, and familiarity with universities and higher education is essential; administrative experience is desirable. Send vita, references, and samples of writing to Jerry Gorman, 116 College Hall/CO.

EDITOR, ALMANAC

Weekly journal of record at the University publishes official documents, faculty and staff opinion, campus news and general information. Editor works closely with faculty, administration, and employee groups. *Qualifications:* Strong writing, editing, and production skills with experience in space allocation, display of financial and other data, and cost control; knowledge of university structure and policy, fundamentals of academic freedom and personnel relations; ability to work under pressure. Send resume and working samples to Jerry Gorman, 116 College Hall/CO.

THINGS TO DO

Note: To insure that your event (lecture, film, exhibit, play, concert, etc.) is included in Things to Do, please submit information (who-what-when-where) the Tuesday before the Tuesday of issue to Almanac, 515 Franklin Building (Ext. 5274)—M.A.

MIXED BAG

Plates and Platters made by local women artists are on display at the Crafts Gallery of the Women's Cultural Trust now through the month of September. Hours: 11 a.m. to 5 p.m., weekdays.

The railroad station as architectural and historic structure: *Terminal, Station and Depot* at G.S.F.A., second floor, now open until October 9; sponsored by the Architecture Department.

Symbols, Subsistence and Social Structure: The Ecology of Man and Animals in South Asia is this year's topic for the South Asia Seminar series. Sessions are in University Museum room 138 on Thursdays from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. beginning September 15. Admission free. Information: Ext. 7475, 820 Williams Hall.

Morris Arboretum's fall schedule: call CH 7-5777.

Silent Movie quietly opens PUC's fall film series on Friday, Sept. 16 in Irvine Auditorium: \$1.

Those not familiar with using Lippincott Library can get acquainted during orientation tours Tuesday, Sept. 20, 3:30 p.m. . . . Wednesday, Sept. 21, 11 a.m. . . . Tuesday, Sept. 27, 11 a.m. . . . Tuesday, Sept. 27, 3:30 p.m. Tours start in the first floor Conference Room west of Van Pelt.

ANNENBERG TIMES TWO

The Annenberg Center has scheduled not one but two "seasons" for 1977-78. In its third year, the Western Savings Bank Theatre Series starts with George Bernard Shaw's *Too True to Be Good*, starring Jean Marsh; and Eugene O'Neill's *A Touch of the Poet*, directed by Jose Quintero and starring Jason Robards.

Five productions in this series come from Princeton's McCarter Theatre Company: Howard Ashman's *The Confirmation*, starring Herschel Bernardi; Clark Gesner's *The Utter Glory of Morrissey Hall*, starring Eileen Hackert; George Kelly's *The Torch-Bearers*; Lillian Hellman's *Toys in the Attic*; and Shakespeare's *Much Ado About Nothing*.

The playing schedule for these is: *Too True*—Sept. 21-Oct. 2, preview Sept. 20; *Confirmation*—Oct. 26-Nov. 6, preview Oct. 25; *Touch of Poet*—Nov. 9-13, preview Nov. 8; *Morrissey Hall*—Nov. 30-Dec. 4, preview Nov. 29; *Torch-Bearers*—Feb. 8-12, preview Feb. 7; *Toys*—Mar. 22-26, preview Mar. 21; and *Much Ado*—Apr. 19-30, preview Apr. 18.

The new "second series" is called the Off-Broadway Series. Its schedule: *Hold Me*—Oct. 19-Nov. 6, preview Oct. 18; *The Architect and the Emperor of Assyria*—Dec. 7-18, preview Dec. 6; *Creditors*—Jan. 18-29, preview Jan. 17; *Sizwe Banzi Is Dead*—Feb. 15-Mar. 5, preview Feb. 14; *The Wonderful Ice Cream Suit*—Mar. 29-Apr. 16, preview Mar. 28.

Curtain: 8 p.m., except opening nights, 7:30 p.m., matinees 2 p.m.

LEARN PHILADELPHIA FIRST

For everyone interested in learning more about the city we live in, the College of General Studies offers the *Center for Philadelphia Affairs*, a new program of six non-credit evening courses about life in the city. Penn faculty moderate most courses with practitioners in urban affairs serving as guest lecturers. Ninety-minute sessions are held every other week at the Law School. Tuition is \$50 per course, with checks payable to the University of Pennsylvania. Registration is by mail through September 15 or in person until September 19 at CGS, room 210, Logan Hall. Information: Ext. 7326.

THE COMPLEAT LECTUREGOER

Almanac is compiling a directory of all named lecture series for a September issue. If you know of or are responsible for organizing any established lectures or seminars named for persons or programs, please send their descriptions, including 1977-78 schedules where known.

ALMANAC: 515 Franklin Building (16) Ext. 5274

Editor..... Karen C. Gaines

Assistant Editor..... Marilyn Ackerman

Distribution..... Karen A. Graves