

Almanac

Published Weekly by the University of Pennsylvania
Volume 24, Number 15 December 20, 1977

- NEWS • *On Alleged Malfeasance*
- SPEAKING OUT • ALMANAC BULLETINS
- HONORS • DEATHS • STAFF CHANGES
- OPENINGS • THINGS TO DO



NEW ALMANAC EDITOR: DIANE COLE

The *Almanac* Advisory Board is pleased to announce the appointment of Diane Cole as the new editor of *Almanac*, effective January 2, 1978.

Before accepting this position, Ms. Cole was assistant editor of the *National Jewish Monthly*, the principal journal of B'nai B'rith, headquartered in Washington, D.C. Previous posts included associate editor of *Women's World*, the house organ of B'nai B'rith Women in Washington, D.C., and women's editor of *City Dweller* in Baltimore. For the past three years her book reviews have appeared, on a free-lance basis, in the Baltimore Sunday *Sun*.

A graduate of Radcliffe College, she earned her master's degree at Johns Hopkins University.

The Board is also pleased to announce the promotion of Marilyn Ackerman to associate editor of *Almanac*.

REINSTATEMENT OF HOUSEKEEPERS: JANUARY 9

The University has offered reinstatement beginning January 9, to housekeeping workers who were terminated last August 7. The employees were asked to indicate by December 23, their intention to return to their jobs.

The letters signed by George W. Budd, director of personnel and labor relations, were sent to 311 of the 343 terminated. The others have chosen early retirement, have been placed in permanent disability status or otherwise have voluntarily left.

The housekeepers will return to work in January 1978 with the five percent pay increase that other University employees received last summer. The University and Local 115 of the Teamsters Union will resume negotiations on a new contract shortly.

TRUSTEES

As in recent meetings, on December 15 the Executive Board of Trustees was informed about current developments in the University's labor and Commonwealth relations. E. Craig Sweeten, senior vice-president, Program for the Eighties, said that the appropriations bills for the colleges and universities in the state were now with the Governor. Professor Curtis Reitz reviewed a proposed master plan for the State's higher education system. The plan is scheduled to be presented to the State Legislature in September 1978 and is expected to restructure the financial relationships of the colleges and universities to the Commonwealth.

Gerald L. Robinson, executive director of personnel relations, reported on the labor situation. Representing the University-wide Strike Support Committee, John Parvensky, a law student, explained the activities of this group and its reasons for supporting the housekeepers. Dr. Isidore Gersh presented suggestions to the Board from the Concerned Faculty and Staff, Students and Staff of the School of Social Work and the Black Faculty and Administrators' Caucus. Their suggestions included: appointing a broadly based Investigatory Commission to look into the labor dispute; and this commission's ascertaining responsibility for the labor policy, redesigning *Almanac* guidelines and studying alternative labor policies.

Provost Eliot Stellar described some of the areas the Contingency Financial Planning group is studying.

Trustee John Eckman, chairman of the Development Operating Committee, reported that as of December 2, the total in gifts and pledges for the Program for the Eighties was \$128,975,112 or 51 percent of the goal of \$255 million. Trustee Henry M. Chance II, chairman of the University Museum Board of Managers, reported that the Museum had applied for a \$1.5 million challenge grant from the National Endowment for the Arts. Vice-President for Administration, Dr. Bruce Johnstone, explained plans for modification of facilities to assist the handicapped. Deadline for meeting federal requirements is 1980; cost is approximately \$800,000. Some of the money will be funded by external sources.

President Meyerson informed the Board about Council's discussion on the Bakke brief and his call for a symposium. Stephen B. Burbank, general counsel, predicted that the U.S. Supreme Court decision on the Bakke case would not be before summer. He also explained that the federal legislation on foreign medical student transfers had been amended. Although the amendments are ambiguous, Mr. Burbank noted that the most objectionable aspect of the original legislation seems to have been deleted.

The Board voted on a resolution to fund, at an estimated cost of \$3,735,000, the renovations to provide additional space for the Department of Radiology and Radiotherapy.

PROVOST EMERITUS: DR. RHOADS

Dr. Jonathan E. Rhoads was designated by the Trustees December 15 as provost emeritus. Dr. Rhoads served as provost for the period from 1956 to 1959. He has been a member of the surgical faculty since 1934 and occupied the John Rhea Barton Professorship as chairman of the Department of Surgery and director of the Harrison Department of Surgical Research, 1959 to 1972. He also has served as chairman of the Faculty Senate. Now there are two on campus: Dr. Rhoads joins Dr. David Goddard as provost emeritus.

COUNCIL

The Bakke brief was again the center of discussion at the University Council meeting December 14. (See page 2.)

In his report, President Martin Meyerson gave an update on the Commonwealth appropriations. He forecasted that 1978 would be a difficult year for the University in terms of its relations with the State and that all major universities in the State would be under increased scrutiny. However, he was more hopeful for 1979, predicting a different atmosphere in Harrisburg. President Myerson also mentioned that a master plan which examines all aspects of State support in higher education was being prepared.

Dr. Helen Davies, commented that the situation in Harrisburg was chaotic, and the University community itself would have to exert pressure in the future to get appropriations passed. Trish Brown, Undergraduate Assembly chairperson, reported on recent

student activities to gain support for the University's appropriations.

Provost Eliot Stellar discussed the need for the Contingency Planning Group (*Almanac* November 8) to provide imaginative solutions for ways the University can organize itself to achieve its academic goals with less funds.

In his report, Chairman of the Steering Committee Dr. Robert F. Lucid brought to the attention of Council (although no action was called for) a proposed ordinance to establish internal police department procedures for the handling of citizen allegations of police misconduct. He also discussed a request by the A-3 Assembly to have greater representation on Council. (See below.)

Dr. Julius Wishner, chairman of the Educational Planning Committee (EPC), in an informational report, announced that an EPC subcommittee review of the Graduate School of Fine Arts had been completed, endorsed by the EPC and sent to the Provost. A review by a subcommittee on the School of Nursing's new doctoral degree program had also received EPC endorsement, but a review of a new educational plan for the School of Dental Medicine was still in subcommittee.

During the meeting, Council members discussed a 1974 Council resolution to create a task force on graduate education in relation to graduate education's current status. The Council resolution, adopted April 10, 1974, was never implemented. Dr. Lucid said that the resolution was being routed to the EPC. Vice-Provost for Graduate Studies and Research Dr. D.N. Langenberg provided a history of developments in graduate education and issues the task force needed to review.

BAKKE DISCUSSION: CALL FOR FORUM

President Meyerson, in Council's continuing discussion on the filing of the Bakke brief, called for a symposium to be held following the U.S. Supreme Court's decision on the Bakke case to discuss the effects of the decision. His suggestion followed comments by Dr. Peter Conn that the previous discussion in Council (*Almanac* November 15) had not been a learning experience, and by Irene Pernsley that the Council was preoccupied with process—not examination of issues.

Because Council discussion was limited to the procedures in filing the brief, not on the substantive issues, Dr. Michael Cohen referred Council to Professor Louis B. Schwartz's letter of October 25 on "The Bakke Case and Racial Handicapping: Another Chance to Think It Through."* Dr. Cohen said he believed that a uniformity of opinion could not be assumed by the Administration, that the issues were controversial and the brief shows an inadequacy in the consultative process.

Chairman-elect of the Faculty Senate, Irving B. Kravis, expressed the view that the presidents of the universities should have used their own names as educators, not the universities' names. Dr. Seymour Mandelbaum countered by saying he felt the "fiction" of the institution was a "necessary" and "appropriate fiction." Provost Stellar called for the Steering Committee in the future to "red flag" sensitive issues. Dr. Lucid said Steering Committee had not been kept informed on the Bakke brief.

*Professor Schwartz's letter may be obtained from the *Almanac* Office.

A-3 ASSEMBLY: GREATER REPRESENTATION

Joseph F. Kane, an A-3 observing member of Council, informed Council of A-3 Assembly requests for a change in Council Bylaws. These include: (1) having a voting, rather than an observing, member on Council; (2) adding two A-3s to the Benefits Committee [There are now two.]; and (3) having membership in the following committees—Committee on Committees, Committee on Open Expression, Facilities Committee, Laboratory Animal Care Committee, Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics, Research Committee, and Safety and Security Committee. Dr. Lucid reported that the Steering Committee had referred their requests to the Committee on Faculty Affairs.

NYET IN RUSSIA: DA AT PENN

Films that are *nyet* in the Soviet Union will be studied next semester. Taught by Antonin J. Liehm, Czech film and social critic, the course will feature controversial films from Hungary, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Poland, as well as Russia.

Mr. Liehm, forced to flee his native country after the 1968 Soviet invasion, joined FAS this fall as a professor in the department of Slavic languages. He previously taught at City University of New York and the British National Film School.

Author of eight books, Mr. Liehm and his wife, Mira, have just published *The Most Important Art*, a book about Eastern European films since 1945. It was hailed by the *London Times* as an outstanding "record of the cat and mouse repression of cinema art." Mr. Liehm, actively involved in the postwar international cinema movement, co-founded the Czech weekly, "Politics of Culture," in 1945; in 1946 he participated in the first Cannes Film Festival.

More recently he organized the 1977 Venice Biennale, an international art show founded in 1895. Held in November and early December, this year's theme was cultural dissent. According to Mr. Liehm it was "a hit" in Europe, despite the U.S.S.R.'s film embargo and denial of exit visas to Soviet participants. "Many courageous people sent films to the Biennale defying the embargo," he said, "resulting in the world's largest exhibition of Eastern and Central European movies."

To the members of the University research community

On Alleged Malfeasance

The following article is reprinted from the November 10, 1977 issue of the Audit Information Exchange, a publication of the Committee on Governmental Relations of the National Association of College and University Business Officers. Its message merits careful attention by all members of the University who do or manage research. The press is becoming increasingly interested in this issue (see, for example, "Research Management Scandals Provoke Queries in Washington," Science, November 25, 1977, p. 804). Several federal agencies are in the midst of investigations, and congressional hearings are planned for early 1978. We have a problem, colleagues. Forewarned is forearmed.

—D. N. Langenberg,
Vice-Provost for Graduate Studies and Research

One day in early September Jack Anderson devoted his nationally syndicated column to a report of suspected widespread malfeasance in higher education. The first paragraph stated:

Some of the nation's most prestigious universities may be implicated in a multi-million dollar scandal. At least the preliminary findings indicate that universities may have been cheating routinely on their federal research grants.

The columnist cited an example of a refund of \$132,000 paid to the government by an institution after federal auditors found that salaries were charged to a grant for employees who did not work on the project, and that salaries of other employees were charged in excess of the effort spent. He said NIH had audited 24 institutions of which 16 had overcharged the government \$600,000. Anderson commented:

Whether the abuses already uncovered are isolated or merely the tip of an ugly iceberg, the agencies and universities alike have been less than diligent about preventing abuses.

Noting that federal officials complain they do not have enough auditors or investigators, Anderson continued:

Yet even an increase in auditing, officials privately concede, may not end the abuses, because the audits merely uncover damage that has

already been done. What are needed, these officials suggest, are better bookkeeping and more careful spot checks. "The institutions aren't carrying out their part of the bargain," complained one (federal) investigator. Some universities have kept such poor records, in fact, that HEW auditors could scarcely decipher and reach any conclusions at all.

Soon afterward other publications printed versions of the same story. *Science* magazine added its own comment:

... Off the record, a number of researchers questioned by *Science* admitted that it is not uncommon to "fudge a little," so that if there is a little extra money in one grant it may be applied to another. But it is, nonetheless, illegal, and the current round of auditing is likely to provide the makings of a scandal. It is also likely that Congress will get into the act with a series of hearings that might leave a number of research institutions embarrassed, to say the least.

The recent reports followed a year of similar publicity of audit findings at another institution. At that time wire services carried the story that:

Federal auditors have accused (the university) of juggling the figures on federal grants and charging some expenses to federal grants in order to cover deficits in other operations or simply to use up all the money in the grant.

The report said the institution was accused of "misusing millions of dollars of federal money," of "widespread bookkeeping irregularities," and of "bookkeeping manipulations." The development prompted the *Wall Street Journal* to devote an editorial to the subject, which ended with the following:

We have frequently complained on this page that the federal government, which gives colleges and universities almost \$9 billion a year, has imposed upon them an unnecessary web of regulations and red tape. The problem is obviously more complicated than that. There also would seem to be an absence of some *necessary* red tape.

(The figure of \$9 billion evidently includes student aid and other programs in addition to sponsored research of around \$2.5 billion per year.)

That such published reports and comments are damaging to higher education there can be no doubt. Whether exaggerated or not, publicity of this nature takes its toll.

It leads the public and Congress to believe there is need for tighter control than now exists over federal funds administered by universities. In this circumstance higher education can hardly expect favorable reception when it contends that controls are already too rigid and too cumbersome. Nor can higher education expect a sympathetic audience when it pleads for more equitable reimbursement of costs. Each story of scandal, manipulation, misuse or bookkeeping irregularities is a setback to the effort to achieve better understanding of the legitimate appeals of higher education.

Federally sponsored research in universities is public business, whether it is performed by a state institution or a private institution. All public business is subject to requirements for accountability, to close scrutiny and to disclosure. Disclosure of an alleged transgression in the use of federal funds can cast a shadow over an institution which may extend to higher education as a whole, the sponsoring agency and the entire federal research program. Even one or two projects gone wrong and declared a scandal can overshadow many other projects that are successfully brought to conclusion with all propriety.

Not all the criticism is warranted and that point should be understood. But some of the adverse comments appear to be based on facts, so institutions of higher education need to act to prevent causes of justifiable criticism.

In defense of the institutions are the following aspects:

—Accounts which have appeared in the media, as well as similar reports which have been published in the *Audit Information Exchange*, include those that should be construed as inconclusive allegations. In a number of cases universities have been able to prove propriety and refute the allegations.

—Some criticism can be attributed to an increasingly narrow interpretation of rules and regulations by federal officials. In some cases practices that were once accepted by the government have been considered no longer acceptable. At times increased standards have been applied retroactively to prior years without forewarning institutions.

—Generally audit criticism has been directed at earlier years. In many cases improvements have been made subsequently by institutions.

—The extent to which universities have voluntarily used institutional resources to share in the costs of federal research has been virtually overlooked. Often the government has underfunded projects, and

institutions have had to use both federal funds and institutional funds to support the research. As a project has neared completion, some federal funds may have remained unexpended because of costs charged to institutional funds. Since the federal funds awarded were inadequate to carry out the purpose for which they were made available, it is understandable in that situation that universities would expect to be able to use the remaining federal funds by transferring an equivalent amount of legitimate charges from institutional funding to federal funding. Under a narrow interpretation of the rules the government has criticized such transfers because they were made late in the process, even though the costs would have been acceptable if the charges had been made initially against federal funds.

—Some research projects are so closely related to each other that costs can justifiably be assigned to one project or another. Transfers of costs between such projects in order to comply with budget constraints have been criticized.

—The extent of abuse appears to be small in relation to the magnitude of government research performed by universities. It may be unrealistic to expect complete absence of abuse in a research program of around \$2.5 billion of federal funds per year, with over 200 institutions and thousands of employees involved. In a number of respects the administration of research projects is necessarily decentralized in the institutions. This compounds the difficulty of achieving absolute safeguards. While any abuse is wrong and not to be condoned, question must be raised as to how much cost should be devoted to an attempt to prevent *all* abuses.

Valid as the above matters are, they only explain away part of the problem of alleged misuse in a manner that objectively defends higher education. In other cases all too often there is indication that some universities do not have management systems which assure reasonable standards of accountability, or that some institutions fail to be duly trustworthy in the stewardship of federal funds. Wherever one or the other of these shortcomings exists, sober self-examination is warranted by the universities involved.

To the credit of higher education in general, many institutions in recent years have made significant improvements in their financial management systems. But where systems are still deficient, priority must be assigned to getting the house in order. Inadequate funding must *not* be used as an excuse to delay action, for substandard practices imperil present funding. Needed action should be taken promptly at an institution's own initiative without waiting for comment by federal auditors.

While concern about the adequacy of management systems is important, the apparent failure of a consistent sense of ethics to prevail is a matter that should be of even greater concern. On entering into an agreement with the government, an institution and a researcher commit themselves to use federal funds only within the terms of the grant or contract. From that point on, ethics dictate that the obligation be scrupulously carried out, regardless of any subsequent audit and possible exposure to criticism. Personnel of institutions of higher education should not have to be reminded of their obligation to abide by terms to which they agreed. There is no more justification for lack of good faith in relations with the government than in relations with individuals. Even when failure to meet obligations occurs through inadvertence or inattention, the seriousness of the failure is undiminished.

The present structure of the federal program, which depends almost entirely on multiple, short-term, separate agreements, is not the optimal structure for funding research in universities. Faculty researchers and university administrators are exasperated by restrictions which interfere with ultimate objectives. Nevertheless, after entering into agreements under the existing structure, they cannot unilaterally ignore the rules.

The intent here is to persuade individuals to be watchful and to take action wherever warranted. This message is directed not only to central fiscal and research administrators in universities. From their central positions they cannot assure all aspects of propriety. Principal investigators and academic administrators, such as deans and department heads, bear an important share of the responsibility. It is essential that all segments of the academic community be aware of their obligations and act accordingly.

Only when effective action is taken to correct substandard practices, wherever they exist, and only when a high level of ethical conduct is manifested, will there be significant relief from accusations of fiscal irresponsibility. When the collective houses are in order, explanations of legitimate extenuating circumstances will be given the credence due them, and the public will regain a full measure of confidence in higher education. A reduction in notoriety will take public pressure off Congress and federal agencies. And that may result in acknowledgment by the government that higher education deserves better treatment than it is now getting in regard to shortfall in cost reimbursement and burdensome constraints.

Speaking Out

SCHOOL AUTONOMY: THE REAL ISSUE

"Hard cases make bad law." Too often a decision which yields the "right" result in a particular case also harbors unfavorable policy implications for future situations. Such an unfortunate case was the November 30 decision of the Faculty Senate to refuse support of the Wharton School's requested adoption of a ten-year pre-tenure probationary period.

From the beginning of the Senate's debate, it was apparent that the Wharton proposal raised more than one substantial policy issue and that it would be difficult to reconcile the competing components in a single decision. Professor Capron assisted the deliberations by moving to divide the Wharton motion into its separate parts. The Senate passed the Capron substitute and approved the School's request for authority to promote junior faculty from assistant to associate professor without simultaneously granting tenure. No parliamentary move would serve, however, to segregate the two larger issues which were inextricably intertwined in the Wharton proposal: first, the wisdom of extending the maximum length of the pre-tenure period—the stated substantive issue—the second, the right of the faculty of an individual school to set its own rules for academic appointments and promotions.

It was this joinder of issues which made the decision so difficult for many of the Senate members present. The negative vote (70-43) on the tenure extension was a wise choice; those opposed to the 10-year probationary period have good reason to be pleased. But a larger, potentially more important issue, that of school autonomy, was also dealt with, albeit implicitly. We all might wonder whether in the name of preserving academic freedom grave damage may have been done to that very principle. This, in essence, was the message of Dean Pollak, who defended most eloquently the right of an individual school within this "federation" we call a university to decide important matters of faculty policy by its own democratic processes.

In February of 1973, the University Council supported Senate action of October 1972, and adopted a resolution on tenure and promotion criteria which began:

Adequate weight should be given to both teaching and research in matters of appointment, promotion and salary, but the weights need not be the same in all parts of the University and should

be determined by the individual faculties. (*Almanac*, Feb. 20, 1973; emphasis supplied by contributor.)

It was not happenstance which placed at the head of the resolution language supporting the right of the individual schools to consider their own missions and priorities in structuring their respective academic reward systems. The placement was deliberate and reflected a strong, University-wide commitment to the principle of school autonomy in faculty personnel matters.

Does the November 30 Senate decision signify an abandonment of this principle? Not necessarily. Many who opposed the Wharton proposal were less concerned with the merit of uniformity than with its inevitability. Knowing the Provost favored extension of the tenure track, they regarded the Wharton proposal as "the thin end of the wedge" and voted against it not because they care what Wharton does, not because they were persuaded of the need for uniformity, but because they saw the likelihood of their own schools soon coming under pressure to make a similar extension. Many who voted against the Wharton proposal were addressing themselves, I believe, to the immediate, substantive issue of a 10-year tenure track, while many who supported the proposal were focusing on the broader issue of school autonomy, the issue to which Dean Pollak had spoken. Although such information is not available, it would be helpful to know what were the real motivating factors which led to the 70-43 vote. My sense, strongly held, is that the extension of the tenure period—not the principle of school autonomy—was the issue defeated.

The 1973 Council resolution cited above contains another highly significant provision

which I would like to recall to my faculty colleagues:

A minimum acceptable standard of teaching competence should be required of those outstanding in research if they are to be assigned teaching responsibilities. A minimum acceptable standard of competence in research should be required even of outstanding teachers. (*Almanac*, Feb. 20, 1973)

The above is the only public statement of the University's criteria for promotion and the granting of tenure. Since 1973, it has been regarded by the Wharton School, and presumably by the other schools as well, as the operative rule for the review of tenure candidates. Moreover, it has been used as a practical guideline for advising junior faculty as to the allocation of their time and efforts while on the tenure track. Many, including myself, have relied on this statement of "the rules of the game." However, within the last year, it appears the University has deserted the 1973 University Council formulation and now treats outstanding, or "nearly outstanding," scholarship (meaning, specifically, research and publication) as the only route to tenure. Without open debate before the faculty and without allowing for the autonomy of the individual schools, the Provost's Staff Conference has effectively adopted the new criterion for promotion to tenure. Such a change needs to be examined in the clear light of collegial debate. At the very least, fairness demands that a change of this magnitude and impact must be communicated to junior faculty and must not be applied retroactively.

The several schools of the University should have the right, even in times of financial stringency (perhaps, especially at such times), to determine their own personnel policies. Economic realities cannot be disregarded, of course; and there is a real need for review at the Provost's level of how well the schools are implementing their policies. At bottom, however, our "One University" is, as Dean Pollak has argued, a federation. Subtle and incremental changes, whether wrought by the Faculty Senate or the Administration, should not be allowed to erode the rights of the schools and their respective faculties to govern their own affairs.

—Arnold J. Rosoff,
Assistant Professor, the Wharton School

PUBLICATION RECESS

This issue marks the last issue of *Almanac* until the beginning of the spring semester. *Almanac* resumes January 17. Anyone wishing to submit material during the semester break may do so. Material for the January 17 issue should be submitted by January 10. The *Almanac* office will be closed the week of December 26; also January 2 but will remain open otherwise.—M.A.

Speaking Out is a forum for readers' comment on University issues, conducted under the auspices of the *Almanac* Advisory Board: Robert L. Shayon, chairman; Herbert Callen, 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.

HOW TO DEFEND TENURE

In the various debates that have taken place concerning extension of the tenure probationary period, I have been puzzled by the initial premise underlying the arguments of most opponents of extension. These faculty members clearly consider proposals for extension as attacks upon the institution of tenure itself. The most extreme statement of this sort came in Professor Wales' letter of November 15, 1977 addressed to members of the local AAUP chapter in which he referred to the proposal for lengthening the tenure track in the Wharton School as an "assault upon our common interests." Even though most opponents of extension have not resulted in this sort of colorful prose, they feel deeply about this matter and defend their position ably. One must have great respect for their opinions. Nevertheless, it is possible to see the problem in a very different light—one that suggests that the trees may be obstructing the view of the forest.

We all know about the leveling off of financial support for higher education that has occurred in the seventies, how this has taken place in the face of steeply rising costs, and what the consequences are. Faced with the certainty of declining student populations in the eighties and keeping a suspicious eye on Harrisburg, we can accept the fact that the next ten years will be hard for higher education and hardest for private colleges and universities. When Professor Wishner reminds us that not only is the institution of tenure under attack but also the attacks are intensifying, we must agree. The true assault upon tenure is of the most serious sort striking at its very existence. As persons who believe that the right to search, to question and to speak out is central to the mission of a faculty, we must be greatly concerned at these developments.

The chief reason behind attacks on tenure is economic. In times of contraction or modest expansion, the competition among society's subgroups for a "fair share" of the pie becomes fierce. Since a large portion of higher education's dollars go to tenured faculty and behave like a fixed cost, one obvious way to reduce the funding needed for higher education is to abolish tenure, place the faculty on term contracts, and speed up turnover. This sort of naked economic argument is rarely raised by the foes of tenure, but it usually lies behind their explicit arguments. On a smaller scale, it informs the negative opinions on tenure sometimes voiced by members of university administrations on boards of trustees. Removal of the tenure principle would allow reallocation of funds to such areas of rising costs as maintenance of physical plant and satisfaction of union demands, thus diminishing the pressure on student tuition.

However, when one crosses swords with an advocate of tenure abolition or reads the published propaganda against tenure, the argument is on an entirely different level.

Tenure is described as a gigantic boondoggle, as a process designed and administered to protect incompetents, and unfortunately there are certain facets of the tenure process that are vulnerable to this sort of criticism. Let us look at these weaknesses: it is the thesis of this presentation that the best way to defend tenure is to eliminate them—to improve and rationalize the institution of tenure and in the process deprive our opponents of their most telling arguments.

The indefensible aspects of tenure center around the fact that in the sixties and even into the seventies it was quite easy to obtain it at most institutions. This is not surprising in a period of vigorous expansion, nonetheless:

a) Standards for the review process were not very stringent. The number of published papers sometimes served as a surrogate for quality of the contents. Candidates for tenure usually suggested sources for letters of recommendation and occasionally made the requests themselves. Teaching performance could be entirely overlooked. Obversely, persons with no publications were occasionally added to the tenured faculty when backed by a powerful chairman or dean.

b) Faculty were granted tenure on the basis of their promise as scholars rather than after they had accumulated a proven scholarly track record. Surely scholarly *promise* could be established in less than seven years, and the AAUP's 1940 recommendation should be viewed in this context.

c) The ratio of the number of tenured faculty to the total number of full-time faculty equivalents grew steadily. By the early seventies, it was not uncommon to find departments here and there whose members were from 80 to 100 percent tenured. Similar ratios for whole schools moved into the 70 to 80 percent range.

d) Most unfortunate of all, the idea of tenure by inadvertence became established at some institutions.

In 1968, there were few articulate and well-informed proponents of tenure abolition. Now they are many. They argue with great effect that tenure has been granted:

a) not by comparison with a set of rigorous standards, but sometimes for political reasons;

b) not to established scholars, but to persons who may or may not become established scholars;

c) not only under conditions of low or average tenure ratio, but also under conditions when this statistic was extremely high; and

d) not always by a systematic review process, but occasionally because of a clerical error.

Higher education is moving slowly to respond to these criticisms. This is none too soon; if substantial tenure reform does not take place by 1980, the anti-tenure forces may well become dominant. We will still have to deal with those who wish to appropriate funding presently going to higher education, but by reforming tenure we can take away the best weapons that our opponents possess. The way to defend tenure is to change it so that the review standards are tough, so that it is granted to established scholars only, so that tenure ratios fall in the arbitrary but reasonable 55 to 65 percent range, and so that tenure by inadvertence can never occur. (The Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education sponsored by the Association of American Colleges and the AAUP recommended in 1973 that "tenure never be acquired by default through the mere passage of time in probationary service.") It is thus possible to view the Wharton Faculty's overwhelming vote in favor of lengthening the tenure probationary period as a move to be more careful in the awarding of tenure and thus to strengthen the tenure principle. At least one faculty and AAUP member, myself, views it in that light.

History shows that social institutions that can adapt are social institutions that can survive. The AAUP recommend a seven-year tenure track in 1940, and this began to be generally implemented after World War II. Thus, although the seven-year period has been standard throughout the working lives of most of us, the time involved is only about 30 years—a time of unparalleled growth and vigor in American higher education. It was a great time; it was almost certainly atypical. We forget that during the previous 25 years, when higher education was not prospering, the AAUP's recommended tenure probationary period was 10 years.

In any case, it is unlikely that tenure in the painful eighties and the unknown nineties will take exactly the same forms as in the educational boom through which we have just passed. Those who truly wish to defend tenure should not attempt to maintain every detail of the present system; they should seek modifications that are appropriate to the new environment into which we are moving. Tenure, like any other social institution, will survive more propitiously in dynamic rather than in static form.

—Richard C. Clelland,
Professor of Statistics
and Operations Research,
and Associate Dean,
the Wharton School

LETTERS WELCOME

Almanac welcomes letters for its Speaking Out column from all members of the University community—administration, faculty, staff and students—on issues relevant to the University. These letters must conform to *Almanac's* guidelines, which may be obtained in *Almanac's* office.—M.A.

Almanac Bulletins

YOUR CHRISTMAS GIFT TO THE UNIVERSITY

Christmas recess is one of the most important periods in our energy conservation calendar. This year, with your help and support, we hope to see continued reduction in our energy use.

Here is a checklist to use as you leave for break:

- 1) Turn off all lights in your office or dorm.
- 2) Turn off all typewriters, coffee pots, electric heaters and other appliances. (Some of these should be off for safety as well as energy considerations.)
- 3) Set your refrigerator to the lowest setting.
- 4) Shut down research equipment and laboratory exhaust hoods where possible. If you have any doubts concerning the shutdown of a piece of equipment, check with your building administrator.
- 5) Remove any items which block vents or radiators.
- 6) Close all blinds and curtains.
- 7) Check to see that all doors and windows have been shut tightly.
- 8) Turn thermostats to the lowest setting.
- 9) If your room has a fan coil unit or room ventilator, turn the switch to the "off" position. If you cannot locate your unit or the switch, please contact your building administrator.

If you pass by an unoccupied lounge or classroom where lights have been left on, please take a moment to shut them off.

The best Christmas gift you could give the University this year would be your contribution to the energy conservation program!

Thank you and have a happy holiday.

—Francine McQuade and Horace Bomar
Energy Office, Operational Services

FOREIGN INTRIGUE

Do you expect a distinguished foreign visitor to the University? Would you like to have help in finding him or her a place to stay or other hospitality arrangements? How about scheduling and setting up contacts? Outside the University, as well as within. Do you need an interpreter? If your answer is yes, call Ambrose Davis, protocol officer for the University, in the Office of International Programs, Ext. 4661.

This office wants to keep accurate statistics on numbers of foreign visitors. So, even if you don't need any help, International Programs would appreciate knowing about your guests. You may call either Mr. Davis or Humphrey Tonkin, director.

TIRED OF HIGH BLOOD PRESSURE?

Volunteers are needed at the Hospital for a study of new treatments for high blood pressure. The purpose is to determine the usefulness of a new anti-hypertensive drug. The university's committee on studies involving human beings must approve all such testing before it is undertaken.

To qualify for the program, volunteers must now be taking at least two anti-hypertensive drugs, neither of which is a tranquilizer. Participants will receive either the new, experimental drug or a traditional, accepted medication. Frequent examinations and tests, with no cost to volunteers, will be made to follow the effects of the drugs. For more information, call Paula Levine at 662-2780/2781.

ANIMAL RESEARCH

Lippincott Animal Colony of the School of Veterinary Medicine, 25th and Locust, has space available for animal research. For information and prices call Grace Pinhak (Ext. 8809) or Eleanor Lang (Ext. 8803).

NEW QUARTERS FOR WHARTON APPLIED RESEARCH

The Wharton Applied Research Center, under the direction of Dr. James R. Emshoff, will be moving to new quarters during Christmas vacation. Effective January 1, 1978 the address will be: Suite 100, 3508 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19104. Telephone numbers for all Center senior staff members will remain the same. The main telephone number for the Center is Ext. 6320.

HOLIDAY HOURS

Bookstore: regular hours through Dec. 23; closed Dec. 24-26; open Dec. 27-30, 10 a.m.-5 p.m.; closed Dec. 31-Jan. 2; open weekdays, Jan. 3-13, 9:30 a.m.-5 p.m.; closed Jan. 7-8; open Jan. 14-15, 10 a.m.-5 p.m. During the first two weeks of spring term classes, the Bookstore's hours will be extended. Jan. 16-19, 9 a.m.-8 p.m.; Jan. 20, 9 a.m.-5 p.m.; Jan. 21, 10 a.m.-5 p.m.; closed Jan. 22; open Jan. 23-24, 9 a.m.-8 p.m.; Jan. 25-26, 9:30 a.m.-6:30 p.m.; Jan. 27, 9:30 a.m.-5 p.m.; Jan. 28, 10 a.m.-5 p.m.; closed Jan. 29. The Bookstore will resume normal hours on January 30.

Campus Bus: stops running Dec. 23, resumes service Jan. 2.

Dining Service: All facilities close after lunch Dec. 22, except for the Hill House Cafeteria and Class of 1920 Commons, which close after dinner; resume service Jan. 16. The Law School Cafeteria will be open during the break by contract to law students and on a cash basis to others.

Faculty Club: closed Dec. 23-Jan. 2; open for lunch only (11:30 a.m.-2 p.m.) weekdays Jan. 3-13; resumes normal hours Jan. 16.

Language Lab: closes Dec. 23-Jan. 2; open weekdays, Jan. 3-13, 9 a.m.-5 p.m.; resumes normal hours Jan. 16.

Mail Service: no service Dec. 26 or Jan. 2; one delivery daily (8 a.m.-1 p.m.) Dec. 27-30; resumes normal service Jan. 3. To arrange special pick-up during the break, call Ext. 8665.

Van Pelt and Lippincott Libraries: close at 5 p.m. Dec. 22-23; closed Dec. 24-26; open Dec. 27-30, 9 a.m.-5 p.m.; closed Dec. 31-Jan. 2; open weekdays Jan. 3-13, 9 a.m.-5 p.m. Normal hours will resume on Jan. 16. **The Rosengarten Reserve Library** will be closed from Dec. 23-Jan. 15.

Purchasing: closed from Dec. 23-Jan. 2.

Recreation: All facilities closed from Dec. 23-Jan. 15 except for the Hutchinson Gymnasium and Levy Tennis Pavilion. Hutchinson will be open weekdays Dec. 27-Jan. 13, 12 noon-7 p.m. The Levy Courts will be closed Christmas Day, but will be open for the rest of the break, weekdays, 7 a.m.-midnight, and weekends, 8 a.m.-midnight. Check with the Levy Pavilion office about New Year's Day, Ext. 4741.

Telephone Service: The switchboard will be open from 9 a.m.-5 p.m., Dec. 27-30.

CORRECTION: ISLAMIC LAW PROGRAM

We neglected to say in the December 6 issue that Ann Mayer is the director of the Islamic Law Program. Further information on the Program—unique in this country—is that it is designed to train lawyer specialists on the Middle East and that all the diploma requirements may be completed at Penn. (The final year abroad is optional.)

HONORS

NEH SUMMER SESSION: PROJECT DIRECTORS

Two University professors are among the 122 project directors who will conduct the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) Summer Seminars for College Teachers.

Dr. Murray G. Murphey, professor and chairman of American Civilization, and Dr. Siegfried Wenzel, professor of English, will each guide one of the 24 disciplines offered—American and Afro-American studies, and English and American Literature, respectively.

The Seminars, for the sixth year, will provide opportunities for undergraduate faculty members to work with a distinguished scholar in their area of interest.

To be held in 23 states, the 1,464 participants will be selected in a national competition. The deadline for applications is March 13, 1978. Winners will be announced in April.

Of the \$48,000, an average NEH grant for each seminar, \$30,000 will be used to provide each participant with a stipend of \$2,500 for travel and a two-month tenure.

Further information may be obtained from: The Division of Fellowships, National Endowment for the Humanities, 806 15th Street, NW, Mail Stop 101, Washington, D.C. 20506. Telephone: (202) 382-7114.

PENDER AWARD: DR. RAJCHMAN

Dr. Jan A. Rajchman, a pioneer in electron optics and computer technology, is the winner of the University's Pender Award for distinguished engineering contributions. Dr. Rajchman, who is a retired staff vice-president for information sciences at RCA Laboratories, received the award at the annual dinner meeting of Penn's Engineering Alumni Society in the University Museum on October 28. The Pender Award, established in 1972, honors the late Dr. Harold Pender, first dean of the Moore School, from 1923 to 1949.

KUDOS FROM CASE

The CASE (Council for Advancement and Support of Education) Recognition Program recognized the University very nicely. For the seventh consecutive year, *The Pennsylvania Gazette* was named "One of the Top 10" alumni publications in North America. "The Gay Minority," written by Mary Ann Meyers, won for *The Gazette* The Newsweek Award (co-sponsored by CASE) in the Public Affairs category. And for Arnold Roth's illustrations in "Poems by Chairpersons," *The Gazette* received a citation for Visual Design.

For its work on two series and a segment which was broadcast on the "Today Show" the Radio-Television Office of Communications Services received an Electronic Media Programs citation. One series, "The Course of Human Events" (produced in cooperation with KYW-Radio) was broadcast on seven other Westinghouse stations in addition to Philadelphia.

The University won Exceptional Visual Design, Exceptional Individual Publications, Periodicals Improvement (the Wharton School) and a citation for Direct Mail for Financial Support.

HONORS IN BRIEF

Dr. Harold I. Lief, professor of psychiatry, honored at the 20th annual meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Sex, was presented with a plaque citing him "for outstanding effort, meritorious achievement, and longtime service in the advancement of scientific knowledge, research and education in the field of human sexuality."

Dr. John F. Lubin, associate dean, was elected chairman of the Institute of Management Science College on Planning for 1977-8.

Dr. Dan M. McGill, professor of insurance, was elected chairman of the United Presbyterian Board of Pensions for 1977-8.

Dr. Howard E. Mitchell, UPS Foundation Professor of Human Resources and Management, was elected to Fellow status by the Council of Representatives of the American Psychological Association.

Dr. Peter Randall, professor of plastic surgery, was elected president of the American Society of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgeons.

Dr. George Rochberg, professor of music, received the 1977-78 ASCAP (American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers) Award.

Dr. Thomas L. Saaty, professor of social systems sciences, received an Institute of Management Sciences Award.

Dr. Virginia E. Schein, associate professor of management, was elected to the Council of Representatives of the American Psychological Association. Dr. Schein was also appointed to the editorial review board of the *Academy of Management Review*.

Dr. M.H. Samitz, emeritus professor of dermatology, received the Clark W. Finnerud Award at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Dermatology.

Dr. Edward J. Stemmler, dean of medicine, was awarded the honorary degree of Doctor of Science at Founder's Day Ceremonies at Ursinus College.

Richard Wernick, Pulitzer prize winner and professor of music, received the 1977-78 ASCAP (American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers) Award.

DEATHS

Clarence Brown (November 24 at 54), a cook at Hill House who joined the dining service in 1960.

Dr. Leonidas Dodson (October 15 at 77), former archivist and emeritus associate professor of history, who became affiliated with the University in 1930. Author of numerous articles and book reviews, he published a book, "Alexander Spotswood, Governor of Colonial Virginia, 1710-1722" and co-edited the "Philip Vickers Fithian Journal, 1775-1776."

Dr. William Gordon (November 5 at 78), professor emeritus at the School of Medicine, taught at the School of Medicine and Graduate Hospital for 39 years before retirement. He received both his undergraduate and medical degrees from the University.

Mykola Ostapiak (November 11 at 76), research associate in the School of Veterinary Medicine, retired in 1967 but continued working part-time until 1974.

Dr. Johannes F. Pessel (October 14 at 83), former associate professor of gastroenterology at the Graduate School of Medicine, began his association with the University in 1931.

Howard W. Reynolds (November 8 at 71), former parking attendant, joined the University in 1963.

Dr. David Emanuel Snyder (October 23 at 52), associate professor of endodontics, School of Dental Medicine, was in the departments of operative surgery and oral medicine since 1954.

Charlotte Klatt Sullivan (November 20 at 81), associate professor of dental hygiene, directed the University's dental hygiene program from its beginning in 1921. When she retired in 1962, the Dental Hygienists' Alumnae Association presented her portrait to the School of Dental Medicine.

William W. Templeton (September 19 at 23), FAS student, began his studies a few weeks before his death.

STAFF CHANGES

Dr. Valarie Swain Cade and Ann Carper are new assistants to Vice-Provost Patricia McFate. Dr. Cade is responsible for the Benjamin Franklin and University Scholar's Programs.

Nicholas D. Constan, Jr., Esq., has become manager of the employment office.

Michael Elley has been named associate chairperson of the decision sciences department, the Wharton School.

Marilyn Lucas has been named manager, development research, Development and University Relations.

Odessa McClain has been named compensation administrator in the personnel department.

Dr. Nancy Signorielli has been appointed communications research coordinator, a newly created position in the Annenberg School of Communications.

Tessa Tagle has been appointed director of the Act 101 Program in Vice-Provost McFate's office.

OPENINGS

The following listings are condensed from the Personnel Office's Bulletin of December 15. The full description is made available weekly via bulletin boards. 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. The two figures in salary listings show minimum starting salary and maximum starting salary (midpoint). An asterisk (*) before a job title indicates that the department is considering promoting from within.

ADMINISTRATIVE/PROFESSIONAL

*ASSISTANT TO CHAIRMAN develops systems for organization, direction and control of work flow, plans and estimates budget proposals, reviews teaching programs. At least five years' experience in this capacity. \$9,275-\$13,000.

ASSISTANT TO DIRECTOR responsible for program organization, cultivation and solicitation of veterinary alumni annual enlistment of officers for each program. Preferably a Penn graduate with experience in fund-raising, public relations. \$13,250-\$18,575.

ASSISTANT TO SECRETARY OF THE CORPORATION (12-6-77).

CONTRACT ADMINISTRATOR I processes applications and proposals assuring that University policy relative to publication, patents, copyrights, etc. are provided for and exceptions justified. Graduate from a college or university with a degree in business or engineering, experience in a sponsored projects office. \$11,515-\$16,125.

EDITOR (\$14,000-\$20,000) (10-4-77).

FISCAL COORDINATOR (12-6-77).

JUNIOR RESEARCH SPECIALIST (two positions) (12-6-77).

OFFICE MANAGER prepares budgets and administrative expenditures for all federal and private grants for University department. College degree or relevant experience. Excellent typing, bookkeeping and supervisory experience needed, familiarity with medical terminology helpful. \$9,275-\$13,000.

RESEARCH SPECIALIST I (two positions) (12-6-77).

RESEARCH SPECIALIST III (12-13-77).

SPACE AUDITOR (12-13-77).

STAFF NURSE/CLINIC COORDINATOR (12-6-77).

PART-TIME

PROGRAMMER ANALYST I (12-13-77).

SUPPORT STAFF

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT TO THE CORPORATION SECRETARY (12-6-77).

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I (a) (12-13-77); *(b) responsible for invoicing and coordinating of incoming and outgoing work. Basic background in photography, typing and shorthand. \$7,150-\$9,150.

BOOKKEEPER with clerical and bookkeeping duties relating to preparing bags for lot operations and controlling assignment and return of tickets. Good typing. \$6,700-\$8,575.

COMPUTER FACILITIES SECRETARY operates CRT, on-line text editor and/or IBM Mag Card. High school graduate, two years' secretarial experience. Previous experience in using computer terminal and on-line text editing equipment beneficial. \$7,700-\$9,850.

CONTRACT ACCOUNTANT (12-6-77).

DENTAL NURSE TECHNICIAN (12-13-77).

JUNIOR ACCOUNTANT coordinates data into account records, verifies expense allocation. One to two years' experience in accounting. \$7,150-\$9,150.

PAYROLL CLERK (two positions) (12-13-77).

*PHYSICAL LABORATORY TECHNICIAN II operates UHV systems and electronic equipment used in Auger electron spectroscopy. Excellent mechanical/electronics aptitude. \$7,650-\$9,800.

RECEPTIONIST greets visitors and directs them to appropriate staff, answers telephone and maintains log book of whereabouts of personnel. High school graduate with at least one year's experience. \$5,400-\$6,925.

RESEARCH BIBLIOGRAPHER I involves some library research, manuscript typing, making travel arrangements, setting up meetings. Graduate from a college or university with a major in the general area of investigation. \$7,150-\$9,150.

RESEARCH LABORATORY TECHNICIAN III (5 positions) (12-6-77).

SECRETARY II (three positions) \$6,225-\$7,975.

SECRETARY III (six positions) \$6,700-\$8,575.

SECRETARY IV types confidential material via handwritten notes or dictaphone, arranges appointments, conferences, meetings. High school graduate, at least five years' secretarial experience, dictaphone experience required. \$7,700-\$9,850.

SECRETARY, MEDICAL/TECHNICAL (seven positions) \$7,150-\$9,150.

SUPERVISOR, ASSISTANT (12-13-77).

PART-TIME

DENTAL ASSISTANT II (three positions) (12-6-77).

*PSYCHOLOGY TECHNICIAN I involves research on depressed patients' data collection, writes reports. Requires someone who has done pre-doctoral level research in cognitive factors in psychotherapy, statistical analysis computer programming, research design. Salary to be determined.

TEMPORARY LABORATORY ASSISTANT (12-6-77).

THINGS TO DO



ALMANAC: 515 Franklin Building (16) Ext. 5274

Associate Editor.....Marilyn Ackerman

Consulting Editor.....Jeanne McCleary

Design.....Jane Whitehouse