

# Almanac

Published Weekly by the University of Pennsylvania  
Volume 24, Number 3 September 20, 1977

- SAC/Administration Statement on Structure
- TRUSTEES: September 15 • Letter to Harrisburg
- EDUCATIONAL PLANNING: Report on the School of Public and Urban Policy; Minority Report
- FOR COMMENT: Proposed Public Safety Policies
- GRANT DEADLINES: • Graduate Hospital (Gaddis)
- HONORS • OPENINGS • THINGS TO DO

## FOR FAS, \$1.14 MILLION FOR THE HUMANITIES

A record \$1.14 million grant, the largest of its kind ever awarded by the National Endowment for the Humanities, has been made to FAS, Dean Vartan Gregorian has announced.

The grant is a three-year "challenge grant" and under its terms FAS must raise three times that amount as part of the Program for the Eighties.

FAS will receive \$380,000 a year for the next three years, using it to strengthen the school's humanities programs, especially in interdisciplinary study.

Some of the new funds will be used to establish a series of NEH Visiting Professorships in such interdisciplinary fields as early American studies and the history and sociology of ethnic groups in America. The award will also enable FAS to renovate the humanities section of the University library, some classrooms, and the Audio-Visual Laboratory used for teaching languages.

FAS sought the grant in challenge form, the Dean said, to stimulate private giving in a central area where funds are traditionally difficult to raise, but where the school needs to keep abreast of an important new trend in scholarship.

With the creation of FAS three years ago, 28 scattered arts and sciences departments (16 of them in the humanities) were brought together. As part of the planning process, a panel of FAS faculty reviewed existing departmental and transdepartmental strengths with a special eye for the "hidden universities"—that is, those informal clusterings of individuals who share a common intellectual interest. One subgroup identified, in the humanities, areas where cross-disciplinary stimulation could produce new educational themes. The FAS plan is for NEH Visiting Professors to help develop the themes, bringing their research and teaching here to act as catalysts. They are expected to leave behind a "permanent cadre of scholars who would be accustomed to working collectively in these areas," Dean Gregorian said.

Program funds will support each of the visiting professorial ventures, providing for teaching assistance, visiting lecturers, travel, small conferences and other necessities. With five NEH Visiting Professors a year for three years, almost all departments would have an opportunity to take advantage of program funds at least once in the three-year cycle, the Dean said.

## SAC/ADMINISTRATION AGREEMENT

On page 2 of this issue is a six-point agreement between the Senate Advisory Committee and the President and the Provost on changes in implementation of the Trustees' ad hoc report on administrative structure (*Almanac* September 13). The Senate's special meeting October 5 is still scheduled, Acting Chairman Robert F. Lucid said, but the focus changes in the light of the new agreement.

## HSP: THE NEWEST HMO OFFERING

This fall, faculty and staff will be offered a new option in health care: Health Service Plan of Pennsylvania (HSP), an HMO developed by the faculty of the Hahnemann Medical College and Hospital.

HSP is the campus's third option in health care, Associate Director of Personnel Relations James J. Keller said. Faculty and staff earlier had Blue Cross/Blue Shield and an HMO called Philadelphia Health Plan to choose from.

The new plan is the only HMO in the state which is both medical school-sponsored and federally-qualified by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. It has four ambulatory care facilities (Center City, Northeast, South Philadelphia and Havertown) and has agreements with eight area hospitals for inpatient care.

Personnel electing HSP may do so with complete continuity of coverage for preexisting conditions, the Plan's offer states. The Plan is described as emphasizing preventive care in a "one-step family health care approach" in which unlimited office visits and other primary specialty services are at no additional cost.

Details are in a mailing being made to faculty and staff this week. For information needed to compare the new offering with others, contact Mr. Keller at Ext. 7280.

## COLLEGE HALL: DR. SALAMON, MR. MERSON

Dr. Linda Bradley Salamon, former dean of students at Wells College, has been named Executive Assistant to President Martin Meyerson. A 1963 alumna of Radcliffe, Dr. Salamon took her A.M. in 1964 and Ph.D. in 1971 from Bryn Mawr, then taught English and literature at Duke, Dartmouth, Smith and Bennington before joining Wells in 1975. At Wells she was compliance officer for Title IX and executive secretary of the student affairs committee of the Board of Trustees while also holding responsibilities in institutional planning and management.

The new Executive Assistant to Paul O. Gaddis, Senior Vice-President for Management and Finance, is John Cox Merson, former senior associate with the consulting firm Cresap, McCormick and Paget, Inc., in New York City. Mr. Merson received his B.A. in economics from the University of North

## GRIEVANCE COMMISSION: SUSPENSION

At its meeting of September 7, 1977, the Senate Advisory Committee took the following action in the name of the Faculty Senate. Acting at the request of the Grievance Committee, SAC suspended the activities of the Commission pending complete external Senate review and the adoption of whatever conceptual and operational changes prove to be necessary. In the meantime the Commission will remain intact, without rotation of members, and new grievances will be held by the Chairman of the Faculty Senate. SAC is forming a Senate committee to conduct the external review, the membership of which will be announced.

*Ed. Note:* Grievance Commission Sally Green has requested space to publish next week a series of background documents on its decision to ask for suspension of activity for review.

Carolina at Chapel Hill in 1969 where he also coached freshman wrestling. He took his M.B.A. from Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration in 1971. After leaving Harvard, Mr. Merson held a three-year Woodrow Wilson internship at Lenoir Rhyne College in North Carolina, where he served as associate academic dean, director of the summer session, and director of the interim term.

## Joint Statement On Administrative Structure

The Senate Advisory Committee, acting on behalf of the Faculty Senate, and the President and the Provost agree to the following statements with regard to the questions raised by the Trustees' Report on Administrative Structure (*Almanac*, Sept. 13, 1977):

1. The Senate Advisory Committee has received assurances from the Trustees, the President, and the Provost of their commitment to collegial governance.

2. The Senate Advisory Committee is cognizant of the organizational overloads facing the administration and will devote itself energetically and cooperatively to both the short- and long-term solutions of those difficulties.

3. Because the title of Deputy Provost suggests a large shift in responsibility of the Vice-President for Health Affairs, Dr. Thomas Langfitt, without faculty consultation, the President and Provost will ask the Trustees to withdraw the title of Deputy Provost. The Senate Advisory Committee joins the President and Provost in insisting that this action is in no way to be construed as a comment on the abilities of Dr. Langfitt.

4. Without change in title, Dr. Langfitt will continue to carry out his increased responsibilities. The Provost will inform the faculty of the nature of these duties.

5. The President and Provost will work closely with the Senate Advisory Committee on the various issues raised in the Trustees' Report on Administrative Structure: organization and functions of the Provost's office, including both the title of Deputy Provost and the office of Associate Provost for Academic Planning, with the specific request that a recommendation on the Deputy Provost title be ready for the Provost to present to the Trustees at their meeting of October 27-28.

6. The Senate Advisory Committee will, with respect to the issues of University governance, recommend means of reinforcing the office of the Provost and of improving consultation and searches, matters of concern in the Trustees' Report on Administrative Structure.

*Robert F. Lucid*

*Martin Meyerson*

*Eliot Stellar*

*Ed. Note:* Dr. Lucid reminds faculty that a special meeting of Senate is scheduled Wednesday, October 5, 3-6 p.m. in Room 200 College Hall. It will take up some of the questions indicated in the text above.

## TRUSTEES

In a brisk Trustees Executive Board meeting September 15, Commonwealth funding was the most extensively-discussed item (below and page 3), with brief coverage of other topics. President Meyerson's report touched on the Burson-Marsteller communications audit (distributed at the meeting, for discussion at a future one), the Trescher report on administrative structure (later developments are discussed at left), and the Ivy Group's setting up of a subcommittee on athletic eligibility.

Mr. Meyerson noted the inquiry received this summer on CIA-related research in the 1950s and '60s. (The University issued a statement in August on a CIA General Counsel letter notifying Penn that it is one of the institutions—reportedly one of 80—"at which some portions of this CIA-sponsored research appears to have been performed or with which one or more individuals performing some aspect of this research were affiliated." University General Counsel Stephen Burbank is seeking access to government records which may indicate the nature of the involvement; CIA's letter was not specific.)

## HARRISBURG: BIPARTISAN APPROACH

Mr. Meyerson distributed a copy of the letter he and four other presidents from the Commonwealth sent last week to all members of the Pennsylvania State Legislature urging continuation of state support for higher education (full text on page 3). In order to pass a state budget for FY 1978, the Legislature cut out all \$300 million in higher education aid, including the state, state-related and state-aided schools. The restoration of the funds is now linked to proposals for a tax increase.

E. Craig Sweeten outlined a "no-stone-unturned" approach to lobbying for restoration of funds, spearheaded by the four largest institutions (Penn, Penn State, Pitt and Temple). They plan to distribute information, hold joint alumni meetings through the state, and communicate with and help the 100-odd smaller private institutions. They will be nonpartisan and will avoid choosing among tax packages (industry/corporate vs. income tax increase), Mr. Sweeten said.

## LABOR DISPUTE

The FY 1978 budget performance has two uncertainties, Senior Vice-President for Management and Finance Paul O. Gaddis reported: income from the state and costs of services such as trash removal during the labor dispute over termination of in-house housekeeping services. Gerald Robinson's report on the dispute emphasized problems of approaching the laid-off workers for placement elsewhere. The Office has talked to more than 100 about employment on or off the campus. Many who have accepted campus jobs say they will wait for the end of picketing; they will start "as soon as they feel it is safe to report to work," Mr. Robinson said. The dispute is in federal mediation, he noted.

## DEAN OF SPUP: BRITTON HARRIS

Professor Britton Harris, acting dean of the School of Public and Urban Policy since July 7, was approved by the Trustees at the Sept. 15 meeting as dean of the School for the period from July 1, 1977, to June 30, 1980. The 1907 Foundation Professor of Transportation Planning and Public Policy, Prof. Harris joined the Penn faculty in 1954 and was chairman of the Department of City and Regional Planning in the Graduate School of Fine Arts from 1970-73. He has served on the University Development Commission and other major all-University consultative bodies. Prof. Harris succeeds Dr. Almarin Phillips.



## SEPARATION OF GRADUATE HOSPITAL

The Executive Board of the University Trustees approved the actions and arrangements being taken for the final separation of Graduate Hospital on September 21.

Included in the resolution was a loan and mortgage agreement with Graduate that commits the University to lend the new corporation \$1,000,000 for the period from July 1, 1980, to and including June 30, 1990. The success of the \$38 million Hospital Authority bond issue in August made possible the Graduate Hospital division from the University on September 1.

Senior Vice-President for Management and Finance Paul Gaddis discusses the divestiture on page 13 of this issue.

## ASSISTANT TREASURER: ED LODGE

Edward A. Lodge, formerly assistant comptroller, was approved by the Trustees as assistant treasurer.

## FINANCE

The proposed sale of additional Hospital Authority bonds for the advance refunding of the \$34 million Silverstein Bonds was approved at the September 15 meeting. The immediate cash savings from the advance refunding will provide for the additional funds of \$9,050,000 needed for "The 1977 Improvements"—capital improvements for the Hospital relating to the Radiology Department (and the Department of Nuclear Medicine) and the Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology.

Harold Manley, Vice-President and Secretary, introduced and the Trustees passed a resolution authorizing Mark Levitan and Arthur H. Piper Jr. to sign contracts with the city for emergency and outpatient care at HUP.

## PROGRAM FOR THE EIGHTIES

Trustee John W. Eckman said the Program for the Eighties, targeted to reach \$171 million by June 30, 1978, currently has \$123 million committed. At a recent Ivy-MIT-Stanford development conference, he said, Penn ranked third among the ten participating institutions—after Harvard and Stanford—in fund-raising for FY 1977. (The University ranked sixth among all public and private schools for 1975-76. Annual giving from alumni, parents and other friends in 1976-77 reached a total of \$3,752,154, an increase of \$302,883 over the previous year.)

Mr. Eckman also reported that a challenge fund of \$1 million has been assembled to spur annual giving for 1977-78. Details of the fund will be reported in an October issue.

## OF RECORD



### COMPLIANCE STATEMENT ON THE HANDICAPPED

The University of Pennsylvania does not discriminate on the basis of handicap in admission or access to, or treatment or employment in any of its programs and activities, and it is required by Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, and regulations pursuant thereto, not to discriminate in such manner. The person designated to coordinate the University's compliance efforts in this regard, to whom inquiries may be referred is:

Chairman  
Executive Committee on University Services  
for the Handicapped  
Room 737—Franklin Building/16  
3451 Walnut Street  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

## The Letter from Harrisburg

September 8, 1977

Before the Legislature reassembles later this month, we the undersigned address this joint letter to you and to each of your colleagues in the General Assembly.

As you know only too well, the recent months have been among the most difficult in Pennsylvania's legislative history. They have been difficult for you as you searched for an appropriate solution to the Commonwealth's financial problems. They have been difficult for Pennsylvania citizens who depend on the orderly processes of government. Now, of course, the crisis is focused directly on most of Pennsylvania's colleges and universities.

Pennsylvania has had a record of commitment to higher education spanning two hundred years. Your predecessors in the State Legislature were in the forefront in the development of Pennsylvania's colleges and universities. The first legislative aid to higher education was granted to the University of Pennsylvania in 1779. The commitment to The Pennsylvania State University began in 1855 with the enactment by the Legislature of legislation establishing and funding Penn State. This commitment to higher education was further expanded when the Legislature enacted legislation to include Pittsburgh, Temple and Lincoln as public universities of the Commonwealth. The colleges which are state-owned, the community colleges, and the Institutional Assistance Grants to 78 private colleges and universities further illustrate Pennsylvania's commitment to higher education.

We have no fear that the Commonwealth will now—in 1977—turn its back on these commitments. There have been assurances from both sides of the aisle that this will not be done.

We do not know—indeed it is not our prerogative to suggest—the appropriate solution to resolve the current fiscal dilemma, a dilemma not just of higher education, but of the entire State. We do know, however, that the current crisis is severe. The problems grow each day. The ramifications differ for each of our institutions, but the cumulative impact is serious—indeed grave.

Any delay in solving the current crisis means, of course, that its impact will continue to grow. The damages to our educational programs will mount. Waste in the form of interest charges on the money we are forced to borrow is, at this very moment, running into thousands of dollars a week. It mounts as time goes on.

Whatever the solution, we respectfully urge that it be a bipartisan solution. Our colleges and universities—Penn State, Pitt, Temple, Lincoln and Penn—are neither Democratic nor Republican. We must be the universities of all the people in Pennsylvania. We know full well that our attempts to hold to this position have been misinterpreted by some. We ask for patience and understanding on your part regarding the essential nonpartisan nature of our universities.

We are keenly aware of the pressures faced by all in the recent weeks as you have worked to find a resolution to the State's budget problems. The job, unfortunately, is not yet finished. The future of Pennsylvania's colleges and universities, the future of our young people and, indeed, the future of our State hangs in the balance. Our doors must remain open and the education of thousands of young people across the State of Pennsylvania must not be interrupted. You have our gratitude and our support in your efforts to search for an early and workable solution.

We welcome and appreciate the leadership and assistance you will give.

*Herman R. Branson*  
President, Lincoln University

*Martin Meyerson*  
President, University of Pennsylvania

*John W. Oswald*  
President, The Pennsylvania State University

*Wesley W. Posvar*  
Chancellor, University of Pittsburgh

*Marvin Wachman*  
President, Temple University

# Speaking Out

## SHORT-TERM, SHORTSIGHTED

The recent report of the Trustees Ad-Hoc Committee on Administrative Structure (*Almanac* September 13, 1977) suggests rather basic dissatisfaction with the principles of collegiality of faculty and administration in university governance. It is apparently believed in some quarters that stronger executive powers and more sharply defined roles for faculty and administration will be more effective in addressing the serious problems the University now faces. Our traditional approach, with shared confidences and common interests, is felt to be too inefficient to face the crises now upon us.

The search for more effective ways to address short-range problems has been very common at all levels of organization throughout history. Unfortunately, effective solutions to short-range problems tend themselves to create long-range problems. At a university such shortsighted approaches can destroy the very fabric of the institution. The only real asset of a distinguished university is a distinguished faculty. Effective use of that asset is the only way to preserve and build the character of a great university. To ignore that asset because of momentary impatience with the pace of change or frustration in finding the most appropriate mechanism to use the faculty's wisdom is to squander the real resources of the university and to assure that the long-range solutions to the problems facing this university will sacrifice the very distinction we have worked to achieve.

—Walter D. Wales, Professor of Physics and President, U. of P. Chapter, AAUP

## RUMORS, FACTS . . .

I wish to call your attention to what appears to be a rather serious error in Gerald Robinson's statement on "Rumors, Facts, Commitments" in the *Almanac Special Bulletin* of September 12. According to a telegram sent by Local 36, one of the four contractors does *not* have a valid contract with the union, but is the subject of an unfair labor practice complaint before NLRB. A misstatement of this sort undermines the credibility of administration and potentially of *Almanac* itself.

—Fred Karush, Professor of Microbiology/Med. and member, Almanac Advisory Board

Mr. Robinson responds: Dr. Karush is correct. At the time we signed a contract with the firm in question, we were aware of the unfair labor practice allegations but were informed that the firm in question was honoring the basic provisions of the labor agreement with Local 36, SEIU, until a settlement is reached. We are informed that the employees are still union members.

## MORALISM, MORALITY

Oliver E. Williamson's criticism of our Kissinger protest letter (*Almanac* July 15) has some objectionable features of its own that call for a response. He speaks of "Edward S. Herman's letter," when the letter was signed by many individuals, a number of whom contributed to its final language. Williamson says the letter "presumes to speak for faculty opinion," by which he means *all* faculty, a scope hardly suggested by a letter with an aggregate of 60 signatures and claiming no such generality of application. (Nobody speaks for *all* the faculty on any question, even on the desirability of faculty salary increases.)

Equally objectionable is Williamson's dismissal of the letter as moralistic and simplistic, in contrast with his own loftier recognition of the "complexity" of the situation. This is all highly reminiscent of the Vietnam war era, when self-designated "responsible" people were disturbed at the harsh tone used by opponents of the war, who called Rusk, Johnson and McNamara names usually reserved for people who kill at retail, or for heads of enemy states. Responsible people never used (or use) invidious language in describing their own national leadership. As I indicated in a *Great Society Dictionary*, published in 1968, "responsible" means "starting from the premise that those wielding power seek admirable ends on the basis of superior knowledge."

One person's moralism is another's morality. Williamson's values are imbedded in the alleged complexity of the relevant issues. While not elaborating on the elements neglected in our unduly simple treatment, he does mention explicitly the feelings of the students, faculty and trustees who recommended Dr. Kissinger. Those feelings may weigh heavily in Williamson's calculus, but suppose *our* cost-benefit analysis also includes, with equal value for each human

## LOG-JAM

Readers and authors are asked to bear with *Almanac* when material is delayed due to shortage of space. To control costs, the September 6 issue was eliminated. The September 13 space was preempted by the SAC/administration debate on structure and by the long-promised Mission Statement of the President. Thus we are in effect a week behind in offering the new security proposals (pages 8-9), the details of separation of Graduate Hospital (page 13), and GRANT DEADLINES and OPENINGS.

The editors will appreciate all possible brevity on the part of authors during this period of overcommitment. —K.C.G.

being involved, the lives and feelings of the several million killed and otherwise maltreated victims of the Kissinger forward strategies? In that case, the apparent simplicity and moralism, and neglect of the feelings cited by Williamson, is based on facts relevant to *our* values. Williamson is obviously entitled to a different view, but it would have been nice to see this made explicit, not hidden beneath a projected image of value-free and higher order understanding.

—Edward S. Herman, Professor of Finance

## GRASPING VALUES

I do not believe it wise for a graduate student, whose academic performance is rated subjectively, to take issue with a letter by a faculty member. Nevertheless, asking "what is the value of my degree if in earning it I must sacrifice peace of mind as well as freedom of thought?", I proceed:

I do not understand the implications raised in Dr. Herman's letters of disapproval of the former Secretary of State in the May 3 and 10 *Almanac*. Do Dr. Herman and cosigners suppose that students, faculty, and administrators who support Dr. Kissinger likewise "lack sensitivity to values for which a great University is presumed to stand" and, thus, "do not speak well for the honor and good sense of the University?" I have difficulty grasping the values to which Dr. Herman is referring. Dr. Kissinger's accomplishments were not shrouded by mendacity. Nor was the Chilean affair an issue that could be scoffed at indiscriminately. The American role in Indochina was steadily diminishing during the Kissinger years and it was Nixon, not Kissinger, who ordered the invasion of Cambodia. In fact, it was during the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations that the American involvement in Indochina had its tragic beginnings. Using the same simplified reasoning, do Dr. Herman and cosigners also suppose that Presidents Kennedy and Eisenhower do not speak well for the honor and good sense of the University? If so, I do not know which values these authors have presumed but certainly one value not presumed is "honor for our leaders." In that Dr. Herman and Dr. Gandhi have mocked the granting of an honorary degree to our founder, Benjamin Franklin—see *Almanac* February 1—I think Dr. Kissinger can rest assured he's in good company.

In condemning the "sense of values" of counteropinion, it is odd that Dr. Herman's letter would include among its cosigners the chairperson of the "Committee on Academic Freedom." One must wonder if, in fact, such anomaly speaks well "for the honor and good sense of the University."

—Asar M. Stepak, FAS Graduate Student

*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, Fred Karush, Ann R. Miller, 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.



## Report on the School of Public and Urban Policy

### PREFACE TO THE REPORT August 23, 1977

The report below is the result of intensive efforts by a subcommittee of the Educational Planning Committee (EPC) appointed to review the School of Public and Urban Policy (SPUP) in accordance with the mandate of its predecessor, the Academic Policy Committee, when it approved a proposal for the constitution of the School. The subcommittee was chaired by Professor Fay Ajzenberg-Selove; its members were Ms. Deborah Burnham, graduate student in English, Dr. Nancy Geller, assistant professor of statistics, Dr. Morris Mendelson, associate professor of finance, and Dr. Humphrey Tonkin, professor of English.

The subcommittee met some 31 times. It interviewed the faculty in and out of the School, students, administrators, and a number of interested friends of the School from outside the University. It collected more than 50 basic documents which are listed below in Appendix C\* and are available for perusal by concerned members of the faculty in the Provost's office.

The subcommittee circulated a preliminary draft report to relevant faculty and administration for comment, and subsequently submitted a preliminary report to the EPC as a whole. The EPC requested the subcommittee to obtain the advice of an external panel of experts in public policy. Such a panel was assembled. It consisted of faculty members from Harvard, Yale, Princeton and the University of Chicago. Its report was submitted to the subcommittee, which utilized it in formulating its final report. The EPC endorsed the report by a vote of 9 to 5. A minority report, initiated by Professor Britton Harris, was filed subsequently, and is attached below.

Independently of the EPC, the administration sought advice concurrently from Professor William Cooper of Harvard University. His report is included in the appendices available in the Provost's office.

At the call of the Provost, the EPC met with the Provost and President on June 15 to discuss the report. On June 17, the Provost informed the Chairman that the President and he had decided to ask Professor Harris to be acting dean of SPUP, and anticipated a meeting with the SPUP faculty to seek its advice on a permanent dean.

The report had been transmitted to the President and Provost on May 9. The transmittal letter from the Chairman prefaces the report as printed herein.

—Julius Wishner, Chairman  
Education Planning Committee

### LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL May 9, 1977

To: Martin Meyerson, President  
Eliot Stellar, Provost  
Britton Harris, Chairman of the Senate  
and Steering Committee  
From: Julius Wishner, Chairman of the Educational  
Planning Committee

The EPC met on Friday, May 6, 1977, to discuss the revised report of its subcommittee on SPUP. After thorough discussion, it endorsed the subcommittee's recommendations by a vote of 9 to 5. A motion to endorse the recommendations of the external panel was defeated, 8 to 6. It is probable that you will be receiving a minority report, initiated by Brit Harris.

Enclosed is the report, together with the appendices which constitute the principal data base for it.

Writing for myself, I endorse the action of the EPC. In my view, the formation of a graduate group or department and an Institute of Public Policy offers the best chance for advancing the study of public policy via research and interdisciplinary seminars, on the one hand, and furthering educational programs for students at all levels, on the other.

An Institute ought to be able to attract funding about as well as a school and, for some research projects requiring a variety of experts, perhaps better. It would more easily attract interested faculty from a variety of disciplines.

Similar advantages hold for educational programs embedded in a context of a fully functioning undergraduate and graduate school, such as FAS and Wharton. Indeed, the need to defend "school turf" should abate greatly under such a situation.

The major disadvantage of phasing out SPUP is the image it must present to the world at large that the University is retreating from its commitment in the area of public policy. The fact that SPUP is not widely known may reduce the public impact of such a move somewhat, but this problem weighed heavily in my mind when I was reaching my conclusion. In the end, it was outweighed by the advantages I see in the arrangements recommended by EPC. An important factor in this balance is that I fear that if SPUP is continued much as at present, the EPC three years from now will find the situation at SPUP the same or worse. This fear is based on my integration of the elements of SPUP as I have observed them, and I have to regard it as a realistic fear. The risks of failure of an Institute seem to me much lower and the probabilities of success much higher for the reasons given above. We need the courage, therefore, to back away from a course which seemed promising three years ago and begin on a new track, keeping in view the possibilities of a fully independent school five to ten years hence.

If you believe it will be useful to convene a subset of those most intimately involved in formulating these recommendations, along with other interested parties, for further discussion before reaching your own conclusions, I am at your service.

\*Editor's note: Appendix C is printed here. All other Appendices (A through G) are available in the Provost's office.

# Report on the School of Public and Urban Policy

## INTRODUCTION

The subcommittee of the Educational Planning Committee (EPC) appointed to review the School of Public and Urban Policy (SPUP) carried out the bulk of its work over a two-month period from early December, 1976, to early February, 1977. During this period the subcommittee conducted extensive interviews and reviewed numerous documents (see the appendices to this report) and engaged in prolonged debate. Our goals were to establish the past history of the School, particularly the circumstances of its foundation, in order to assess the extent to which stated goals are now being realized. In addition, as requested by Provost Eliot Stellar in his letter of January 3, 1977 to Professor Julius Wishner, the chairman of the Educational Planning Committee, the subcommittee was asked for "an assessment of whether the School is consolidating and strengthening education and research in public policy; whether, in view of recent faculty losses, it is capable of attracting and holding strong faculty members; whether it is providing or planning to provide new opportunities for undergraduate or other programs in public policy, urban studies and similar fields." Provost Stellar stated further, "Most worrisome is the fact that, so far, the School has not attracted more funds than might otherwise have been available and, indeed, shows signs of becoming a real financial drain upon other parts of the University. We had hoped that the School could be a new type of entity, staffed mainly by our considerable faculty strength already existing elsewhere in the University and therefore not requiring permanent new central funding. We were willing to grant central funds for a start-up period only, while it established its student, research and endowment bases. Given our financial outlook we must now ask how long we should continue to provide a significant subvention. We need to establish whether the benefits that can be obtained would justify such a reallocation of resources on either a temporary or permanent basis."

Following the preparation of a preliminary draft report, the subcommittee circulated it as well as the Appendices A-E to a number of individuals at the University concerned with public policy. The list of individuals to whom this preliminary draft was sent is displayed as p. 1 of Appendix F. The responses we received commenting on the draft report comprise the remainder of Appendix F.

At its meeting of March 10, the EPC passed the following resolution:

"Resolved, that the report produced by the subcommittee to review the School of Public and Urban Policy be used as a basis for seeking further advice on the school from an external panel composed of qualified individuals who will be invited to visit the campus to study the situation; that the report on the school that the external panel generates is to serve as an appendix to the subcommittee final report; and that in producing its final report the subcommittee is to make use of the external recommendations as it feels appropriate."

The Provost approved the convening of a panel of outside experts. Professors Danielson (Princeton), Nelson (Yale), Posner (Chicago) and Zeckhauser (Harvard) visited the University on April 20-22, 1977, and prepared a written report presented here as Appendix G.

In preparing this final report we have carefully read and discussed the documents presented in Appendices F and G as well as the earlier information we had available. The final draft incorporates the modifications which we felt were warranted in light of the comments we received.

In the course of its deliberations, the subcommittee encountered questions such as the relative value of this or that approach to public policy, the existence or lack of existence of a discipline of public policy studies, and the proper relationship between theory and practice in the study of public policy. While we were actively interested in the extent to which the School had grappled with these issues and defined its own mission, we did not feel that the subcommittee should do the School's work for it. The definition of a School's intellectual priorities is properly the responsibility of the School itself and its associated faculty.

The subcommittee is deeply indebted to the many individuals who contributed to its understanding. It was consistently impressed by the candor and cooperative spirit of administrators, deans, faculty members and students. Particular acknowledgement is due to Dr. D. Bruce Johnstone, who helped us gather necessary information on the early history of the School and to Ms. Eleanor Loomis who aided us in numerous ways.

## II. THE FOUNDATION OF THE SCHOOL

The principal documents relevant to the School's foundation are, first, the report of the University Development Commission (1973); second, the report of the so-called Phillips Task Force (1974); third, the Meyerson proposal of April 1974; fourth, the recommendations of the Academic Planning Committee (May 1974); and fifth, the Trustees' Resolution of May 1974. (See Appendix D.)

While some of the documents may be regarded merely as way-stations on the road to final agreement on the precise nature of the School, certain themes remain constant throughout the debate of which these documents are the outward manifestations. The School is seen, for example, as a linking-place, drawing together the scattered resources of the University in the area of public policy. It is perceived as a focus for research and the funding of research, and as the basis for the development of new academic programs. The School, says the Trustees' Resolution, "will consolidate and strengthen education and research in public policy; better attract faculty and students with established interests in this field; provide new opportunities for undergraduate programs in public policy, urban studies, and similar fields; lend strength and breadth to other programs within the Wharton School; and attract more funds to public policy than would be available in the absence of a school."

Examination of the relevant documents and reconstruction of past history suggests that there was a significant lack of clear agreement on the goals and purposes of SPUP even at the time of its founding. While debate on future goals is a healthy part of the planning process, there was too much papering over of cracks in the discussions surrounding the creation of the School. There were disagreements not only on goals but also on those faculty members who should be brought within the orbit of the School (the two problems are of course related). The Trustees' Resolution notwithstanding, the conception of the School as a linking-place



quite rapidly gave way to the notion of a school with a tightly structured program, focused on a particular set of approaches to public policy analysis and excluding, for whatever reasons, large parts of the University engaged in work closely related to public policy questions. Some schools, though mentioned in the original recommendation of the Development Commission, drop from sight in later formulations. A decision is made to leave the Department of City and Regional Planning in the Graduate School of Fine Arts. In later documents little, if anything, is said about such units as the National Center for Energy Management and Power.

As best the subcommittee can determine, there arose a division of points of view between those seeking excellence in highly-specialized research and those seeking a broader and more practical orientation. From such a division of opinion it follows that there were two views regarding the internal role of the school (an elite unit providing leadership and example *versus* an umbrella organization covering many activities) and its external status (visibility and reputation in a prestigious but narrowly-based academic field *versus* visibility in the world of public affairs). While the programs being developed in the School seem to reflect both points of view (surely a necessity for a school of this kind), the underlying divisions of opinion have seriously weakened the ability of the School to function as a unit.

As a result there have been disagreeable collisions of opinion over matters internal to the School and, perhaps more disquieting in its consequences, there has been a certain hesitation on the part of some faculty members with primary appointments elsewhere to commit themselves wholeheartedly to the School. Each such alienation has deprived the School of talents potentially necessary for its success and raised the specter of a still further narrowing of its focus and aspirations.

### III. PRESENT STATUS

The school is currently too small to function as an effective academic unit. Most of those interviewed stated that a core of eight to twelve faculty members with primary appointments in SPUP is necessary. It is debatable, however, whether even a group of this size is truly adequate for the status of a school. There is much to be said for confining the status of school to a unit capable of having a critical impact on the institution as a whole, with a broadly-based structure and system of governance. Given the University's current budgetary policies, which require that schools be able to adjust internally to shifting financial pressures, this consideration seems doubly relevant. Small units should not be established as schools without compelling justification.

In its report of May 2, 1974, the subcommittee on SPUP of the Academic Planning Committee emphasized that "a *distinctive* and *distinguished* program should result" from the establishment of the School. As the group mandated to review SPUP at this time, we must report with regret that such is not yet the case. While there has been little time to build such a program, we do not discern the sense of direction, the clear faculty constituency and the administrative resolve necessary for its achievement.

The resolution of the APC stated that the deans of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the Graduate School of Fine Arts should be extensively consulted in the development of the new school. While we appreciate that formal procedures of governance often give way before the exigencies of the moment, we were unable to discern evidence that such extensive consultation had taken place, that the deans were working in concert to build the new school, or that the administration was actively involved in the resolution, through centrally-devised procedures, of potential friction between the schools affected.

The APC also recommended that there be "no reallocation of resources within the University in implementing the proposed new School without prior consultation with affected parties." We find no agreement, formal or informal, among the affected parties to divert University resources into the new school. We note, however, that such reallocation has taken place: University subventions to the

school total some \$770,000. It seems important to add that the hopes expressed in the Trustees' Resolution, that the new school would "attract more funds to public policy than would be available in the absence of a school," remain unfulfilled. The School has attracted some outside funding, largely in the form of restricted research grants, but this has been insufficient to come close to covering the costs to the University.

As for the other hopes expressed in that portion of the Trustees' Resolution quoted earlier, we note the following:

1. The role of the school as consolidator of education and research in public policy is still largely unrealized. We do feel that there is much potential for intellectual cross-fertilization between the many faculty members throughout the University whose interests lie in Public Planning and Public Policy, but the mechanism of SPUP has so far not greatly advanced the process.

2. While the school has attracted a number of talented students to the University, they have not been as numerous as they might be, and the School seems to have experienced some difficulty in projecting its image outside the University. As for faculty members, the resignation of such well-known scholars as Professors Banfield, Boormann, Margolis and Wingo since the foundation of the school points to a negative rather than a positive result.

3. The expected development of undergraduate programs in the new school has advanced only very slowly. While an undergraduate program in public policy is now under consideration, the subcommittee found only limited enthusiasm for it. It also detected no strong sentiment for the transfer of the Urban Studies Program from GSFA to SPUP. Given the present lack of focus in SPUP, this delay may be for the best, but it is dispiriting nevertheless.

4. The relationship between SPUP and the Wharton School is hard to assess, but it does not seem to have been either as extensive or as beneficial as was originally hoped. Perhaps the formal status of the school—a part of "the Wharton Schools" yet a responsibility center, a free-standing unit yet not a free-standing unit—has inhibited fruitful cooperation.

Given the brevity of the School's history, its present internal and external difficulties might be regarded as merely disquieting rather than cause for outright alarm—were it not for the fact that the subcommittee found insufficient evidence of concerted plans to follow through on the original rhetoric out of which the School was born. We must reluctantly conclude that the course on which the School is presently embarked is unacceptable. There must be decision action to define the University's role in the study of public policy and to build the structures necessary for the performance of this role.

We add our view that the history of SPUP should encourage the University administration in the future, when it accepts the recommendations of a committee such as the APC (now EPC), to make every effort to abide by these recommendations, and to report any significant inability to do so to the committee for advice.

### IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

#### A. INTRODUCTION

The subcommittee considered four possibilities for the future of the School:

1. *A continuation of present policies*, with continued subvention of the School by the University, the appointment of a new dean, and continued cautious expansion of the School and its programs.

2. *A reduction of the University's involvement in the study of public policy* through the closing of SPUP, without the transfer of its activities elsewhere.

3. *Decision expansion of the School*, with heavy investment to broaden its scope, and with the integration of relevant programs across the University into SPUP.

4. *A reassignment of the School's present activities to the established schools* and a decentralization of the planning process necessary for the strengthening of the University's involvement in public policy studies.

5. Provost Eliot Stellar, in a letter dated February 24, 1977, suggests a "fifth option": "to continue the School for another three years in order to achieve the original objectives set forward in the Development Commission report. The hope here is that we can learn from past errors and that all the failures of the past three years could be overcome and a School with a healthy theoretical and professional mixture could still be

(continued on page 9)

## FOR COMMENT



## PROPOSED POLICIES ON SECURITY

*The President's Task Force on Public Safety submits the following policy proposals for campus response. Comment should be sent by September 30 to David Johnston, director of public safety, at 3914 Locust Walk.*

### #1-77. ACCESS TO CONFIDENTIAL MATERIAL

1. Reports concerning alleged crimes or alleged violations of University regulations shall be considered "Confidential," and shall be kept in locked files when not in use.
2. Files containing confidential material shall be locked when a security officer is not in the room.
3. Student Security Aides shall not have access to confidential material.
4. Student Security Aides shall not be present when persons are being questioned by campus security officers, unless they have first-hand knowledge of the circumstances which are the subject of the inquiry, and their presence is deemed necessary by the security officers.
5. Violation of these procedures will subject Student Security Aides to immediate termination from the Department of Public Safety. Security officers will be subject to departmental disciplinary procedures.

### #2-77. USE OF STUDENTS IN SECURITY ACTIVITIES

1. Student security assistants should be identified; i.e., they should wear an identifying armband, jacket, etc. EXCEPTION: Students security assistants assigned to approved theft prevention duty may remain unidentified.
2. Students should be adequately *screened* prior to being accepted with the program to assure their suitability for the assignment according to criteria approved by the Director of Public Safety. Appropriate interview application screening procedures will be developed by the Security Specialist, and must be approved by the Director of Public Safety.
3. Students should be adequately *trained* for the job they are to perform. Training programs will be supervised by the Security Specialist.
4. Students should be properly *supervised* while on duty. The supervisor is responsible for their on-the-job performance.
5. Except with the approval of the Vice Provost, assignments for student security assistants shall be limited to:
  - Escort service
  - Checking emergency telephones
  - Lockdown and door checks
  - Campus patrol
  - Theft prevention duty (bookstore, bicycle patrol, locker rooms, residences)
6. A list of student security personnel and their duties shall be maintained by the Security Specialist. A copy of personnel and assignments will be provided to the Vice Provost monthly. Any question about appropriate use of students for security purposes will be cleared with the Vice Provost.

### #3-77. ESCORT SERVICE

Escort service is intended to provide security and assistance for individuals who otherwise might not reach their destination safely. It is not intended as a taxi or messenger service for students or others on campus.

- Typical examples of valid escort requests include the following:
1. Medical escorts or emergencies at any time.
  2. Personal escorts between campus buildings at times other than after dark or in the early morning.
  3. Accompaniment to public transportation during "off" hours.
  4. Escort to campus residences or home in West Philadelphia area after dark or in early morning.

The campus police van should *not* be used as a taxi service during daylight hours for persons going from one campus building to another; for trips to 30th Street Station in place of taxis or other public transportation; for food runs to local restaurants in evening hours; for airport pickup service; or for other obvious abuses of the system.

On some occasions, for example escort to the campus loop bus stop at Houston Hall is adequate service, instead of going all the way to 30th Street Station.

All personnel must be extremely sensitive to the possible reaction to refusal to undertake an escort under the above guidelines. Every effort should be made to provide information about alternative sources of transportation (i.e., the dispatcher should have the number of public cab services available), and to assist in obtaining it.

If no alternative form of transportation is available, the escort should be made. A record of all escorts should be entered in the daily report log for future analysis and evaluation of the procedure.

### #4-77. NOTIFICATION PROCEDURE

In the event of a serious crime or a major incident on campus (e.g., injury, auto accident, rape, suicide, death), the following is the authorized notification procedure:

1. Dispatcher on duty calls Director of Public Safety (or other designated Public Safety duty officer).
2. Director of Public Safety calls Vice President for Operational Services and Vice Provost.
3. After appropriate consultation, Vice President for Operational Services and or Vice Provost notify President Provost and other administrators as required.
4. Dispatcher also notifies Residence Life Emergency Duty Officer (EDO) in cases involving students.
5. In incidents involving an assault on a woman, dispatcher notifies Security Specialist after Director of Public Safety is notified.

NOTE: At various times, at each level of notification, a "duty" person may be designated to act for the person named. In such cases, others within the system will be informed in advance who the "duty" person is.

In the event of a student death, the Office of the Chaplain normally notifies the student's parents, after appropriate consultation with the Vice-Provost. In the event of a faculty staff death, the Office of the Chaplain normally notifies the next of kin, as well as the Office of the President and Executive Director of Personnel. In all cases, the Office of the Chaplain should notify the Director of Public Safety, Vice President for Operational Services, and Vice-Provost.

In the event of accidental death or injury, personnel from the Public Safety and Physical Plant Safety Engineering Offices are responsible for immediate investigation to assure all facts are obtained before the scene is disturbed. The decision to report any incident to OSHA is that of the Director of Physical Plant.

### #5-77. RESPONSIBILITY FOR PROTECTION OF OPEN EXPRESSION AT DEMONSTRATIONS

Under the University Guidelines on Open Expression (III E), the Vice-Provost is designated as the individual responsible for supervision of demonstrations on campus in order to assure that the rights of all concerned are respected.

It is the responsibility of the Director of Public Safety (or a designated member of his staff) to assure that the Vice-Provost (or a designated



member of her staff) is properly notified if a demonstration takes place on the campus.

At such events, the Vice-Provost is responsible for assuring that the Guidelines are being observed. To the extent that the actions of the campus police may affect the participants' rights of Open Expression, and where circumstances permit, the Director of Public Safety shall coordinate such actions with the Vice-Provost or a designated member of her staff.

## #6-77. SECURITY FOR PUBLIC MEETINGS

The University of Pennsylvania, as a community of scholars, affirms, supports, and cherishes the concepts of freedom of thought, inquiry, speech, and lawful assembly. The freedom to experiment, to present and examine alternative data and to debate various views, and the freedom to voice criticism of existing practices and values are fundamental rights which must be upheld by the University in a free society. The exercise of these rights within the limits of the Guidelines on Open Expression will be protected. The University also affirms the rights of others to pursue their normal activities within the University and to be protected from physical injury or property damage.

On occasion, the rights of open expression of groups or individuals using campus facilities may be jeopardized under the Guidelines on Open Expression. It will be the responsibility of the Vice Provost to determine whether other administrative offices should be informed of a planned use of University facilities. It will be the responsibility of the Vice Provost to decide and to notify the Department of Public Safety if the presence of uniformed officers is deemed necessary in order to protect the open expression rights of the participants and others. Uniformed security personnel assigned to assist at public meetings will be accompanied by a supervisor (sergeant or lieutenant) and will wear their normal duty uniform.

On other occasions, security personnel may be necessary as when prominent public figures are involved or it is determined by the Director of Public Safety that there exists an imminent danger of violence at the event. Security personnel may also attend if requested by the person or group responsible for the event.

In instances where no alleged criminal action or violation of University regulations is involved, Public Safety personnel will not make written investigative reports of the function if asked to attend.

## #7-77. DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION

Records maintained by the Department of Public Safety must be maintained apart from education records, and must be solely for law enforcement purposes. Information in Public Safety records may not be disclosed to any individual other than law enforcement officials with jurisdiction over the same activity.

*Education records of the University may not be disclosed to members of the Department of Public Safety.*

Requests to the Department of Public Safety for any information concerning a student which are not made in connection with a pending criminal investigation (such as requests for verification of enrollment) will be referred to the *office responsible for that record*.

Examples of appropriate offices responsible for various types of records include:

—education (academic records)	Registrar's Office
—financial records	Treasurer's Office
—placement records	Placement Office

Requests for information about a possible criminal record will be referred to the Philadelphia Police Criminal Records Division. The person making the request will be notified of the action taken to fulfill the request.

Requests to the Public Safety Department—from law enforcement officials with jurisdiction over the same activity—for information in connection with a pending criminal investigation will be honored, upon specific prior approval of the appropriate Public Safety division head and the Director of Public Safety. The Director of Public Safety will notify the General Counsel of all such requests for shared criminal investigation information.

Any questions regarding the interpretation or implementation of this policy will be referred to the General Counsel for approval prior to the information being released.

developed, bringing together important public policy interests and activities from all parts of the University."

We rejected the second option (the phasing out of SPUP's activities) because the importance of the field, the University's established strengths and its present commitments make such reduction neither justifiable nor desirable.

We believe that the fifth option is not significantly different from the first, and we will discuss the first option in some detail below.

### B. OPTION 1

This option involves the continued subvention of the School by the University, the appointment of a new dean, and incremental changes in its staff.

It is the option preferred by the outside panel who state it as follows: "SPUP would be retained as a school. A new dean would be appointed, one committed to vigorous fund-raising, faculty and student recruitment, and economizing where feasible. A master's program would be developed, with principal emphasis on attracting into the program students enrolled in other degree programs at the University."

It should be noted that the outside panel does not favor "expanding SPUP primarily by folding in other units in the University concerned with public policy, such as the energy management program and perhaps city and regional planning." They state further, "The umbrella concept . . . is vague and apparently founded mainly on wishful thinking. There is no good *a priori* reason for believing that combining disparate units of varying quality within the University, linked only by being concerned with public policy, serves any purpose other than organization chart tidiness." They state, "We emphasize the indispensability of a meaningful master's program to a revitalized SPUP. It can't be just a Ph.D. program without a thesis since there is little or no market for such a degree. An attractive alternative is a program that emphasizes joint degree students and undergraduates pursuing a B.A.-M.A. option."

In its oral discussion with the outside panel, the subcommittee determined that the panel had in mind the following changes in SPUP, under this option.

1. A dean with excellent leadership and administrative qualities. The panel felt that a senior person cannot be attracted from the outside, that an inside person was possible only if he/she had not been involved in the infighting at SPUP, and that a realistic prospect was someone fairly young, and eager to show his/her capabilities. The outside panel felt that a new dean has to be brought in *immediately*, and we think it is a fair description of their views to say that if a very good acting dean or dean cannot be brought in immediately, that Option 1 is not feasible.

2. 2-4 FTE new faculty members have to be hired by SPUP, under this option; there has to be a 50 percent increase in Ph.D. students and at least 10-15 M.S. students/year to make the program viable within three years.

3. In that three-year period the subvention by the University to SPUP would have to rise to a total of at least \$1 million.

The subcommittee is deeply grateful to the visiting panel for its comments which we feel are very perceptive. It is wise advice but it is advice which had to be given without taking into account the financial problems of the University and its administrative framework. The EPC, on the other hand, must take into account the relation of SPUP to the remainder of the University. We feel that the increased commitment to SPUP, both financial and in terms of faculty positions, implied by Option 1 must not come from a reallocation of such resources from other areas of the University. We wish to point out that since the inception of SPUP about \$1 million in University funds has gone toward its support (despite the recommendations of the APC at the founding of SPUP). While the net support was somewhat less (because some subvention would have gone into public policy teaching and research even in the absence of a school) Option 1 involves the expenditure of approximately an addition \$1 million over three years during a period when it appears to us that the University is engaged in a zero-sum game. A new dean of SPUP would face a most difficult situation at the University under such conditions.

(continued)

### C. OPTION 3

We wish to emphasize, in the strongest terms possible, that a decision to expand the scope of the School cannot be accompanied simply by cosmetic readjustment of present policies. It requires a total reappraisal of the School's mission. A school of a dozen faculty members is not a good administrative model, nor is a school so thoroughly devoted to a single set of intellectual concerns, however right or important or promising they may be: a school requires a broader foundation. A school must have both visibility outside the University and ability to compete for resources on the inside. If it is to be broad-based, it must draw under its aegis the units of the University directly associated with public policy. Loose associations through secondary appointments neither warrant a separate school nor appear notably effective so far.

While expansion is certainly a conceivable alternative, we note almost insuperable obstacles. First, in our own admittedly limited judgment, the University has neither the financial flexibility to make the necessary heavy investment, nor the breadth of support among its own deans and faculties to carry through such a policy. Second, there is a question in our minds as to whether it is proper to assign a high priority to development in this new area, to the inevitable detriment of other schools. While the growth and expansion of new knowledge requires that an institution of higher learning engage in changes of direction from time to time, and have the collective courage to do so, we do not find the arguments for a reorganization of our development strategies to give still greater emphasis to SPUP compelling.

Third, expansion would require the realignment of existing units within the University and seems almost certain to cause renewed dissension. The scope of the original vision of the school, as expressed in the Report of the Development Commission, was steadily narrowed in subsequent discussion because (in our judgment) transfer to the new school proved less attractive to the units affected, or to their parent schools, than was originally hoped. In certain respects this was just as well, since wholesale transfers might well have weakened the intellectual foundations of the schools in question.

Fourth, it is apparent to us that no part of the University with a strong interest in public policy questions should rightfully be excluded from the planning process for an expanded SPUP. Anxiety to keep the quality of SPUP programs high does seem to have brought about such exclusion in the past. Yet one of the goals of SPUP, stated or unstated, should surely be to raise the quality of other programs, rather than to shut out schools or programs regarded as weaker or less intellectually challenging. The reputation of SPUP is affected by that of other components of the University which deal with public policy.

The alternative of expansion thus requires (a) a heavy investment, (b) a larger measure of agreement on the School's objectives that has hitherto been attained, (c) the assignment of a very high priority to the area, and (d) the development of an atmosphere congenial to the cooperation of the various parts of the University concerned with public policy studies despite their varying quality and objectives.

To these four requirements we add (a) strong leadership at all levels, and (b) the development of new student markets. An expansion which merely draws on students currently enrolled at the University, or on the pools from which such students are drawn, will do little to strengthen the University as a whole. SPUP must cater to a new and identifiable clientele.

Nothing we have found indicates that these requirements are likely to be met easily if at all. Therefore even if expansion is to be considered a viable option it seems best not to search for a dean unless a blue-ribbon panel chosen from both University members and outsiders finds that the requirements can indeed be satisfied and then develops an acceptable medium-term plan. As happened at the time of the foundation of SPUP, any such plan should be reviewed by the EPC. This plan must include a clear cut mandate

that can serve both as a guide to the dean's search committee and as direction to the dean that may eventually be appointed. Unless the University is prepared and able to develop this kind of foundation, expansion is not an acceptable alternative.

The outside panel states, "We don't think that the University would be well advised to attempt such an undertaking in the absence of a substantial endowment, given the strong competition of other schools, many of which are in the process of expanding their existing programs." We agree with the outside panel.

### D. OPTION 4

Reassignment of the School's present activities might best be carried out, with the cooperation of the schools concerned, FAS and Wharton, through a two-part structure.

1. An Institute for Public Policy to be established within FAS. Such an Institute could help bring about an integration of research activity, result in the development of faculty seminars, and offer, if wished, a certificate or diploma which would be given concurrently with the degrees earned through graduate groups or departments in related areas. The Institute would provide external visibility and potential leadership in public policy analysis.

We suggest that any funds raised by the University for public policy in the future should be used in part to support such an institute, and in part to support distinguished professors in the social sciences whose academic disciplines are in one of the established social science areas of the University but whose research concerns are with public policy studies. These professorships should be offered to outstanding scholars of international renown.

2. A Graduate Group or Department of Public Policy, in FAS, to integrate the unique elements of the various pertinent disciplines within the University without duplicating them. Such a unit would offer the Ph.D. program. The unit should actively pursue the development of the joint Masters' degrees recommended by the outside panel. The possibility of adapting the proposed professional Master's program, the MBA in PP, to be offered by the Wharton School, to joint degree format should be explored.

We believe that the effect of placing these two units within a faculty of viable size, with a tradition of governance, and with a strong administrative head will have beneficial effects for all concerned.

Great care should be taken to facilitate the continued studies of present SPUP students at the University in the units described above. Faculty members currently holding primary appointments in SPUP should, of course, be transferred to existing departments in appropriate fashion and without loss of present contractual rights or privileges.

The disadvantages of this option of reassignment will be readily apparent. The potential for a clear and identifiable focus for public policy interests would be lost, there might be some loss of attractiveness for outside funding, and there would be considerable administrative upheaval. We are not convinced, however, that transferral of the School's responsibilities to other units would weaken the coordination of public policy studies. Indeed, by bringing it into the mainstream of the relevant schools' concerns it might actually facilitate it. Furthermore, the decisive step involved in this realignment of functions might provide the University with a new start in an important intellectual area and an opportunity to recoup the recent losses of faculty members by the appointment of a group of major scholars in public policy within the existing departments.

We are also not unmindful that reassignment of the School's current activities might be construed as a retreat from earlier goals or a winding down of present commitments. It is important to emphasize, however, that we envisage no reduction in the current level of activities. Quite the reverse: it is imperative that high priority be given to the establishment of a group of professorships in public policy within the existing departments, and that the University's commitment to public policy studies be reaffirmed by some well-chosen appointments. Unaccompanied by the serious administrative problems that have plagued SPUP, this would constitute a good investment. In our estimation, that would do



more to draw public policy studies together than would a separate school.

With the establishment of a separate school of public and urban policy, the University has become enmeshed in a tangle of its own rhetoric and procedures. The recent emphasis on "facilitators"—units in the University whose intellectual concerns touch many parts of the institution—may be sound in itself but should not lead to the conclusion that such facilitators can be constructed through the foundation of new schools. Facilitators function in spite of school divisions. Hence in an important sense the notion of a facilitator that is also a school is a contradiction in terms. And the steps in recent years to establish procedures for budgetary responsibility at the school level put intolerable burdens on a new school competing with the old. What may have seemed attractive three or four years ago, when the structure of parts of the University was in flux, seems less so now. We must confront that reality.

#### E. CONCLUSION

1. We do not favor Option 1 because of the heavy investment of University resources which it mandates and because we are not convinced that the administrative and intellectual climate can be changed rapidly enough to make the School viable in a short period of time, i.e., three years.

2. We consider Option 3 to be impossible for the University to undertake.

3. We definitely favor Option 4.

The University *must* move *rapidly* to create the needed administrative units and to appoint a director of the research institute. During this process, the central administration *must* keep a firm hand on the mechanics of reorganization and must appoint an effective administrator to act as coordinator of the transition.

A new start is necessary. The strengths within existing departments and established schools should be consolidated, with the possibility that in five or ten years a single broadly-based view of an institute or a school or some other grouping might develop under more auspicious circumstances. As an institution we must ask ourselves whether the history of SPUP does not offer important lessons about the need to balance internal competition for resources with strong centralized procedures for guaranteeing sufficient financial and administrative breathing-space for new or special ventures.

## Minority Report

The signers of this minority report wish to commend the subcommittee on its diligence in pursuing the review of the School of Public and Urban Policy, and to commend the use of external reviewers in dealing with problems of this type. We believe the experience gained in this review can greatly strengthen the future work of the Educational Planning Committee.

Although the subcommittee exercised its prerogative in choosing an option other than that recommended by the external experts, we, in dissenting from the committee report, disagree with that choice. To move from a school to an institute is clearly a step down and offers little prospect for continued growth or for distinction for the University with respect to public and urban policy. We therefore urge the option recommended by the external committee. That option hinges strongly on the question of a new dean and the commitment of support (including some funds) by the University. We do not find it unrealistic to hope for this leadership and support if the University and the School can clearly define its mission. To move from a school to a program is to us a sign of increasing entropy. We are not convinced that the Faculty of Arts and Sciences will be able to nurture this kind of endeavor in the midst of all its problems. Moreover, a school of public policy has never been more timely with respect to purpose, prospective leadership, and sources of funding than at the present.

In consequence of these considerations, we urge the President and the Provost to work toward the continuation of SPUP. Such a

continuation should be contingent not only upon the appointment of a new dean, but also upon the ability of the school faculty to arrive at a clear statement of purpose and program and to generate an acceptable outline financial plan. We feel that the subcommittee erred in not communicating its need for these statements in clear terms to the School, and that the EPC as a whole should have provided an opportunity to meet objections on these counts before voting its final report. If the administration concurs in our desire to continue the School, eliciting these documents will not only strengthen and clarify its bases for action, but will do much to mitigate the division within the committee.

Claude S. Colantoni      Michael Gilson  
Helen C. Davies      Larry Gross  
Alfred P. Fishman      Britton Harris  
Donald Silberberg

### APPENDIX C

#### Written Documents Examined by the Subcommittee

Listed below are the written documents which the Subcommittee read. In the list which follows, the following abbreviations are used:

SPUP School of Public and Urban Policy  
DCRP Department of City and Regional Planning  
GSFA Graduate School of Fine Arts  
FAS Faculty of Arts and Sciences  
Penn University of Pennsylvania  
MAPP Master of Arts in Public Policy

- 1) Wharton Deans' Ad Hoc Committee on Master of Government Administration Programs, Draft, 11/18/69 (J. Margolis, Chairman)
- 2) Section of Report of the University Development Commission re: area of public policy work at Penn 7/73
- 3) Phillips' Task Force "Public Policy at Penn" 1/74 (Almanac 1/14/74)
- 4) P. Shephard, Letter to Meyerson and Stellar 2/22/74 re: SPUP
- 5) M. Meyerson, E. Stellar, D. Carroll, P. Shephard, J. Margolis, "A Proposed SPUP Within the Wharton School", 3/1/74; and revised draft 4/9/74.
- 6) W. Grigsby, Letter to Meyerson, Stellar, Carroll, Shephard and Margolis, 3/14/74, re: comments on "A proposed SPUP within the Wharton School, 3/1/74".
- 7) P. Shephard, Letter to City Planning Faculty, re: SPUP etc. 3/25/74.
- 8) B. Harris, Memo on "Institutional Aspects of Planning at Penn" 5/8/74.
- 9) Report of the Subcommittee of the Academic Planning Committee on the Proposed SPUP 5/2/74.
- 10) Minutes of the Executive Board of the University Trustees, establishing SPUP as of 7/1/74. (See Appendix D) and press release of 5/19/74.
- 11) M. Meyerson, letter to Honorable N. S. Winnet, re: SPUP and Fels 7/8/74, same, 9/4/74.
- 12) M. Meyerson, E. Stellar and D. Carroll, letter to J. Margolis and A. Phillips, 9/1/74, "Operating Principles for Fels within SPUP".
- 13) J. Margolis, Statement on Fels Center, 9/11/74.
- 14) A. Phillips, Memo to D. C. Carroll, 9/24/74, then transmittal letter from Carroll to John Hobstetter 9/24/74, "Case Statement for SPUP for Ad Hoc Committee on Resources".
- 15) A. Phillips, letter to Meyerson, Hobstetter and Manley, re: Fels Fund 5/2/75.
- 16) M. Meyerson, short paper on SPUP, 11/75.
- 17) O. Williamson, Memo to SPUP Faculty on Joint Master's Program, 4/1/76.
- 18) Minutes of SPUP Faculty Meeting 9/22/76.
- 19) A. Phillips, Memo to J. Wishner, 11/4/76, re: MAPP.
- 20) A. Phillips, Memo to SPUP Faculty and to SPUP Advisory

Committee, 11/15/76 "Mission of SPUP, Alternative Development Scenarios and Comments".

- 21) E. Stellar, letter to J. Wishner, 12/13/76.
- 22) B. Harris, Memo 10/20/76 "The Role of the GSFA in the University".
- 23) B. Harris, Memo 11/10/76 "Scenarios for the Future of the DCRP".
- 24) B. Harris, Memo 11/29/76 "Notes on SPUP at Penn".
- 25) B. Harris, Memo 12/2/76 "The Dimensions of Public Policy at Penn".
- 26) Curriculum vitae for A. E. Boardman, J.D. Laing, M. Lustig, J.H. Nagel, J. R. Pack, and A. P. Schinnar.
- 27) "A Student Evaluation of SPUP", written by M. Feuer and B. Phillips, Fall 1976 (Attached as Appendix E1).
- 28) "Objectives of the Undergraduate Major in Public Policy", proposal to FAS Committee on Instruction, 12/76.
- 29) A. Phillips, SPUP budget information, 12/9/76.
- 30) A. Phillips and A. Katz, SPUP budget information 1/28/77.
- 31) J. N. Hobstetter, memo to subcommittee, 12/22/76, "The SPUP Budget Position and some Relative Output Measures".
- 32) Booklet describing SPUP and the Fels Center of Government, 1976-1977.
- 33) D. Bruce Johnstone, letter to Fay Ajzenberg-Selove, 12/20/76, re: early history of SPUP.
- 34) Lucy E. Creevey, various reports on the Urban Studies Program, 1976, prepared as background for the Whitney Committee below (35).
- 35) Report to the Dean of FAS on the Possible Relocation of the Urban Studies Program in FAS by the Whitney Subcommittee on the Urban Studies Major, January 1977.
- 36) Minutes of Meeting held between Stellar, Jon Strauss, John Pyne, A. Phillips and A. Katz, re: SPUP budget 12/23/76; includes proposed budget for FY 78.
- 37) B. Harris, memo to DCRP and SPUP, 1/20/77 "Alternative Types of Cooperation".
- 38) O. Williamson, memo to Fay Ajzenberg-Selove, 1/26/77 "SPUP Review Selective Excellence".
- 39) 1/31/77—Received from J. Pyne, the statements of revenues and expenditures for SPUP for FY 75 and FY 76.
- 40) "Joint Ph.D. J.D. Student Evaluation of SPUP," December 1976, Baird Brown and Rodney Lorang.
- 41) Letter to SPUP Subcommittee, 2/4/77, by George J. Reilly, second year graduate student at SPUP on "Meeting with SPUP students of 1/21/77 regarding SPUP evaluation."
- 42) Eliot Stellar, letter of 1/3/77 to Julius Wishner, outlining charge to Subcommittee.
- 43) Minutes of the 2/23/77 SPUP Faculty Meeting.
- 44) Letters of February-April 1976 to and from Dr. Tom Kessinger (Committee on Instruction, FAS), from R. M. Heiberger (Statistics/Wharton), H. Teune (Political Science, FAS), A. Hess (Economics, FAS), J. R. Behrman (Economics, FAS), A. Phillips (Dean, SPUP), regarding proposed SPUP undergraduate major.
- 45) A. Phillips to J. Hobstetter, 3/3/77, "Budget Figures Submitted to the EPC Committee".
- 46) J. Hobstetter to A. Phillips, 3/8/77, reply to (45).
- 47) B. Harris, 3/10/77, "Substitute for the Subcommittee Report".
- 48) J. Margolis, letter to J. Wishner, 4/15/77.
- 49) A. Phillips, 4/18/77, memo "Administrative Views of SPUP".
- 50) D. E. Boyce, E. K. Morlok, A. R. Tomazinis, 4/77, "A brief account of the Transportation Program Development at the U. of P."
- 51) Letter from Dean V. Gregorian to B. Harris, 4/26/77.
- 52) Report on applications by students to SPUP as of 4/29/77, prepared by A. Katz.

## GRANT DEADLINES

### NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

#### Program Announcements and Deadlines

- Revised guidelines available at NIH September 1, 1977 for Diabetes Research and Training Centers.
  - Revised guidelines available at NIH September 1, 1977 for Multi-purpose Arthritis Centers.
  - Guidelines available at NIH for Core Center Grants Award Diabetes Program.
  - Special Research Award Program of the National Institute on Aging.
  - Studies on Nutrition in Relation to Health of the Aged and Aging Processes.
  - Fogarty International announces Research Fellowships to Sweden and Switzerland.
  - Guidelines for the Research Grants Program—National Institute on Drug Abuse (copy in ORA).
  - Descriptions of NIH Collaborative Programs of the various components of the NIH (NIH Guide Vol. 6 No. 13 dtd 1 July 1977 available to ORA).
  - Neural Regeneration and Plasticity Research Program.
- 10/1 Deadline date for submission of renewal applications and new Career Development, Program Project and Center applications.

### NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

#### Program Announcements and Deadlines

- Engineering Research Equipment Grants Program.
  - Visiting Women Scientists Program to Encourage High School Girls.
- 10/1 Long-Term Collaborative Research to New Zealand beginning 6/1/78.
- 11/1 Professor E.D. Bergmann Memorial Research Grants for young scientists to be received in Jerusalem.
- 11/1 Mathematical Sciences Program Proposals.
- 11/1 Computer Science Program Proposals.
- 11/1 Pre-College Teacher Development in Science Program.
- 11/1 U.S.-France Exchange of Scientists.
- 11/4 Advisory Panel Proposals for 1) Ecological Sciences, 2) Population Biology and Physiological Ecology, and 3) Systematic Biology.
- 11/4 Student Originated Studies Program (Guide available in ORA).
- 11/15 Division of Social Sciences Proposals.
- 11/15 Engineering Research Initiation Proposal.
- 11/28 NATO Postdoctoral Fellowships.
- 12/1 Latin American Cooperative Science Program.

### ERDA

- 10/14 Proposals for Faculty Development Projects in Energy (brochure in ORA).
- 10/31 Proposals for Graduate Traineeships in Energy Related Fields (Guide OUP-77-03 available in ORA).

### DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION

- FY 1978 Annual Solicitation—Program of University Research—Proposal closing date December 1, 1977 (Copy available in ORA).
- Proposals are invited for the DOT Research Fellow Program—1977-78 (Brochure in ORA).

### NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

- Announces it will support the publication costs of some humanities texts.

### ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

- Announces a program of awards for 1978-79 to support production of works of humanistic scholarship intended to illuminate and assess the value of contemporary civilization.

### PHARMACEUTICAL MFRS. ASSN. FOUNDATION

- PMA announces continuation of three award programs: (1) Faculty Award in Clinical Pharmacology, (2) Faculty Program in Basic Pharmacology, and (3) Fellowships in Clinical Pharmacology.

Additional information is available from the Office of Research Administration, 409 Franklin Building/16, Ext. 7295.

—Alton E. Paddock



# Separation of the Graduate Hospital

The separation of the Graduate Hospital from the University was accomplished on September 1, 1977 with the filing of the legal plan of division. The University and the Graduate Hospital will continue their affiliation in the area of medical education. At the same time the Graduate Hospital will assume responsibility for its legal and financial obligations and will be able to initiate a major construction program without relying on the University for financial support.

The separation of the Graduate Hospital represents the culmination of more than ten years of study and planning. The merger of the Graduate School of Medicine with the School of Medicine of the University in 1965 led to the University's reexamination of the mission of the Graduate Hospital and the extent to which University resources should be committed to its operation and necessary rehabilitation. The original mission of Graduate Hospital had eroded as a result of major changes in the University's medical education programs, particularly after World War II. In 1974, when Graduate Hospital had incurred deficits for several years and when it became clear that a very expensive rebuilding program would be necessary, the University conducted an intensive study which concluded that the role of Graduate Hospital, both as a patient care facility and as a teaching hospital, could best be fulfilled if it acquired an independent status with greater community support and participation. In February of 1975, the Trustees' Health Affairs Committee of the University of Pennsylvania adopted a resolution which provided for the organization of the hospital as an independent institution retaining a teaching affiliation with the School of Medicine. In July, 1975 an Advisory Committee for Graduate Hospital was formed, consisting of representatives from the medical staff, the community, business and the University. The Advisory Committee, invited by the University to review the plan approved by the Health Affairs Committee and to evaluate the future of the hospital, later constituted itself as the initial Board of Directors and assumed the responsibility for directing management, developing reorganization plans, developing those policies necessary for the day to day operation of the hospital, and choosing its own legal counsel, independent accountants, financial consultants, planning consultants, architects, and construction management.

## *Academic Interaction*

The Graduate Hospital and the University have entered into agreements whereby the hospital will continue to serve as a clinical facility for the School of Medicine and the School of Dental Medicine. The University will utilize the hospital for the training of medical and dental students, interns, residents, fellows in medicine, and practicing physicians, and the hospital will participate in the educational program and classroom instruction of the schools. Each agreement is for a term of five years and is automatically renewable for successive five year terms unless either party gives the other notice of termination prior to the expiration of any term.

The physicians and dentists engaged in teaching will hold appointments from the School of Medicine, School of Dental Medicine, or other appropriate faculties. As faculty members, they will enjoy the appropriate professional rank, privileges, and tenure under the procedures which govern standing and affiliated faculty appointments. The hospital's Chiefs of Service will have responsibility for the development, staffing, and direction of medical and dental education programs at the hospital. Programs may be developed independently of or jointly with the University. Physicians who do not hold University faculty appointments or

teaching responsibilities will continue to be eligible for medical staff appointments.

These affiliations are expected to assist the hospital in attracting both specialists medical staff of high qualifications, and well-qualified house staff. The specialists medical staff is expected to enhance the drawing power of the hospital, and the academic relationship to provide the stimulation, climate of inquiry and discipline which lead to excellence in patient care.

## *Financial Considerations*

The separation of the Graduate Hospital from the University and the completion of arrangements for financing its plant expansions are made possible primarily by the improvement in the financial operation and condition of the hospital. Beginning in 1972, the hospital incurred increasing deficits, culminating in a net loss of approximately \$2.9 million for the year ended June 30, 1975. This period was characterized by increasing staffing levels, declining patient utilization, inadequate patient charge levels, and a lack of cost control measures. In addition, a change in the Blue Cross reimbursement mechanism reduced profitability and further complicated third party reimbursement.

The University, recognizing the administrative and operating problems caused by the organizational structure, during fiscal 1975 appointed an executive director experienced in hospital management (Mark Levitan), reporting directly to University operating management to oversee operation of both its hospitals. In addition, an experienced hospital management was installed at the Graduate Hospital in May, 1975.

By implementing financial and operational control measures, the hospital moved from losses from operations before depreciation and interest in each of three fiscal years ended June 30, 1975 to income from operations before depreciation and interest of \$651,496 for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1976 and \$942,736 for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1977. Measures which contributed significantly to this improvement included staff reductions, increase in patient charges, increased utilization of facilities, transfer of outpatient clinics to private physician groups, and an aggressive cost containment program for non-payroll expenses.

Arrangements have been made for immediate payback of \$1.8 million the University advanced during the two-year period it took to shift the hospital to independent status. The University has also agreed to make limited guarantees for certain financial obligations of the hospitals. Terms of our five-year agreement are spelled out in the recent bond offering circular, available at the Office of the Secretary.

—Paul O. Gaddis,

*Senior Vice-President for Management and Finance*

## **FACULTY EARLY RETIREMENT: OCTOBER 15**

Faculty members interested in taking advantage of the *Faculty Voluntary Early Retirement Plan* are reminded that October 15th each year is the date for timely notification of intention to retire early.

Notice given to the faculty member's dean by October 15 this year of intention to retire early on June 30, 1981, would entitle the faculty member to maximum early retirement benefits. Shorter notice reduces the level of benefits.

A full statement of the plan appeared in *Almanac*, March 2, 1976. Copies of the plan may be obtained by calling the Office of Personnel Relations, Ext. 7280.

—James J. Keller, Associate Director



# HONORS

## THREE AT UPPSALA

Three University faculty members were among the 102 scholars and scientists from 22 countries who will receive honorary degrees in Sweden on September 30 at a celebration of the University of Uppsala's 500th anniversary. They are *Dr. John P. Hubbard*, emeritus professor of community medicine; *Dr. James B. Pritchard*, associate director of the University Museum and curator of biblical archeology; and *Dr. Walter B. Shelley*, professor and chairman of the Department of Dermatology. The three were among 28 Americans chosen, and Penn was the only institution where three were honored. Berkeley, Chicago, Princeton and Yale each had two faculty members on their list.

## HONORS IN BRIEF

*Morris Arnold*, professor of law, has been elected to membership in the American Law Institute.

*Dr. Baruch S. Blumberg*, professor of medicine and anthropology, received an honorary Doctor of Science degree from Dickinson College during its commencement exercises May 15. Dr. Blumberg, who is associate director of clinical research and senior member at the Institute for Cancer Research at Fox Chase, was awarded the Nobel Prize for medicine last fall.

*Dr. Frank P. Brooks*, professor of medicine and physiology, was appointed to a 17-member National Commission on Digestive Diseases.

*Dr. Robert H. Dyson*, professor of anthropology, curator of the Near Eastern Section of the University Museum, and associate dean, FAS, has been elected a member of the Permanent Council of the International Union of Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sciences.

*Dr. David R. Gaskell*, associate professor of metallurgy and materials science, has been awarded the Distinguished Alumnus Award at McMaster University for 1976-77.

*Dr. Eileen S. Gersh*, lecturer in biology and research associate professor of anatomy in animal biology, received the 1977 good citizenship award from the Philadelphia Bar Association.

*Dr. Vartan Gregorian*, dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and Tarzian Professor of Armenian and Caucasian History and Culture, recently was elected to the Board of Directors of the World Affairs Council, was appointed to a nine-member advisory council of the Association of American Colleges and was named to a visiting committee for Lehigh University. Along with deans from Duke and Stanford, he was also named by Trustees of the University of Rochester to a visiting committee of the College of Arts and Sciences there.

*Dr. William G. Grigsby*, chairman of city and regional planning, has become president of the American Real Estate and Urban Economics Association.

The UPS Foundation Fund at the University of Pennsylvania has designated the funds it awards *The Gaylord P. Harnwell Fund* in honor of the President Emeritus. Dr. Harnwell was also elected an honorary member of the University Faculty Club Board of Governors.

*A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr.*, a University Trustee and lecturer in law, was one of two recipients of the Edward A. Buochet Award at the Yale Alumni Associates of Afro-America convocation on April 29 and 30. The U.S. district judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and former member of the Yale Corporation was recognized for his service to the black community at Yale.

*Dr. Madeleine M. Joullie*, professor of chemistry, is the 1978 winner of the American Chemical Society's \$2,000 Garvan Medal, which recognizes distinguished service to chemistry by women chemists who are U.S. citizens.

*Dr. David Kritchevsky*, associate director of the Wistar Institute, Wistar Professor of Biochemistry in the School of Veterinary Medicine, and chairman of the graduate group on molecular biology, will receive the 1977 Philadelphia Section Award from the American Chemical Society at its October meeting.

*Dr. Christian J. Lambertsen*, director of the Institute for Environmental Medicine, professor of medicine and professor of pharmacology and experimental therapeutics, received an honorary Doctor of Science degree from Northwestern University and gave the medical school commencement address on June 16.

*Dr. Donald N. Langenberg*, vice-provost for Graduate Studies and Research and professor of physics, is chairman of the recently-formed National Science Foundation Advisory Council.

*William Margrabe*, lecturer in finance, was awarded a faculty fellowship for attendance at the School of Mortgage Banking.

*Dr. Robert R. Marshak*, dean of the School of Veterinary Medicine, has been elected to the Bide-A-Wee Home Association Board of Directors.

*Dr. Adrian M. McDonough*, professor of management and director of international affairs, has been given an honorary appointment as professor for the period 1977-81 by the faculty of the Université de Technologie de Compiègne of France in recognition for his participation in the development of the curriculum for the U.T.C. Information Management Institute in Paris.

*Dr. Howard E. Mitchell*, UPS foundation professor of human resources and management, was appointed as a member of the Committee of the Friends of SOS Children's Villages.

*Dr. Donald F. Patterson*, Charlotte Newton Sheppard Professor of Veterinary Medicine, was elected a trustee of the Seeing Eye, Inc. Dr. Patterson is chief of the Section of Medical Genetics and co-director of the Comparative Cardiovascular Studies Unit at the School of Veterinary Medicine.

*Dr. Charles C. Price*, Benjamin Franklin Professor of Chemistry, received the honorary degree of Doctor of Science at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute's 171st commencement exercises on May 20.

*Dr. Irwin Allan Rose*, professor of physical biochemistry, was one of 108 fellows plus 16 foreign honorary members elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences this year.

*Dr. Alvin Z. Rubinstein*, professor of political science, has been awarded a NATO research fellowship.

*Dr. Elaine Scarry*, assistant professor of English, has been awarded fellowships from the National Endowment for the Humanities and from the Institute for Values in Medicine to continue her research on communication of pain in literature.

*Nancy L. Schnerr*, associate in statistics, is a subject of biographic record in *Who's Who of American Women*, tenth edition, 1977-78.

*Professor David Solomons*, Arthur Young Professor of Accounting, is the 1977-78 president of the American Accounting Association.

*Dr. Albert J. Stunkard*, professor of psychiatry, is a member of the panel of scientists and medical specialists established by the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment to study the benefits and risks of saccharin as well as the scientific basis for the ban on saccharin proposed by the Food and Drug Administration.

*Dr. Jerry Wind*, professor of marketing, won for the second time the Alpha Kappa Psi Award for the best article published in the *Journal of Marketing*. The paper, which was co-authored with Henry Claycamp, was on "Planning Product Line Strategy: A Matrix Approach."

## INANIMATE HONOR

*The University Museum Building* has been nominated to the National Register of Historic Places. The Furness Building is the only other campus structure on the National Registry.

ART IN THE SEVENTIES • EMERGING TRADITIONS III: ART IN THE SEVENTIES • EMERGING TRADITIONS III: ART IN THE SEVENTIES

## EMERGING TRADITIONS III: ART IN THE SEVENTIES

What's new in art?

Hear such distinguished speakers as  
Marcia Tucker, former curator  
of the Whitney Museum,  
on *Ritual and Primitivism*;  
Germano Celant, Italian art  
historian and critic on  
*Inside/Outside: The Environment*;  
Jan van der Marck, director  
of the Dartmouth College  
Museum and Galleries, on  
*The Metamorphosis of a Decade*;  
Richard Schechner, co-director  
of The Performance Group  
and contributing editor of N.Y.U.'s  
*The Drama Review*, on *Performance Art*.

EIGHT LECTURES ON TUESDAY EVENINGS AT 7:30 P.M.  
OCTOBER 11 THROUGH NOVEMBER 29  
**INSTITUTE OF CONTEMPORARY ART**  
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA  
INFORMATION: [215] 243-7108

### PLUG INTO CONTEMPORARY ART

The Institute of Contemporary Art  
would like to welcome  
you as a member.

By joining ICA you will  
participate in the Institute's  
exciting programs, receive  
a host of special discounts,  
and contribute to the cultural  
vitality of the University.

Special rates on ICA membership  
are available to University  
faculty and staff.

Please call Carla Hultman  
at x7108 for more information.



## RESOURCE DAY: SEPTEMBER 30

Resource Day: September 30 in the Quadrangle. A chance for students to meet and gather information from faculty, administrators, and special programs directors. 1-4 p.m. in the Lower Quad in McClelland Hall.

## OPENINGS

The following job titles were taken from the Personnel Office's Bulletin of September 15. Full descriptions are available 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. An asterisk (\*) before a job title indicates that the department is considering promoting from within.

### ADMINISTRATIVE/PROFESSIONAL

ADVISER, FOREIGN STUDY  
ASSISTANT COMPTROLLER  
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR  
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF ADMISSIONS  
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF MERCHANDISING  
ASSISTANT TO THE DEAN  
ASSISTANT TO THE DIRECTOR  
\*ASSISTANT TREASURER  
ASSOCIATE DEVELOPMENT OFFICER II  
\*BENEFITS COUNSELOR  
\*BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR II  
CHIEF ELECTRICAL ENGINEER  
CONTRACT ADMINISTRATOR I  
COORDINATOR  
\*DIRECTOR  
\*DIRECTOR, RESIDENCE UNIT  
JUNIOR RESEARCH SPECIALIST (4)  
LACROSSE COACH  
PROGRAMMER ANALYST II  
RADIO STATION MANAGER  
RESEARCH SPECIALIST I  
SENIOR SYSTEMS ANALYST  
STAFF NURSE, RN  
STAFF WRITER II  
STATISTICIAN

### PART-TIME

STAFF WRITER I

### SUPPORT STAFF

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I (2)  
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT II  
AUDIO-VISUAL TECHNICIAN  
BUILDING SUPERVISOR II  
CLERK—BOOKSTORE  
CLERK IV—NEW BOLTON CENTER  
\*COORDINATING ASSISTANT  
DENTAL ASSISTANT II  
GROOM  
HISTOLOGY TECHNICIAN II  
LICENSED PRACTICAL NURSE  
MAINTENANCE ENGINEER  
MEDICAL RECEPTIONIST  
PSYCHOLOGY TECHNICIAN I (7)  
PSYCHOLOGY TECHNICIAN II  
RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN I  
RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN II  
\*RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN II (2)  
RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN III (15)  
\*RESEARCH SPECIALIST I  
\*RESEARCH SPECIALIST II  
SECRETARY I

SECRETARY II (11)  
SECRETARY III (9)  
SECRETARY, MEDICAL TECHNICAL (7)  
SECRETARY TO VICE-PRESIDENT FOR HEALTH AFFAIRS  
STOCKKEEPER II  
TELEPHONE OPERATOR

### PART-TIME

CLERK-TYPIST (3)  
\*LABORATORY TECHNICIAN  
PERMANENT PART-TIME EMPLOYEE  
SECRETARY  
SECRETARY, TECHNICAL

### POSITIONS AT SCHOOL OF DENTAL MEDICINE

TEMPORARY LAB ASSISTANT—Contact Ms. Janet Romeo, Ext. 6553. TEMPORARY SECRETARY—Contact Mrs. Catherine Redden, Ext. 6649. If no answer at the above telephone numbers, call Barbara D'Ulisse, Personnel Department, Dental School, Ext. 6091.

### NON-UNIVERSITY JOB

HERS, Mid-Atlantic has an opening for a typist. Contact Irene Basile, Ext. 5426.

## THINGS TO DO

### MIXED BAG

WEOP meets Sept. 21, 12 noon in the Women's Center, Houston Hall.

International Cinema Series 3, co-sponsored by the Christian Association and International House, begins its season with *Pickpocket* on Sept. 22 (7:30 and 9:30 p.m.) and *Two English Girls* on Sept. 23 (4, 7:30 and 9:30 p.m.) in Hopkinson Hall, International House, \$1.

*Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid* ride into Fine Arts Auditorium, Sept. 24, 7:30 and 10 p.m., \$1.

*Going to the Movies: Mysteries, Wishdreams, Hallucinations* is Professor Amos Vogel's subject for a film/discussion on Sept. 27 at 1:30 p.m. in Annenberg Center's Studio Theater, sponsored by the Faculty Tea Club. Tea in the Faculty Club follows.

Upstairs, Downstairs star Jean Marsh trades her maid's uniform for a nursing whites in George Bernard Shaw's *Too True to Be Good*, opening in Annenberg Center's Zellerbach Theater Sept. 21 and continuing through Oct. 2 (preview Sept. 20). Performance times: 8 p.m., Tuesday through Saturday; 2 p.m. matinees Thursday, Saturday and Sunday. Information: Ext. 6791.

*Books by Eugene Feldman, 1921-1975*: Books that the late artist/printer/Penn faculty member designed and printed for himself are on display in Rosenwald Gallery, sixth floor Van Pelt Library 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. weekdays from Sept. 29 to Oct. 28.

Registration for fall classes of the *Free Women's School* begins Sept. 29 and continues through Oct. 5. For a brochure, call Ext. 8684 or stop by Houston Hall, second floor east.

### EMERGING TRADITIONS III

Earthworks, artists' performances, highway culture and video art are only a few of the topics in *Emerging Traditions III: Art in the Seventies*, an eight-week series of non-credit evening lectures by a group of scholars and critics. The series starts Tuesday, Oct. 11 and continues for eight consecutive Tuesdays from 7:30 to 9 p.m. in the Fine Arts Auditorium. Series tuition is \$30; individual tickets, if available, will be sold at the door for \$4. For ICA members, students and senior citizens, series tuition is \$25 and individual tickets \$3.50. Fellowships are available for art students and educators in metropolitan Philadelphia and southern New Jersey. For information about tuition, registration and fellowships or ICA membership contact Carla Hultman, Ext. 7108.

ALMANAC: 515 Franklin Building (16) Ext. 5274

Editor.....Karen C. Gaines

Assistant Editor.....Marilyn Ackerman

Distribution.....Karen A. Graves