

# Almanac

Published Weekly by the University of Pennsylvania  
Volume 24, Number 10 November 8, 1977

- SPEAKING OUT (*Labor Dispute, Bakke Brief*)
- Professionally Oriented Undergraduate Education
- Hiring Restrictions
- Report on the Wharton Tenure Resolution
- THINGS TO DO

## LABOR: HEARING ANNOUNCED

On Friday the Regional Director of the National Labor Relations Board told the University that he had been authorized to proceed to a hearing on two of the Teamsters' charges: that the University failed to bargain in good faith, and that the University went out of the housekeeping business once Teamsters Local 115 began to represent the housekeeping workers. Under NLRB's standard policy, the regional director becomes the advocate for the complainant (in this case the Teamsters) when the office is authorized to proceed to a hearing on a charge of unfair labor practice. Gerald L. Robinson, executive director of personnel relations, explained that statements by the regional director and reports in the public press must be viewed in this context. "At the hearing the University will have its first opportunity to cross-examine witnesses and produce evidence. In the proceedings that will now ensue, the University is prepared to lay the Teamsters' allegations to rest," Mr. Robinson said. "It should be emphasized that the University's actions with respect to the housekeeping function have been taken for proper fiscal reasons, as required by the duty of the Trustees and administrative officers to manage the University as economically as possible. Those actions will be vindicated by the NLRB or by the courts, which are the proper forums for the resolution of this matter. The University will abide by the decision finally rendered."

## HARRISBURG: NO ACTION

The State legislature recessed last week until November 14, without taking further action on the University's 1977-78 appropriations. The bill, with those of other State-aided and State-related institutions, remains on the calendar for reconsideration. Before recessing the Senate was attempting to reach agreement on tax measures before bringing the appropriations bills to another vote. Prospects for early settlement on the funding problem were dimmed by the collapse of a proposal to increase

both the personal income tax and the corporate net income tax. Opponents claimed the proposal included changes in the corporate tax law that would cost the Commonwealth more than the increased rate would bring in.

With the question of the 1977-78 appropriation still unsettled, the Commonwealth and the University proceeded with the required steps toward formulation of a State budget proposal for 1978-79. President Meyerson headed a University delegation on November 1 requesting \$21,853,500, as compared to \$17,781,000 in 1976-77, based on the rate of inflation during the years in which the appropriation has been virtually static.

## APPROPRIATION: HOTLINE

The Pennsylvania Division of the American Association of University Professors has a toll-free number for faculty to get up-to-date information about the State higher education budget crisis. The Higher Education Hotline is 1-800-692-7286.



Meet at the  
Manor...page 7.

## CONTINGENCY PLANNING GROUP NAMED

In view of the possible threat to our Commonwealth appropriation, we have called together an *ad hoc* group to give advice on whatever emergencies may arise as a result of governmental actions. While we believe that the legislature will behave in an enlightened fashion, prudence dictates contingency planning for all eventualities. The group does not displace roles of the Budget Committee, the Educational Planning Committee, the Council of Deans, or other bodies that must ultimately be involved should emergencies arise.

The members of the *ad hoc* group are:

Eliot Stellar (Chairman), Provost  
Ralph Amado, 1975-76 Senate Chairman  
Donald Carroll, Dean of the Wharton School  
Paul Gaddis, Senior Vice-President for Management and Finance  
Vartan Gregorian, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences  
John N. Hobstetter, Associate Provost for Academic Planning  
Arthur Humphrey, Dean, Engineering and Applied Science  
D. Bruce Johnstone, Vice-President for Administration  
Irving Kravis, 1977-78 Senate Chairman-elect  
Thomas Langfitt, Vice-President for Health Affairs; Chairman of University Budget Committee  
Robert Lucid, 1976-77 and fall 1977 Senate Chairman  
Louis Pollak, Dean of the Law School  
Edward Stemmler, Dean of the Medical School  
Julius Wishner, Chairman of Educational Planning Committee  
Jon Strauss, Executive Director of the University Budget (staff)  
Robert Zemsky, Director of Planning Analysis (staff)

— Martin Meyerson, President; Eliot Stellar, Provost

## COUNCIL: AGENDA SET

The University Council meets on November 9 from 4 to 6 p.m. in the Council Room, Furness Building. On the agenda: reports from the Provost and the chairman of the Steering Committee; action on a proposed charge to the *ad hoc* committee on University relationships with federal agencies (page 7); and a discussion of the brief to the U.S. Supreme Court filed jointly by the University in the Bakke case (*Almanac* October 25).

## MEDICINE: NEW CHAIRS

Two new chairs have been designated for faculty in the School of Medicine. The first Dr. Eugene P. Pendergrass Professor of Radiology is Dr. Stanley Baum, chairman and professor of radiology. Dr. Baum is widely known for developing radiological techniques for studying diseases of the blood vessels and for locating sites of internal abdominal bleeding. Dr. Sidney Cohen, professor of medicine and chief of the gastrointestinal section, has been appointed the first T. Grier Miller Professor of Medicine. Dr. Cohen is noted for his research on the physiology and pathophysiology of gastrointestinal motility.

# Speaking Out

## MISGIVINGS ON LABOR DISPUTE

*Professor Summers' letter was written to President Meyerson on August 10 and later submitted to Almanac. Because of the length of the original, only extracts can be published here. The extracts were submitted by Professor Summers who is on leave in Europe. The original is available in the Almanac Office.—Ed.*

I want to express to you my deep sense of uneasiness with the decision of the University to dismiss all of its janitorial employees and to use employees of an outside contractor to do their work, and to express my total dismay at the manner in which that decision was implemented. I am disturbed because the University appears not to have given adequate consideration to the human costs and social consequences of its action, and has portrayed itself as insensitive to values which should be central to its concerns.

I can not know, of course, all of the considerations that may have been weighed by the University in making this decision, and there may be justification which I do not know. The most I can do is to express my misgivings.

First, the effect of the University's decision is to destroy the seniority rights of 350 employees . . . those years of seniority represent for many of the employees the most valuable asset they have been able to accumulate by their years of work, and for some it is their only substantial asset. For almost all of them it is their sole source of job and income security . . .

The human costs and the social consequences of the University's decision require compelling justifications which the University has not shown, and which I question exist. These employees have been dismissed even though their services are needed: their jobs will be filled, but the University has decided to discard them and use other workers . . .

Second, even if the decision to contract for janitorial services can be justified, the manner in which this decision was implemented portrays an incredible insensitivity on the part of the University toward its employees . . . Twenty-four hours' notice of termination, particularly for employees of long seniority, shocks the conscience. In almost every other civilized society today such action would not only be considered outrageous but would be prohibited by law. For this to be done by a University which stands for recognition of individual worth, human values and social responsibility is beyond belief. . . . Substantial notice of at least two months, or even six months, was certainly possible. . . .

Third, the only justification given by the University for its actions is "estimates of savings as high as \$750,000." I have serious doubts that these "estimated" savings will ever be realized. . . . In the process, the University has lost control of its work force, and the janitorial staff has no sense of loyalty or responsibility to the University.

Fourth, contracting for janitorial services will likely aggravate, rather than simplify the University's labor relations problems. The University will feel the brunt of labor disputes but have no effective control over their resolution. Whatever the contractor concedes to the union at the bargaining table will be paid by the University but it will have no voice in the settlement . . . If four separate contractors are used, as I understand is planned, then the labor problems will be multiplied . . . whipsawing, rivalry and jurisdictional friction will increase geometrically.

These very practical considerations are directly related to the human and social considerations involved. If, after two years it appears that the University has not realized substantial savings, how can it then justify what it has done to 350 of its employees? Is the University so certain that contracting for the janitorial services will actually produce the estimated savings in the long run that it can justify the irreparable injury it has inflicted on its employees? . . .

The central issue is whether the University in making and implementing this decision has acted in accordance with its own principles of sensitivity to human values, concern for social consequences, and acceptance of responsibility to those who have served it. I feel that in this case the University has made a grievous error.

—Clyde W. Summers, *Jefferson B. Fordham Professor of Law*

*Gerald L. Robinson, executive director of personnel relations, responds:* Everyone responsible for the functioning of the University shares Professor Summer's concern over our regard for human values and the University's commitment to those who serve it. President Meyerson shared these concerns of the University in the *Almanac* as recently as October 25. *Almanac* pages frequently have recorded the ongoing efforts of the University to overcome or to ameliorate the consequences of unemployment for the affected housekeeping workers.

The housekeeping workers had been alerted to the recognized need for economies and the steps required to reduce housekeeping costs as early as the contract settlement of the fall of 1975. We advised the workers' representative

repeatedly beginning with talks with Local 1202 in January 1977, and then with Teamsters Local 115 that continuing cost efficiencies were essential. The University's 1977-78 operations review had revealed that the housekeeping function could be performed by outside contractors at a saving of more than \$770,000 from the preliminary budget figure of \$4,554,349. Coopers and Lybrand, the University's independent auditors, verify our projections. We are confident that competitive pressures among contracting firms will maintain comparable savings in future years.

Consequently, union cooperation was urged to develop alternative methods of accomplishing the housekeeping operations at reduced cost. Regrettably, the Teamsters declined to discuss any cost-saving alternatives, but instead demanded a contract estimated to cost the University over a million dollars more yearly than its present costs. In its earnest endeavors to conclude an agreement amicably, the University invited the assistance of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. All reasonable negotiating attempts failed. We were advised by counsel that a bargaining impasse had occurred. Therefore, we notified the housekeeping workers of the lay-off.

In lieu of advance notice of termination, and recognizing its commitment to these workers, the University has made the following offers:

- special early retirement arrangements for individuals within five years of retirement, providing their normal retirement benefits;
- job referral service for placement elsewhere within the University or with other area employers;
- preferential hiring, based on University seniority;
- maintenance of University seniority rights for all those rehired;
- special unemployment allotment to provide an income supplement until January 1, for any individual using the job referral service.

In addition, the University indicated a willingness to bargain further with respect to the effects of the terminations.

The Teamsters have refused to bargain about any benefits. In 15 bargaining sessions, they have adamantly insisted that all employees be rehired and that prior labor-saving contract changes be rescinded. Moreover, they demand that the University sign their form contract, one which does not provide an absolute guarantee of final and binding impartial arbitration of grievances, and they insist upon substantial but undefined increases in wage and fringe benefits.

*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. Copies of *Almanac's* guidelines for readers and contributors may be obtained from *Almanac's* offices at 514-515 Franklin Building.



Charges filed by both the University and the Teamsters are before the National Labor Relations Board for review. The University is complying with the requirements of the law and believes the issues can be resolved fairly, equitably, and humanely if the Teamsters will bargain about the effects of the lay-off. Since its inception, this institution has been responsive to those in its service as well as to those it serves. The present disruption should not be allowed to affect the education of the University's 18,000 students, the well-being of its 14,000 employees, or the common good.

### HOOVER RERUN

The University administrators have been unable to defend themselves convincingly against the charges of excessive cruelty in the firing of the housekeepers and of anti-intellectualism toward the community. To these charges, I should like to add a third, i.e., a return to a pre-Roosevelt attitude toward the welfare of its employees.

This charge is based mainly on two apparent facts: 1) Comparison of the rates paid now to the rates paid to the previous housekeepers shows that savings of more than \$750,000 cannot be made through reduced wages alone. 2) The cost to the University of fringe benefits shows that "savings" of this magnitude could be made only or chiefly by reducing fringe benefits.

Fringe benefits amount (in round numbers) to 23 percent of the payroll. These go toward pension contributions, payments for health insurance, life insurance, long-time disability insurance, social security, unemployment compensation, and workmen's compensation. In addition, an amount equal to about 16 percent of the payroll goes toward time off for vacation, sickness, etc. If the average salary of the 343 fired housekeepers were \$8,000, and the fringe benefits about 40 percent of this sum, then fringe benefits could amount to about \$1,000,000. I suggest that this amount, or some amount approaching it, must have been "saved" when the housekeepers were fired and new housekeepers were hired by outside firms.

It seems obvious that the outside firms could not pay fringe benefits of this magnitude and end up with a profit. We must conclude that the workers hired by the outside contractors do not have these (or most of these) benefits, with the exception of those which are mandated by law: social security, unemployment compensation, and workmen's compensation. This means, I think, that the University has divested itself of responsibilities which have been accepted by most employers in the nation since the time of the great depression, and has arranged its contracts with outside firms so that they also must reject these responsibilities. Such an attitude by the University is far from enlightened; it is in fact deplorably backward. University employees other than housekeepers should take notice of this attempt to return to a pre-Rooseveltian, exploitative attitude which does not differ much from that of J.P. Stevens, Levi-Strauss and Farah in recent times.

If the fringe benefits were such a drain on the University's finances, the University has

only itself to blame. Over the years, it must have granted these benefits by "mistake" without realizing how they mounted up until too late. If it was a "mistake," it was the University's, and the University should have learned to live with it while correcting it through attrition and/or by negotiation. Everybody knows that the University has made "mistakes" in the past at administration and faculty levels and that these methods are used to correct the errors in appointments, rather than by brutal, arbitrary, and summary dismissals.

—Isidore Gersh,  
Emeritus Professor of Anatomy

### AUTONOMY OR AUTOCRACY

President Martin Meyerson claims that discussion is not required when issues question the fundamental autonomy of the University of Pennsylvania to decide for itself, "who may teach, what may be taught, how it shall be taught, and who shall be taught" (*Almanac* October 25). However, it is precisely this premise that permitted the University to discriminate against ethnics and racial minorities in the early and middle 1900s, that permits dismissal of students or faculty members without due process, and that tolerates inadequate facilities for the physically disabled and the handicapped. President Meyerson's rationale for University autonomy is that it will enable the University to increase the number of racial minority members. Meanwhile, this autonomy results in the firing of 343 employees most of whom are of racial minority and of culturally deprived backgrounds.

If concern for freedom, decency, and respect for the individual warrants evaluation then one must believe that the University's autonomy does, too.

—Asar M. Stepak, CGS,  
Member, Student Strike Support Committee

### THANKS BUT NO THANKS

My thanks for letting me see the text of the much discussed Bakke brief at last. Had I been given the courtesy of being asked whether this brief should be filed, *before* it was filed, my vote would have been "no".

The brief is wordy, tendentious, inaccurate and self-serving. It is not likely to be particularly helpful to the Court.

—Henry Faul,  
Professor of Geophysics

### PRECEDENT FOR REVERSAL

There is an excellent precedent for a solution to the problem raised by Dr. Callen in the *Almanac* of October 25, 1977.

On May 29, 1969, Bill No. 1187 to amend Chapter 10-800 of the Philadelphia Code was introduced and became a cause for concern at the University and elsewhere. With some exceptions for security guards, etc., the Bill would have prohibited the possession of any "weapon" in any educational institution. However, "weapon" was defined vaguely and widely, including "...any other object capable of inflicting injury through offensive use," so it could refer to scissors, ball-point pens, nylon stockings, paper weights, etc.

I and several members of the faculty and student body, including the then Chairman of the Faculty Senate and of the Task Force on University Governance, Professor Wolfman, later Dean of the Law School, protested the wording of the Bill at a public hearing in City Hall on June 9, 1969.

On June 5, 1969 the President's Staff Conference, without consultation with faculty or students, distributed a sheet entitled "Statement of Position of the University of Pennsylvania on Bill No. 1187." I strongly objected to that title and proposed changes in both title and contents directly to Vice-Provost Russell and also via the Chairman of the Faculty Senate. On June 6, 1969 I heard by telephone from Professor Wolfman that my proposals had been accepted and on June 9, 1969 a new version of the sheet appeared headed "Statement of Position of the Administration of The University of Pennsylvania on Bill No. 1187."

Thus there is at least one precedent for a rapid and appropriate response from the Administration to rectify a claim to speak for the University on their own without the necessary consultation.

—R.E. Davies,  
Benjamin Franklin and University  
Professor of Molecular Biology

### A PRESIDENT'S PRIVILEGE

I write to express disagreement with the opinions offered in recent letters from Professor Cohen (*Almanac* October 18) and Professor Callen (*Almanac* October 25). They believe that President Meyerson should have consulted the faculty before joining with other universities in submitting the *amicus curiae* to the Supreme Court.

I believe there are decisions properly made by the president and/or provost of a university without consulting other persons, except possibly some trustees. We need as president of a university a person with an academic background who has initiative and good judgement. Such a person will decide which statements, made on behalf of the university, should be presented with little or no consultation in advance, and which ones require consultation with carefully chosen persons within the University.

In the case at hand, I happen to agree with what seems to me to be an extremely well thought-out statement, prepared jointly by able faculty members from several universities. However, even if I disagreed, I would have considered this to be one of the cases in which the president ought to have the privilege of deciding without consultation.

It might be in order to note in passing that, if every decision having to do with a matter of this sort had to be submitted to one or more constituent groups within the University, we would seldom have any statements emanating from the University; and it would be impossible to find a strong and able man or woman who would accept the position of president of a university.

—S. Reid Warren, Jr.,  
Emeritus Professor,  
Electrical Engineering and Science  
and Radiologic Physics

# Report on Professionally Oriented Undergraduate Education

May 19, 1977

## INTRODUCTION

The original charge of this year's committee was "to prepare an analysis of the place of professional education in the University with special attention to undergraduate programs." It was understood that this was a vast area, and the first task of the committee was to narrow down the charge to a manageable area of investigation.

The committee decided to concentrate its attention on undergraduate education. Within this framework a variety of programs which fall under the rubric of "professional education" were identified:

1. Professional degree programs which prepare for entry to a number of professions, e.g. Wharton majors in accounting, finance, etc.
2. Professional degree programs which lead to certification by an outside agency, e.g. Nursing, SAMP, Education.
3. Dual degree programs involving a professional school and FAS, e.g. the joint CEAS-FAS, and Education-FAS programs.
4. Courses within the arts and sciences sometimes regarded as "pre-professional."

With the varied nature of these programs in mind, it was decided to adjust the title of the committee's report to: "Professionally Oriented Undergraduate Education at the University of Pennsylvania."

The Senate Committee on Education decided early in its deliberations not to make recommendations which were specific to particular programs or schools, but rather to address itself to questions which have a broader, university-wide application. It does however note that, within FAS, a Committee on Undergraduate Education, chaired by Professor Robert Schrieffer, has been meeting in the spring of 1977, and has maintained close contact with the Senate Committee. In particular, we have been grateful for the opportunity to work with the FAS Subcommittee on Specialization.

## CURRENT TRENDS

In the decade of the 1970s, the University of Pennsylvania has found itself facing, for a number of reasons, a rapidly changing set of attitudes to post-secondary education within society at large. The increasing number of university graduates during the 1960s, coupled with a somewhat static job market, has led to something of an "employability" crisis for many Americans with a university degree. As a partial response to this phenomenon, there seems to have developed the notion that an education which costs \$7000 a year must produce some tangible benefits in the job market. There is apparently "public impatience" with the results of many current undergraduate curricula which do not seem to guarantee employability. Parents and their children who make up the prospective students of the 1970's seem more than ever concerned with the idea of getting a job after graduation; "obviously employers want prepared workers and parents want employed offspring." (See Toombs, William, "Career Education and Undergraduate Study," *Research Currents*, American Association for Higher Education, November 1976.)

These notions visualize the university as serving the larger society of which it is a part, and indeed it must do so to a degree if it is to survive. It is a very well endowed or even foolhardy institution which can afford to ignore entirely such trends in the perceptions of society. However, there is also a

sense in which a university may provide some kind of intellectual leadership for society, and, in order to do that, it must have the confidence of its own convictions. In other words, it must formulate its own clear goals as to the purpose of the education which it offers and disseminate them vigorously. This becomes all the more important when the fluctuations in attitude towards higher education are considered. During the 1960s, there was a tendency away from the fixed curricula of former years towards a less structured and more varied approach. Several universities lowered the number of courses required for graduation, allowed for greater diversity within their selection of basic courses, changed their procedures for evaluation, and permitted a great deal of individual freedom in the selection of subjects for study.

Whatever may have been the merits of this approach to the undergraduate experience, one of the (perhaps unanticipated) results of the increased freedom of choice, coupled with the overt or covert, apparent or illusory, pressures of society alluded to above, has been a significant shift away from the liberal arts degree and in particular the humanities component within it. Although an increasing number of students, aware of the problem of employment, are opting for undergraduate degree programs which will lead directly into a profession with a bachelor's degree, the liberal arts degree finds itself unfavorably assessed for its immediate and practical application to the job market. This view of the liberal arts seems somewhat inappropriate, but, from a positive point of view, seems to demand a reassessment of the various components which make up an undergraduate degree program in any school of the University.

## THE SITUATION AT THE UNIVERSITY

Within this situation, the University of Pennsylvania finds itself in a very fortunate position. It has a long tradition of professional education and has a number of illustrious professional schools which offer programs and degrees for undergraduates and graduates. It also possesses a number of renowned graduate-professional schools. For the first time, a fully integrated Faculty of Arts and Sciences now exists, responsible for instruction and the awarding of degrees at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Several cooperative programs already exist which enable students in FAS to take courses in the professional schools and vice versa. The University Development Commission and its overriding concept of "One University" has shown that there exist numerous other opportunities to capitalize on Pennsylvania's great strengths in the professional area.

Within FAS, a great deal is said about one particular group of students, the so-called "pre-med" group. The size of this group will vary according to the particular phase in the undergraduate career at which the figures are extracted and to numerous other criteria. A report which was prepared for an inspection team of the Middle States College Association in October 1974 identifies several of the problems which arise with regard to this group (see p. 47 ff.), and the entire phenomenon has been studied in depth by a subcommittee of FAS this year (1977). Their conclusion is that the dimensions of the problem are not as large as had been previously imagined. Whatever the case may be with regard to the "pre-med" experience at Pennsylvania, the Senate Committee has heard sufficient evidence to suggest that particular attention needs to be paid to those students who wish to (or else find that they must) change their career goals and thus their programs of study while in the midst of their undergraduate career.



## AREAS OF INVESTIGATION

The subcommittees of the Senate Committee on Education looked into the following areas:

1. Admissions (chaired by Professor F. Kempin)
2. Programs (chaired by Professor T. Wood)
3. Advising (chaired by Professor C. Graham)
4. Placement (chaired by Professor T. Reiner)

By adopting this format, it was hoped that the Pennsylvania student could be seen in progress through the University from the time before his or her arrival until the time of departure.

1. *Admissions.* When personnel from the Admissions Office go out in order to attract promising applicants to the University, they have to indulge in what is essentially a two-way process with their various audiences. In the first place, they attempt to project an image of the University which reflects the University's self-view and its assessment of particular strengths which it has. At the moment, heavy stress is being placed on the "One University" concept, the motto of both the University Development Commission and the Campaign for the Eighties. On the other hand, they have to answer questions from interested persons about all aspects of the University.

The responses of the Admissions Office staff to our questions showed clearly that their audiences reflect the interest in employment after graduation which was mentioned in the general introductory remarks. In this regard, the University of Pennsylvania reflects a general phenomenon with the Ivy League Schools, namely that it tends to attract high-ranking and active students who are career oriented; it is therefore not surprising that it attracts "pre-professional" students. The majority of questions (often posed by parents rather than students) concern the niceties of getting into medical school and the dollar value of the Pennsylvania undergraduate degree; differently expressed, what is the value of a Pennsylvania degree at \$7000 a year as opposed to a Penn State degree for less.

With this in mind, it seems essential that the University, faculty and administration, formulate clear goals as to the purpose of the education which it offers. These should be formulated by the faculty and then implemented by the administration. Once this has been done, they should be communicated to the Admissions Office so that they in turn may generate to the outside world a sense of a self-confident institution. Pennsylvania in general and its students in particular have a reputation for being self-deprecating, and, while this can be an engaging quality, it may in the long run give an impression of a lack of confidence or worse. The committee feels strongly that the Admissions Office should continue to go out and sell Pennsylvania's strengths in the professional schools, both for their own sake and as useful adjuncts to the liberal arts curriculum. The Admissions Office should also have recourse not only to schools and their departments for specific information about the programs which they offer, but also to other supportive services (especially the advising services) so that they may project a positive impression as to the value of the liberal arts degree both for its own sake and in the process of seeking a job after graduation.

In view of 1) the imminent appointment of a new head of the Admissions Office, and 2) the recent appointment of a coordinator in FAS to work with the Admissions Office (analogous to similar persons in other schools), the committee is aware that changes are already under way. Further changes are envisaged in the report of the Provost's Task Force on Admissions (chaired by Professor J. Bordogna). Within this dynamic framework, we would recommend the following:

1. There should be increased contact between schools and departments and the Admissions Office, so that the goals and content of the University's various programs can be effectively and accurately portrayed by the personnel of the Admissions Office in their recruiting campaigns.
2. Faculty members in all schools remain cognizant of admissions trends by continuing to serve on the admissions slate.
3. In view of the predicted changes in the size and nature of significant portions of the applicant pool, sufficient financial resources must be made available to the Admissions Office to begin the process of broadening the base of applications to the University.

2. *Programs.* It was noted above that trends in higher education are subject to fluctuation, and that, at the moment, in contrast to the decade of the 1960s, the emphasis appears to be very much on the use of a degree in the quest for employment. It is hardly surprising that the professional schools at Pennsylvania feel reasonably comfortable with this state of affairs while there is a certain amount of unease within the more traditional areas of the liberal arts, and especially the humanities. Even so, there are programmatic questions which need to be addressed by all schools, if the best advantage is to be taken of Pennsylvania's unique strength, namely that of having a liberal arts college and a number of professional schools in such close physical proximity on a single campus.

Some members of our committee have pointed out that, if the liberal arts find themselves beset by "pre-professionalism," then many programs within the professional schools also find themselves under some pressure from the outside to revert to a "get back to basics" approach to professional education: business school graduates may well be tested in the future on their ability to undertake specific managerial tasks; law school graduates will tend to be assessed as advocates as much as writers of briefs and memoranda. In other words, the professional schools themselves may be under pressure to become less concerned with theory, public and social policy and the like, and more involved with the practicalities of professions.

From this information provided by members of our committee, we draw the conclusion that all divisions of the University should assess the relationship within their programs of the need for a broad and liberal education and the necessity of earning a living, with or without further education or training. The President of the University has addressed himself to this subject and in particular to the need for some combination of the theoretical and practical:

There is an opportunity for us to achieve a new synthesis of liberal and professional learning and to respond to a cultural spirit—partly humanitarian, partly careerist—in our students by doing so. . . . Similarly by adding to the intrinsically valuable academic studies that devotion to social purpose, which is so typically a part of the spirit of service of the professions, we might give those students who find the traditional studies empty of purpose a sense of their ultimate relevance. We might also open new paths to liberal education through some of the methods, insights, and research of transformed professional education. . . . Those of us in colleges and universities ought to help unite the profession or the calling with liberal learning. . . . Just as liberal learning can enlarge understanding of professions, so comprehension of professions illuminates liberal learning. (Meyerson, Martin, "Civilizing Education: Uniting Liberal and Professional Learning," *Daedalus*, Fall 1974, 173 ff.)

Within this general area, the Senate Committee on Education endorses the concept of the "core curriculum" as being considered by the FAS Committee, and has the following recommendations:

1. that dual degree programs (such as the current CEAS-FAS, and Education-FAS programs) should be encouraged. The increased use of submatriculation toward a master's degree might serve to make such programs even more attractive to students.
2. that alongside the liberal arts components of undergraduate degree programs in the professional schools, a number of "professional minors" should be developed for students whose major emphasis lies in the liberal arts. Examples of such minors might include: language specialties, technical writing, accounting, and medical illustration. These are merely a few of the large number of possible combinations.

This is probably the appropriate point at which to record the general feeling of this committee (shared apparently by many others) that the concept of "One University," implying as it does the cooperation of different divisions of the University in the instructional process (such as we are advocating here), seems to be hampered to a large degree by the implementation of the current budgetary procedures of the institution, the so-called "responsibility center" concept. This system, which may have excellent diagnostic capabilities, seems to have become a prescriptive mechanism and to have created a number of theoretical and/or disciplinary islands at precisely that time when the "One University" concept is exhorting us to devise all kinds of cooperative ventures in education. Whether the system itself is at fault or merely the means by which it is being implemented at the moment, we are not able to say. However, as we recommend an increase in the number of inter-school and inter-departmental programs, it seems appropriate to suggest that the budgetary mechanisms involved may need to be reexamined.

3. *Advising.* During the past few years, advising at Pennsylvania has undergone changes which have improved upon the previous situation in a number of ways. In the first place, several advisory services have been brought together under an office which also has responsibilities within the area of general undergraduate education, namely the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies and University Life. Secondly, the separate academic advising functions of the College and College for Women were combined into a joint advising office with FAS.

The committee feels very strongly that advising, whether academic or "professional," should be seen as a continuum throughout the student's career. With regard to academic advising, there remains a need for a greater flow of information to academic advisers from the central data-keeping offices concerning the current progress of students, but significant steps have already been taken in that direction and further improvements are presumably predicted on the availability of a larger staff. There is also a

widespread feeling that there needs to be a greater faculty involvement in the process of advising students. Some schools have already implemented or are planning expanded advising services for their students, and such additions may help solve some of the more common academic or psychological problems.

The majority of the career and vocational interviewing on the campus takes place in the Career Advising Office and the Counseling Service. The former includes specialists on the fields of health and law and houses the Health Professions Advisory Board which maintains files on all students who register themselves with the office as desiring entry into a graduate school in the health professions. The Counseling Service provides psychological counseling for students and also undertakes vocational testing. This office performs the especially crucial function of trying to redirect the significant number of students who become disillusioned with or fail to meet the perceived or real standards of the "pre-med" curriculum and to suggest alternative career goals toward which they might aspire. The Senate Committee was convinced of the need for a direct connection between vocational and psychological advice and considers that the two functions would remain within the Counseling Service.

Significant progress has already been made in the process of coordinating the activities of these offices. An assistant to the vice provost already chairs two coordinating groups, the larger of which includes representatives from Academic Advising, Career Advising, Counseling Service, Supportive Services and Financial Aid. We note the important role which Financial Aid plays in the deliberations of these bodies, and would suggest that attention might be given to the possible linkage between career goals of students and work-study opportunities, especially during the summer.

In view of the importance which we have attached above to the communication of all kinds of information to the Admissions Office, we would recommend:

That a senior representative from the Admissions Office be included in any collective committee or group which involves the discussion of career advising and counseling for students.

There is, then, a real sense in which the committee sees many of its ideas in the process of being implemented or at least planned for in happier budgetary times. To the general picture, we would like to add one element which is thus far missing, namely placement.

4. *Placement.* The committee would like to see a situation (and a structure to implement it) in which placement came at the end of a progression through the University.

Thus far, it seems fair to say that the Placement Office's main function has been to bring to the attention of prospective employers the availability and talents of Pennsylvania graduates and to invite representatives of various professions and business concerns to visit the campus in order to interview students as prospective employees. Up till now, there has been a strong emphasis on the development aspect of this exercise (in other words, on obtaining donations to the University from alumni serviced in this way and also from businesses who have hired Pennsylvania's talented products); indeed, Placement has been budgeted within the Office of Development.

Within this framework, there seems little doubt that this function has kept the office extremely busy over the years, and this is increased when it is realized that the service is extended to and quite heavily used by Pennsylvania alumni and alumnae. The largest user of the facility has undoubtedly been the Wharton School, with some other professional schools following some way behind. Another general point which might be made is that the geographical distance of the office from the campus (40th and Chestnut) does not aid communication between the Placement Office and the remainder of the University.

If the Placement Office is to serve a function as the analogous office at the end of the student's University experience to the Admissions Office at the beginning, then there obviously needs to be some more contact between this office and the various schools and departments of the University. The Placement Office has voiced the hope that such lines of communication can be established. This should be seen as a two-way process. Some schools and certain individuals within schools have already established contact with the Placement Office, and this pattern should be expanded. Some means needs to be found for greater university-wide faculty contact with Placement. With this in mind, we would recommend:

That a Faculty Advisory Board be established to provide advice to the Director of the Placement Office and to facilitate all necessary contacts between personnel in the office and members of the University faculty.

The Placement Office should be encouraged to turn towards the University and to solicit from its faculty ideas about job opportunities. To do that successfully, the faculty will need to provide descriptions of the programs they offer in ways which will be useful to the Placement Office as they attempt to match students and jobs or prospective employers. This is

not, of course, to suggest that the faculty needs to go into the job-hunting market for its students, but that the Placement Office will be able to function more effectively if it knows a great deal more than it does at the moment about a large number of departmental and school programs offered at the University.

The connection between Career Advising and Placement seems almost too obvious to need elaboration. However, the history of the development of the various advisory services at Pennsylvania seems until recently to have worked against any sort of coordination of the activities of these two offices. We would recommend:

That a way be found to unite the functions of Career Advising and Placement within the purview of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies and University Life, and

That a representative of the Placement part of this combined office should sit on the coordinating advising committees within the Vice Provost's Office.

## CONCLUSIONS

Many of the recommendations which have been made above are in the process of being considered by the central administration of the University. As is often the case, they involve in the main the development of improved methods of coordination of and communication between divisions of the institution which already exist.

Many of the suggestions made will involve an increase in the staff and therefore the budget of specific offices. We are aware that such budgetary increases may have to wait upon more favorable financial circumstances, but it is hoped that some of them can be implemented through adjustments of existing resources.

On the question of the "larger picture," the University and its role within the society, the Senate Committee feels sufficiently strongly about one particular point to put it in the form of a recommendation:

That the University of Pennsylvania should capitalize on its renowned strengths in the professional areas and not be reticent about doing so. The current climate certainly supports such a posture. However, there should be a clear notion in the minds of those who administer academic programs as to what the underlying, basic goals of the Pennsylvania education are. These should form a solid core of knowledge which can resist the more superficial trends in society, and yet the mechanism by which they are determined should be adjustable enough that they can reflect genuine developments in knowledge and not fly in the face of more significant changes. In that way, the University may be a genuine and respected leader in society, and not merely a follower.

## POSTSCRIPT

The comments which follow reflect solely the experience of the committee's chairman this year, but since they reflect so closely the comments of the Chairman of the Faculty Senate to the Council (May 11, 1977 meeting), they seem worthy of being recorded.

The question of professional undergraduate education has been investigated by at least three separate committees this year, each one responsible to a different body. A committee of the University Council investigated the issue as part of the attempt to set terms of reference for discussion of the SAMP issue. In addition to the present committee of the Senate, the Committee on Undergraduate Education in FAS appointed a subcommittee on specialization in the spring of 1977, apparently unaware of the existence of either of the other two committees. If the reports which are to appear may seem to duplicate each other, it can hardly be the cause of much surprise.

Within such a large university as Pennsylvania, there are, of course, a number of different constituencies, each with its own assembly, council, or whatever. However, there must surely be a more effective way of coordinating the activities of Council, Senate, and school committees so as to avoid the considerable duplication of effort which has occurred this year. This need would in no way remove from any constituency the right to investigate proper areas of concern, but would permit the exchange of information and avoid the considerable waste of man hours which seems to have resulted from the situation during this academic year.

### *Senate Committee on Education*

*Roger M. A. Allen (Oriental studies), Chairman*  
*June Axinn (social work)*  
*Charles D. Graham (metallurgy and materials science)*  
*Frederick G. Kempin (business law)*  
*Malinda Murray (nursing)*  
*Thomas A. Reiner (regional science)*  
*Thomas H. Wood (physics)*  
*Charles R. Wright (communications)*



## HIRING RESTRICTIONS

Hiring and internal transfers of staff continue to be restricted by the hiring suspension which was put into effect on October 21, 1977.

Exceptions will be considered for those positions supported by sponsored research (ledger 5) and restricted budgets (ledgers 6 and 8). Position vacancies within these categories are posted on the bulletin boards in the locations listed below.

—Gerald L. Robinson,  
Executive Director of Personnel Relations

### Bulletin board locations:

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

## CHARGE TO THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON CURIA

*The University Council will take action on this suggested charge to the University Council ad hoc Committee on University Relationships with Intelligence Agencies (CURIA) at its meeting on November 9.*

The Committee will:

1. Examine established University policies such as the *Integrated Statement of University Policy on Conduct of Research Programs*, the *Policy on Extramural Consultative and Business Activities of Fully Affiliated Faculty Members*, and the *Guidelines on the Confidentiality of Student Records*, and determine on the basis of the Church Committee report and other public documents (e.g., testimony before and reports of other committees, press accounts) whether such policies adequately protect against possible abuses in the relationships between the University and/or individuals affiliated with it, and external agencies.

2. In the context of the above, consider to what extent it may be desirable or proper for the University to establish distinct policies and guidelines governing relationships between the University, and/or individuals affiliated with it, and intelligence agencies.

3. On the basis of the results of its deliberations recommend to the University Council such modifications of, and additions to, established policies as may be appropriate.

## REPORT ON THE WHARTON TENURE RESOLUTION

*The Senate Advisory Committee approved the conclusions of this report of the Subcommittee on the Wharton Tenure Resolution, and forwards the report with SAC's endorsement to the Faculty Senate for action on November 30.*

November 2, 1977

The Senate Advisory Committee's subcommittee on the Wharton Tenure Resolution recommends against adoption of that school's proposals to extend the probationary period to ten years and to allow internal promotions to associate professorships without tenure.

The advantages of the proposed changes, as outlined to the committee by Dean Carroll, are that:

1. They would make Wharton more competitive during the present scarcity of faculty since a promotion without tenure could answer an outside offer.

2. They would allow young faculty longer to develop the interdisciplinary skills needed for research in Wharton's major departments.

3. They would improve the reliability of tenure decisions, reducing the instances in which tenure is improvidently granted.

These arguments are not altogether supported by the committee's research, and in any case, the committee saw the following disadvantages in the proposals:

1. We believe that tenure rules should be uniform throughout the University unless there are compelling reasons for exceptions, as in the case of the Clinical Track in the Health Schools. Among the reasons for uniform rules are: the value of consistent treatment for all members of the faculty; strengthening the idea of tenure in the University rather than in the school; and simplifying rules and administrative procedures. We are not persuaded that Wharton faculty positions are so special that they require different tenure rules.

2. Although any fixed tenure-probationary period is arbitrary, the seven-year limit has the merits of historical acceptance here and at many other institutions, and of approval by the AAUP. A ten-year period has significant disadvantages:

a. The average time that junior faculty spend without tenure is increased. This reduces the number of candidates who can be considered for tenure, and thus limits our choices. More important, it increases the fraction of a junior faculty member's professional life spent without tenure. Since a faculty member without tenure is under real or perceived pressure to avoid controversy in his research, his teaching, and his University service work, his academic freedom is clearly abridged and his usefulness impaired.

b. The emotional trauma of denying tenure to a colleague of ten years' standing would be severe. We think it possible that reluctance to take this step would offset the presumed gain in ability to evaluate candidates after an extra three years.

3. Promotion to associate professor without tenure, as proposed in the Wharton resolution, has the further disadvantage of downgrading the rank of associate professor.

The committee believes that the disadvantages of the proposal outweigh the advantages.

Jean Crockett (finance)

Murray Gerstenhaber (mathematics)

Charles Graham (metallurgy and materials science)

Robert F. Lucid (English), Chairman\*

Walter D. Wales (physics)

Robert Zelten (insurance)

\*Professors Gerald Frug and Jack M. Guttentag, who served on this committee, dissent from the opinion expressed in this report.

## MEET AT THE MANOR

For anyone planning an academic seminar, department meeting or social function, the Wharton Sinkler Estate in Chestnut Hill, is now available for University use. Guildford, as the estate is called, was given to the University by the widow of Wharton Sinkler, alumnus of the class of 1906.

The estate is a composite of a number of 16th century English country manor homes. Most prominent on the estate is the Manor House, designed after Sutton Place, the home of England's Duke of Sutherland. It was in the library that Alexander Pope is believed to have written his "Essay on Man." The garden to the left of the Manor is a replica of the garden at Hampton Court Palace.

Fee schedule for the use of Guildford is based upon the type of functions and the number of guests. Those interested should contact Ms. Virginia Scherfel, Office of the Vice-President for Operational Services, Ext. 7241. A tour can be arranged through the resident manager, Charles Hatch, Jr., by calling Ext. 4602 or AD3-1199.

## DEDUCTION PLAN FOR ALUMNI GIVING

This year alumni who are employed by the University may contribute to the Annual Giving program by payroll deduction. Our departments of Alumni Records, Management Information Systems and Payroll have arranged this convenience for the more than 2,100 alumni who work at Penn.

If you wish to use this service, just make the notation "Payroll Deduction" on your pledge card. You may select any payment schedule you like, and deductions can be made up to and including the June 30 check. All gifts will be credited to your class and school as usual.

—Bruce G. Birkholz  
Director of Annual Giving

## HEAR BUDD, MORRIS

WXPB plans an hour-long program on the labor dispute which will include half-hour interviews with George Budd, director of personnel and labor relations, and John Morris, president of Teamsters Local 115. The program will be aired on both November 9 and November 13 at noon.

## THINGS TO DO

### LECTURES

The Goodspeed-Richards Memorial Lecturer for November 9 is Riccardo Giacconi of the Center for Astrophysics of Harvard College Observatory, who explores *Prospects for Extragalactic X-ray Astronomy* at 4 p.m. in the David Rittenhouse Laboratory Auditorium.

Dr. Michael B. McElroy, professor of atmospheric science and director of the Center for Earth and Planetary Physics at Harvard, will give the November 10 Leon Lecture on *Man's Influence on the Environment: From the Potomac to the Stratosphere* at 8 p.m. in Room A-1 David Rittenhouse Laboratory.

*Some Early Fossil Remains in South Asia* will be considered by David Pilbeam of Yale University's Peabody Museum on November 10 at 11 a.m. in Room 138, University Museum.

Morris Arboretum curator Paul Meyer takes lecture goers to *European Gardens—A Whirlwind Tour* on November 10 at 8 p.m. at the Woodmere Art Gallery, 9201 Germantown Avenue.

David S. Salsburg, senior statistician in the department of clinical research of Pfizer, Inc., speaks on "Time to Tumor in Small Rodent Lifetime Carcinogenicity Studies—Distributions That Fit and Those That Don't" on November 11 at 3 p.m. in E 222 Dietrich Hall.

*The Reluctant Regulators: The FCC and the Broadcasters' Audience* is the topic for the Annenberg Colloquium on November 14 by Barry Cole, author and former consultant to the U.S. House Subcommittee on Communications at 4 p.m. in the Annenberg School's Colloquium Room.

Richard Schechner presents a lecture titled *Performance* at the ICA, Fine Arts Building, on November 15 at 7:30 p.m. Tickets: \$3.50 members, \$4 non-members.

Dr. John Godleski of the department of pathology of the Medical College of Pennsylvania discusses *Characterization and Use of Pulmonary Macrophage Antigens* at the Respiratory Physiology Group—Pulmonary SCOR Seminar November 15 at 12:30 p.m. in the 4th floor library of the Richards Building.

*Decentralized Parallel Algorithms for Matrix Computation* is the subject of Dr. Takayuki Kimura's Computer Science Colloquium on November 15 at 3 p.m. in Moore School Room 216.

On November 15 the Faculty Tea Club invites Dr. O.M. Salati, professor of electrical engineering and science at the Moore School, to speak on *The Use of Technology in Education* at 1:30 p.m. in Room 103 Moore School.

X-ray astronomer *Herbert Friedman* is the speaker for this year's Tobias Wagner lectures. On November 15 he will discuss "The Inconstant Sun" and on November 16 "The X-Ray Universe," both at 7:30 p.m. in Room A-1 David Rittenhouse Laboratory. These lectures are intended for a general University audience.

## ON STAGE

Jason Robards, Geraldine Fitzgerald and Milo O'Shea come to Annenberg Center for O'Neill's *A Touch of the Poet* from November 9-13, preview November 8. Call Annenberg Center Box Office at Ext. 6791 for tickets and information for this production directed by Jose Quintero.

Penn Players presents Kander's and Ebb's *Cabaret* on Thursday and Friday, November 10, 11, 17 and 18 at 8:30 p.m. and Saturday, November 12 and 19 at 6:30 and 10 p.m. Performances take place in the Harold Prince Theater, Annenberg Center. Contact the Annenberg Center Box Office at Ext. 6791 for tickets.

The *University Symphony Orchestra* conducted by Eugene Narmour performs on November 11 at 8:30 p.m. in Irvine Auditorium. The program includes Mozart's Symphony No. 41 ("Jupiter"), Stravinsky's Symphony in Three Movements and Gluck's Overture to Iphigenia in Aulis.

## EXHIBITS

*By Any Means Necessary: Protest Through Objects*, an exhibit of material from protest groups from the turn of the century to the present, is in Klein Exhibition Corridor in Van Pelt Library until November 28.

At the Faculty Club a group of eight artists present pottery, painting, drawing and sculpture until November 25.

*Hitoshi Nakazato, Four Series: Paint on Paper*, an exhibit of recent drawings by this fine arts faculty member, is on view through November 18 in Hoover Lounge, Vance Hall, Monday through Saturday, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., and Sunday from noon to 5 p.m.

*Processions*, an environment by artist Paul Thek is on view from November 11 until December 4 at the ICA in the Fine Arts Building. Open from 10 a.m. to 7:30 p.m. on Tuesdays, 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Wednesdays through Fridays and noon to 5 p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays.

Creator of *Mad* magazine's Alfred E. Neuman, Frank Kelly Freas, will have his *Science Fiction Art* on display in the Philomathean Society's art gallery, 4th floor of College Hall, on November 11 (7-8:30 p.m.), November 12 (10 a.m.-10 p.m.) and November 13 (10 a.m.-2 p.m.). The artist will be present at the opening, November 11.

## FILMS

Getting ready for winter, the Documentary Film Series features *Nanook of the North* and *Dead Birds* November 9 at 4 and 7 p.m. in the Studio Theater, Annenberg Center.

*Search for the Persian Royal Road* continues on November 9 at 5:15 p.m. in Rainey Auditorium, University Museum.

At the International Cinema, *The Girls* plays on November 10 at 7:30 and 9:30 p.m. in Hopkinson Hall, International House for \$1.

The PUC presents *Deep Throat* at Irvine on November 11 at 7:30, 9 and 10:30 p.m. and *The Poseidon Adventure* on November 12 in Fine Arts Auditorium at 7 and 9:30 p.m., both for \$1. At midnight on the 12th, see *African Queen* in Fine Arts Auditorium for 75c.

The original *Jungle Book* runs at the University Museum's Children's Film Program on November 12 at 10:30 a.m. in Harrison Auditorium.

*Chac* (God of Rain) filmed in Mexico is on the screen at the University Museum's Harrison Auditorium at 2:30 p.m. November 13.

## MIXED BAG

Ruth Wells, crime prevention specialist, and William Heiman, rape prosecution coordinator with the District Attorney's Office, present a *Safety Awareness Program* in Room 13 of the School of Veterinary Medicine November 10 at 7 p.m.

A free day-long Conference for Pre-Medical Women takes place November 12 from 9:30 a.m. to 4 p.m. The morning session includes a talk by Mary Roth Walsh, author of *Doctors: No Women Need Apply*. Contact the Women's Studies Office, Logan Hall, Ext. 8740 for details.

Try a *Football or Theatre Brunch* at the Faculty Club November 12 at 11:30 a.m. After brunch you can take in the 1:30 p.m. Penn vs. Dartmouth game or Jason Robards in *A Touch of the Poet* at the Annenberg Center matinee.

Get away from it all on *A Retreat for Academics* November 13 from 2 to 9 p.m. at St. Margaret's House, 5419 Germantown Ave. Call sponsor St. Mary's Church at 386-3916 for more information.

ALMANAC: 515 Franklin Building (16) Ext. 5274

Consulting Editor ..... Michele M. Steege

Assistant Editor ..... Marilyn Ackerman

Distribution ..... Karen A. Graves