

Almanac

Published Weekly by the University of Pennsylvania
Volume 24, Number 18 January 31, 1978

- President Meyerson: State of the University
- Speaking Out

State of the University: Changes Ahead

A series of proposals offering expanded inter-departmental and inter-school opportunities and a call for more centralization of University services and other belt-tightening efforts in the wake of inflation and other economic uncertainties were the keynote themes of President Martin Meyerson's State of the University report, presented to the University Trustees at their stated meeting, January 13.

The full text of the report, "The State of the University: Achievement and Adversity," appears in today's *Almanac*, starting on page 2.

Academic Plan

One academic plan, conceived by Provost Eliot Stellar, would allow as many as half of all undergraduates to graduate from the University after four years with both a bachelor's and a master's degree. In addition, some undergraduates would work towards Ph.D. or professional degrees on a time-shortened basis.

According to President Meyerson, such a plan would improve the University's attractiveness to the decreasing number of college-bound students in the demographic pool. He also emphasized the need to integrate professional training with liberal arts education as part of the "One University" theme.

Challenges

President Meyerson described the overall mood of the report as "one of subdued and sober resolution, the expectation one of sacrifice." He cited "challenges" ahead, likely among them finding a way to increase the ratio of students to faculty without removing chances for the advancement of junior faculty or reducing personalized attention to students. President Meyerson also indicated that students would increasingly have to look towards personal loans and income from work for financial aid, and that all present planning, for academic as well as administrative functions, will have as its goal the consolidation of expenditures.

"A Number of Roles"

"Those who work at the University must come to think of themselves as playing a number of roles. . . . The coach should be called upon for more than one sport, the secretary should rarely type for a single person, the faculty member should serve as adviser and admissions recruiter for undergraduate and graduate students, as well as scholar and teacher," President Meyerson said.

He called for the increased use of word-processing centers and other centralized procedures and emphasized the importance of minimal expense budgeting as a way of fighting next year's shortfall as well as long-range financial strains. He also asserted that "now is the time. . . to establish a new compact with the state, stressing the University's contributions to the Commonwealth."

Contract Negotiations to Begin

Contract negotiations between the University and Teamsters Local 115, representing the housekeeping employees, are scheduled to begin Wednesday, February 8, according to George W. Budd, director of personnel and labor relations. Representatives will meet at the Federal Mediation and Conciliation offices in downtown Philadelphia, without a mediator present.

This will be the first negotiating session between the University and Teamsters Union to take place since a temporary agreement was signed December 12. As a result of that agreement, 302 housekeeping workers returned to the University January 9.



Carmen singing the "Habanera." See page 8.

Inquest Convened

A coroner's inquest into the death of University sophomore Robert Bazile, whose death at age 19 followed an apparent fraternity initiation last April 21, was scheduled to convene January 30. As we went to press, no details of the inquest were available. A statement from University officials is expected next week.

Senate: Nominations Requested

Pursuant to Section 11(b)(I) and (II) of the Rules of the Faculty Senate, faculty members are invited to suggest candidates for the posts and terms stated below, with supporting letters if desired. Candidates' names should be submitted promptly to the Secretary of the Senate, Helen C. Davies, c/o Faculty Senate, 303A College Hall/CO.

The following 11 posts are to be filled for 1978-79:

Chairman-Elect of the Faculty Senate (one year); incumbent: none.

Secretary-Elect of the Faculty Senate (one year); incumbent: Robert Inman.

Four Members of the Senate Advisory Committee (three years); incumbents: James W. Cornman, Barbara J. Lowery, Ann R. Miller, Thomas A. Reiner.

One Member of the Senate Advisory Committee (two years); incumbent: Gerald Frug.

Two Members of the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (three years); incumbents: Murray Gerstenhaber, Sol Goodgal.

One Member of the Replacement Pool for Academic Freedom and Responsibility (three years); incumbent: none.

One Member of the Replacement Pool for Academic Freedom and Responsibility (two years); incumbent: none.

Annenberg Center Taxed

The University has agreed to pay the city of Philadelphia an annual real estate tax of a little more than \$6,000 on the Annenberg Center's Zellerbach theater. The theater has been assessed by the city at a value of \$114,000, a revision of an earlier city assessment of \$1 million, with a resulting tax figure of \$100,000.

The State of the University: Achievement and Adversity

President Martin Meyerson presented the following report on the state of the University to the University trustees at their stated meeting, Friday, January 13.

I: 1976 and 1977

Each January as the new term begins, as Founder's Day is celebrated and the Board holds its winter stated meeting, I report to our community and our Trustees on the state of the University. Last January, I presented instead a statement on our character and mission. This month I return to a review that outlines the last two years in relation to the setting of the seventies and looks ahead to the difficult tasks facing us in 1978 and beyond. These have been years of academic achievement and financial stringency; while we continue to pursue academic excellence in the years to come, we cannot expect financial problems to abate. I begin this year's report, as I concluded last year's, with a comment from Edmund Burke—this time, his view that most difficult choices represent an option between the disagreeable and the intolerable.

During the seventies, that handful of great American research universities to which Pennsylvania belongs—those that led the world of learning in the 25 years following the second World War—have been suffering financially. Moreover, we face more "blood, sweat, and tears" in the future. The voices of those of us who have steadily been making the claim for these two dozen institutions as national assets of the greatest significance for our economic as well as cultural well-being have not been refuted by Washington, by the state capitols, by foundations, corporate firms, or private citizens—but our voices have been little heeded in practice.

With perhaps three or four exceptions, the complex independent universities have been particularly vulnerable financially. To say that the University of Pennsylvania has done better than most in this decade is not to say that we ought to be satisfied. Furthermore, these next years for our University (and for the rest of quality higher education) surely will be ones of further sacrifices.

In almost every major index of the economic health of our enterprise we can report some successes, but we must in each case take note of significant threats to the continuation of that success. This ambivalence holds true for the students we attract and their ability (with our help) to meet the costs of education, for the salaries and wages that attract and hold our faculty and staff, for our sources of income, and for our ability to control costs. Here are some pluses and minuses of the seventies:

Academic quality of students. By the beginning of this decade, other leading institutions that had not previously accepted women began to do so, thus reducing Pennsylvania's advantage with that population. Otherwise, we have by and large maintained our relative standing for predictable promise in the undergraduates we attract. For this year's freshman class, the mean verbal and mathematical score in Scholastic Aptitude Tests of our entering students continued to be over 1200. The national mean is about 800. For our regular matriculants we have held an even keel in the same high percentiles over the last six years. As for advanced professional programs, the educational quality of Pennsylvania students has been maintained or enhanced in the seventies. Given the national academic depression, there has been a decline in demand for some Ph.D. programs, but we have experienced it here less than in most independent universities.

This record, however, will be difficult to maintain. Demographically, in 1979 the largest class in history will graduate from high school. The cohort of 18-year-olds will decline gradually through 1982, then precipitately through 1993. Thus, unless the college-going rate increases beyond all expectation or unless we attract older students in large numbers, throughout the eighties we will be seeking for our undergraduate programs the top students from a drastically reduced population.

The cost of college. Though tuition and fees, room and board have increased by a percentage no greater than the rise in family income over a 25-year period, the last few years have been especially painful for middle income families with members studying in private and even public colleges and universities. Where there is demonstrated need, we help our students to meet these costs. About half of our undergraduates currently receive financial aid, although much of it must be in the form of work and loans. We manage this level despite having one of the lowest levels of gifts and endowments earmarked for financial aid among comparable institutions. Figures for last year from the Consortium on the Financing of Higher Education illustrate our situation:

Undergraduate Scholarship Support, 1976-77

	Endowment income restricted to scholarships	Endowment income restricted to scholarships per full-time student	Total scholarship grants per full-time student
Harvard	\$3,515,000	\$781	\$1,338
Princeton	3,025,000	688	942
M.I.T.	2,360,000	536	981
Yale	2,730,000	525	1,030
Stanford	2,593,000	405	1,304
Chicago	833,000	347	1,108
Dartmouth	990,000	261	899
Columbia	1,163,000	259	848
Cornell	2,929,000	246	1,060
Northwestern	1,785,000	227	1,355
Brown	753,000	148	763
Duke	711,000	123	456
Rochester	350,000	85	940
Pennsylvania	550,000	68	1,190
Vanderbilt	218,000	46	343
Hopkins	35,000	15	889

Princeton, for example, with 10 times our scholarship endowment per student, grants less in scholarship help.

If inflation continues as it has, early in the 1980s the total yearly charges for attending major independent institutions will pass the \$10,000 mark. Families will have to meet this burden from their net income after taxes. Our ability to extend aid as broadly as in the past will require significant new sources of income.

Faculty compensation. Our showing in faculty compensation in the past was dismal. We have done reasonably well in improving that record. Our recent accomplishments have included keeping faculty compensation nationally competitive and, unlike some institutions, maintaining our student-faculty ratio. (Ours is somewhat less favorable than Cornell's in crude ratios, the same as Yale's, and more favorable than the higher proportions at Columbia, Harvard, and Stanford.) Meanwhile we have also continued to hire a modicum of junior faculty without whom we grow stale. For the academic year 1976-77—the last for which these records have been published—we ranked as follows in faculty compensation:

Total Compensation for Full-time Faculty (exclusive of medicine) at Major Independent Universities 1976-77

Full Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
Harvard	Pennsylvania	Rochester
Pennsylvania	Rochester	Stanford
Columbia	Stanford	Chicago
Hopkins	Cal Tech	Pennsylvania
Yale	Chicago	Cal Tech
Cal Tech	Columbia	M.I.T.
Stanford	M.I.T.	Northwestern
Chicago	Harvard	Cornell
Rochester	Northwestern	Columbia
M.I.T.	Cornell	Harvard
Princeton	Princeton	Hopkins
Cornell (endowed colleges only)	Vanderbilt	Vanderbilt
Northwestern	Yale	Dartmouth
Vanderbilt	Hopkins	Princeton
Brown	Brown	Yale

However, the entire American professoriate is losing ground as against inflation and as against other highly trained professionals. Here too we will need great effort to maintain our standing. In the current year we have surely lost some ground.

Other wages and salaries. Whereas we gauge compensation for faculty—and for administrators who are also faculty—in a national marketplace, in other wages and salaries we attempt to perform reasonably favorably in the marketplace of other institutions in the Delaware Valley. But to perform reasonably favorably does not mean that the University can surpass the market, in its wages and benefits, by any marked degree. Comprehension of

that reality helps in understanding the labor dispute at the University during this past year. University staff, including the maintenance workers, have typically received compensation five to 10 percent superior to those for comparable jobs at other non-profit institutions, unless they are employed by government.

Given our strategy in the labor market—and it is a fair one—greater efficiency was essential, a fact not appreciated by the former union, Local 1202, nor at first by Teamster Local 115. We are now engaged in collective bargaining aimed at a fair wage for our housekeepers and at economies for an efficient maintenance operation at the University. The costs of last fall's labor dispute were considerable, but not as great as acceding in August to what the union demands would have been. Given the climbing minimum wage and federally mandated benefit programs, we know that labor costs will continue to rise. But we cannot expect to increase significantly the compensation of our white and blue collar employees at a rate greater than the cost of living.

Income prospects. Income from our endowment is among the essential sources of funds for the University. In the last few years, returns on our investments have compared well with other institutions, yet we and all institutions have suffered greatly from the performance of the securities markets. Current prospects for these markets are uncertain at best.

Meanwhile, our income from private, state, and federal gifts, grants, and other sources during the seventies will easily surpass all funding from these sources in the entire previous history of the University, though not necessarily when inflation is taken into account. Our receipts for current operations from these sources in the seventies, reinforced in the private sector by the Program for the Eighties, exceeded \$700 million. For private gifts, in 1974-75 we stood fourth in the country among independent colleges and universities—by far the highest ranking we have ever achieved—and in 1975-76 we were sixth. Major foundations that offer grants for general purposes provided the least help in achieving these levels. For example, in 1967 the Ford Foundation made major grants to 12 independent universities, including Pennsylvania, that totaled \$65,245,000; by 1975, their total for significant awards to these institutions had fallen to \$4,585,000.

Thus we are greatly dependent upon generous individual benefactors and corporations, and their generosity has been extraordinary. The Ware College House and Levy Park are only examples of the confidence of good friends that permanently enriches life at the University. Recent, particularly encouraging gifts include the papers, music, and memorabilia of renowned contralto Marian Anderson, \$100,000 from the Ford Motor Company for the Wharton School, nearly \$300,000 in trust from Allen R. and Carlotta Howard to be divided between the Veterinary school and the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, over \$425,000 from the Dupont Company for the Engineering and Wharton schools, over \$500,000 from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation for a Dental Medicine project, \$1 million from Mr. and Mrs. Edmund J. Kahn to endow a library purchase fund, \$1,650,000 from the Muscular Dystrophy Association for laboratories, and of course our three challenge grants in arts and sciences: \$400,000 from the Ford Foundation for South Asia studies, \$575,000 from the Mellon Foundation for Early American studies, and \$1,140,000 from the National Endowment for the Humanities. We are announcing that the Annenberg Chair in the Social Sciences—the first of three endowed by the Ambassador and his family—will be filled by sociology professor Renee Fox. Furthermore, we expect to announce later this month three additional grants to endow chairs and support one of our schools from a corporate foundation, a corporation, and a private donor. The unfortunate fact remains that, given unprecedented increases in our costs and constraints upon our revenues, success in the Program for the Eighties cannot by itself assure us of financial stability in the eighties and beyond.

Our state appropriation for 1976-77 was set at \$17,791,000, the highest we have received and the highest received by any independent institution except Cornell, where the presence of statutory, state-owned colleges in Veterinary Medicine, Agriculture, Industrial and Labor Relations, and Human Ecology creates a special situation. The basic support for the University from the Commonwealth, however, does not keep up with inflation. Simply to match inflation for a single year, our state appropriation for fiscal 1978 should have been \$1 million higher; instead, there were shortfalls in the revenues produced by the General Assembly's tax bills of December, and the Governor cut our funds for the current year to \$16.4 million. Given the Commonwealth's fiscal problems, increases in our appropriations that keep pace with inflation are open to question.

As for the federal government, between July 1, 1970 and June 30, 1977, we received grants and contracts totaling \$376,000,000. That compares with \$292,000,000 received in all previous years. The most recent year for which the federal government issued comparative figures on its support to universities, primarily for sponsored research, is 1975-76. Those figures

reveal that, out of some 2,500 institutions receiving federal monies for all purposes, the University of Pennsylvania stood in thirteenth place, only a few thousand dollars behind the twelfth highest. This position is one rank higher than the previous year, and the highest in many years. Of those above us, only M.I.T., Stanford, Columbia, and Harvard are independent institutions. Among recipients of funds from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Pennsylvania stood seventh; among National Science Foundation recipients, tenth. If we turn to the 1975 tables for research and development in academic science alone, Pennsylvania stands ninth. Unlike some comparable institutions, our total rose, even though academic science has experienced a decline in its share of the federal dollar. And in the biomedical research funded by the National Institutes of Health, Pennsylvania ranks among the nation's top leaders. Moreover, in the competition for fellowships and traineeships supported by HEW, NIH, and NSF, in 1975 Pennsylvania ranked fifth, and the fourth and fifth positions differed minimally.

Though the University of Pennsylvania has thus fared relatively well in recent years, the United States continues to fall behind in the proportion of Gross National Product going to basic research. For example, since 1969 federal support for research and development in all areas has declined at a rate of one percent per year, in constant dollars; for fiscal 1975 alone the decline in payments to universities from the prior year was eight percent in real terms. The share of the federal budget committed to research and development fell from a high of 12.6 percent in 1965 to 6.2 percent in 1975. Particularly noticeable is the sharp drop since 1971, even in real dollars, in fellowships and traineeships—a drop of more than 38 percent from 1974 to 1975 alone. There is little reason to suppose that the decline of federal support for university research will soon be reversed, although it may be arrested, nor is the government likely to reinvest heavily in graduate fellowships. With such prospects, we cannot look to federal sources for substantial increases in funding. We may hope to retain or improve our position relative to peer institutions, but redoubled efforts by our already hard-working faculty researchers will be required.

Cost management. We finished the last two fiscal years slightly in the black for general operations. We have been able to remain in this rough balance for the last couple of years by a number of painful measures. Through attrition, early retirement, and unfilled vacancies we have reduced staff at all levels and in all functions, particularly in administrative services. We have twice instituted temporary hiring freezes, and we have put in place hiring review procedures for both faculty and staff to insure that positions are needed and that funds are available to support them. Like all comparable institutions, to increase revenues we have resorted to steep rises in tuition charges, particularly in the health schools. The Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania dramatically improved its financial performance, ceasing to be a drain on our budget. Further relief is being provided by actions with benefits largely in the future such as divestiture of Graduate Hospital, and by accounting measures such as the deferral of campaign expenses to be repaid from subsequent receipts.

These measures promise no long-term resolution, for they cannot affect rates of growth in our cost of operations. The simple fact is that inflation continues to escalate our expenses at a greater rate than our revenues. One clear index is the rise in our costs for energy from \$2.2 million in 1970 to \$9.8 million in 1977. As I have remarked, failure of income to keep pace with inflation is particularly notable in our Commonwealth appropriation. Now, with the Governor's recent cut in funds to the major universities (in our case \$1.35 million, particularly damaging to our School of Veterinary Medicine), we face despite our best efforts a serious deficit of over \$1 million for the current fiscal year already half-over. The Veterinary school is taking emergency steps to meet this situation, including reduction of services, an increase in clinical fees, personnel reductions by attrition at the maximum rate, and solicitation of one-time private gifts to current operations. Of necessity, however, a shortfall on a scale this massive must be met by economies spread throughout the University.

Even more significant is a shortfall of \$5 million or more facing us as we plan the budget for 1978-79. Though the combined budget of the University is well over \$300 million, this deficit must be made up from the basic educational component of the budget which barely totals \$100 million. As the Budget Committee noted this fall,

Even if the University were to set tuitions higher than we wish to do and to increase salaries by less than we feel is deserved, it is clear that the expense of ongoing unrestricted programs must be reduced by another several million dollars next year. Such reductions have become an annual necessity.

My colleagues and I continue to develop measures to address the persistent gap between available resources and desirable educational programs and their supporting services. In the second part of this report, I review directions for enhancing our education while conserving our resources.

During these past two years we have been particularly aided in our schools by our boards of overseers, most of which are headed by Trustees, and each of which is composed of distinguished leaders including concerned friends and alumni. These groups, which the Trustees and I initiated a few years ago, serve as sounding boards and sources of inspiration, working with administrators and faculty. I wish to thank those chairpersons who have taken on these assignments: for Arts and Sciences Carl Kayser, for Engineering C.B. McCoy, for Fine Arts Marietta Tree, for Law Frederick Ballard, for Social Work Mrs. Morton Langsfeld, for Veterinary Medicine Charles Wolf, and for the Wharton School Reginald Jones.

I should also like to acknowledge the many intellectual achievements of our faculty, something we take for granted at a distinguished university and cannot adequately report in any compressed fashion. Some of these achievements, fortunately, are reported in *Almanac*, in departmental reports, and at commencement. Such successes, of our faculty and of our programs, give purpose to our struggle for financial stability. Our colleagues continue to lead nationwide scholarly and professional organizations, to edit learned journals, and to win external acknowledgement of their gifts at a gratifying rate in such prestigious awards as the fellowships of the National Science Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Social Science Research Council, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the Guggenheim Foundation, as well as elections to such honorary associations as the National Academy of Science. I shall mention particularly the Nobel Prize for Medicine awarded to Barry Blumberg for his work on hepatitis and the Pulitzer Prize for Music that went to Richard Wernick, one of several outstanding composers at Pennsylvania, for his Bicentennial composition, *Vision of Terror and Wonder*. University researchers also continue to make major discoveries that serve not only human knowledge but the public interest: the development of a rabies vaccine by Dr. Hilary Koprowski, director of the Wistar Institute, was followed most recently by Dr. Robert Austrian's vaccine for bacterial pneumonia.

Though we have not aimed to expand the size of our faculty in this period, judicious use of the Provost's reinvestment fund has allowed us to make major appointments of a few scholars who have built distinguished careers elsewhere and add new dimensions to our research and teaching programs. The remarkably high standard represented by these appointments is one in which we can take great pride.

A substantial number of these additions to our scholarly strengths are in arts and sciences, and I cannot close this portion of my review without taking note of the flowering of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. In the last three-and-a-half years more than 500 scholars in some three dozen disciplines, drawn from four prior schools with disparate goals and student clienteles, have forged themselves into a smoothly functioning body. Dean Vartan Gregorian has drawn together an able, respected staff and a governance structure that can record a number of accomplishments. A significant step toward resolving our lengthy discussion of how best to organize graduate studies in the arts and sciences is the decision of the 13 graduate groups in biomedical sciences—groups which include some 270 colleagues in medicine, dental medicine, veterinary medicine, and nursing—to affiliate with the Faculty of Arts and Sciences for coordination of doctoral programs. They now work together with the committee structure of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences to set requirements, integrate course offerings, select new faculty, coordinate research efforts, and in general to establish Ph.D. degrees with a common standard of excellence throughout the theoretical disciplines.

Like every aspect of the University, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences must cope with the financial and other problems that face us. They have taken steps both to increase support for their programs—and their endowment is an unusually small one—and to focus resources not only to maintain but to enhance their strengths. The Faculty of Arts and Sciences development advisory board has advanced varied, imaginative funding proposals for new research institutes in the social sciences, the humanities, and the mathematical sciences that promote interdisciplinary research in such areas as the best social uses of science and technology, ethnic identities in multicultural societies, and the application of mathematical models to contemporary problems like energy supply and transportation systems. Detailed information on student enrollments, faculty time allocation, tenure profiles, and the like has been gathered for all departments, to permit careful planning for future deployment of resources, reinforcement of excellent programs and improvement of weaker ones. External teams of distinguished scholars from across the nation are participating in the evaluation of the goals, strengths, and weaknesses of every Faculty of Arts and Sciences department. To name a few of the renowned chairmen of evaluation committees, we are grateful to Aaron Lemonick, dean of faculty and professor of physics at Princeton; to Kenneth Pitzer, former president of Stanford and professor of chemistry at Berkeley; to Seymour Martin Lipset, professor of sociology and political science at Stanford; to Donald

Fanger, chairman of Slavic languages at Harvard; and to Georges May, professor of Romance languages at Yale.

The Faculty of Arts and Sciences shares the challenges that, as I have outlined, confront us all. Moreover, its vigor provides a most salutary influence on the strength of the professional schools, on the cohesion of separate parts of the University, and on the subtle pervasiveness of academic values.

II: 1978

As I have remarked, we share with other major independent universities most of the dilemmas of the seventies. The measures I believe we must take to resolve those dilemmas and renew our achievements, however, are based on understanding the distinctive nature of the University of Pennsylvania. My broad-brush statement of just a year ago was inevitably both descriptive and prescriptive. Descriptively, I remarked upon the qualities that surround us daily: our record of excellence as a research institution in the generation of new knowledge and insight, new tools for the exploration of further frontiers, and new forms of creative expression; the strength of our professional schools in educating expert practitioners of the highest distinction; our "mixed economy" of private and public support; the special flavor given to our collegial life by a unified, concentrated campus located in the core of a culturally vibrant metropolis. These are features on which we build.

Prescriptively, however, I spoke of aspirations for what our mission ought to be. I emphasized then and I repeat now the special balance that ought to define our University—and incidentally, to dispel the foolish will-o'-the-wisp of an "identity crisis" of which some speak or write. We are taking advantage of our opportunity for a unique amalgam of scholarly disciplines and professions, theoretical knowledge and its applications, scholarship and teaching, a diversified, cosmopolitan atmosphere and intimate, personal attention to our students, curricula that provide penetrating specialized skills and educational breadth. However, we are still too modest in our efforts to grasp fully this special opportunity for linkage, for cross-fertilization, for cooperative ventures.

Let me state some cardinal principles that demonstrate our need for prompt action, especially toward confirming the amalgam. In some cases I shall delineate as well steps to be taken, steps which taken together can strengthen our future.

- As has been true for a dozen years or more, the majority of undergraduate students attracted to Pennsylvania in the foreseeable future—and especially the most academically talented of them—will expect to continue at commencement or shortly thereafter to advanced professional or graduate training. We must assure to them a broad-gauged, rigorous foundation of general education in advance of the specialization on which they are intent. And we must certify by the courses we offer, as we do by our "One University" theme, that liberal education is not the sole province of the arts and sciences, but that the learned professions contribute to it as well. As the Trustee Committee on Educational Policy learned last October, both Engineering and Applied Science and the Wharton School have examined ways in which liberal learning can be most valuably integrated into the programs of their undergraduate professional students. In addition, Wharton has offered thematic studies courses on management in American life that consider such issues as the social role of the business executive, and Engineering has designed the Bachelor of Applied Science for students who seek not professional engineering training but technological literacy. The Faculty of Arts and Sciences, acting on a working document provided by the deliberations of the Committee on Undergraduate Education headed by Robert Schrieffler, is in the process of devising a core curriculum of general knowledge appropriate to the liberally educated individual.

Now the bridge between these efforts must be crossed, in both directions. We are uniquely equipped to offer such a synthesis, one that gives Pennsylvania graduates an unusual preparation for the demands of today's world of complex issues and unpredictable change by including in their education acquaintance with the problems, theories, and methods raised by studies in the law, in engineering, in design, in the planning sciences, in medical studies, in social, public, and economic administration. I have asked the Provost and the Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Studies, working together with the deans of graduate as well as undergraduate schools, to draw together the welcome initiatives taken by the faculties thus far into a roster of general education courses from all schools, available to all undergraduates. Through its fusion of disciplinary and applied learning this collaborative effort could produce a definition of liberal learning new in American educational history, one which no university has a greater right to herald than we. In turning to such courses our students will achieve a valued breadth that no single undergraduate school can offer them.

- The attractive power of independent education at the undergraduate level will continue to reside in the ability of private universities to provide to students flexible programs suitable to their particular goals and instruction that offers personal attention from a distinguished faculty. Pennsylvania currently offers such options as early admission to the University following the third year of high school, the varied experience of courses at Bryn Mawr, Haverford, or Swarthmore, apprenticeship through independent study with the research scholars of our faculty, the chance to complete a bachelor's and a master's degree simultaneously, and the University Scholars program that permits able students to continue from a bachelor's degree straight through a graduate or professional degree, in highly individualized fashion and at an appropriate pace. But we have not taken full advantage of these benefits of our openness, our variety, and our outstanding faculty.

Now our Provost—building on the work of the Development Commission of five years ago, which he chaired—has made an imaginative proposal greatly to expand the opportunities for our undergraduates to obtain an advanced degree as well as a bachelor's degree at Pennsylvania. At one and the same time, this joint venture would enable breadth and concentration to best complement each other and would improve the attractiveness of both our undergraduate and our advanced programs to the ablest students. Eventually, as many as half of our first-degree candidates might be facilitated in working toward the M.A., the Ph.D., or any of our 22 advanced professional degrees in medicine, law, management, engineering, veterinary medicine, city planning, social work, and the like. The Provost intends to go forward on vigorous development of this plan, working together with his vice-provosts, the deans, and the Educational Policy Committee.

- The quality of student life on the campus is central to the ambience and richness of the University. Through cultural as well as living experiences in our College Houses and through cocurricular programs in recreation, athletics, visual and performing arts, and numerous other student activities, we will maintain this important dimension to the student's education, for we understand that the range of learning extends far beyond the classroom. But we expect that, for economic reasons, students themselves will need to conduct these activities far more extensively in the future—an excellent exercise in initiative, incidentally.

Other essential student services in support of academic life include academic advising, admissions, financial aid, counseling, career advising, and placement. All of these services are valuable, but all of them are costly. Thus we must better organize these important functions for both maintenance of quality and reduction of costs. Many faculty members already provide invaluable assistance in academic support functions such as advising and counseling, recruitment and admissions. As the Faculty Senate's Committee on Education reported last May, "There is a widespread feeling that there needs to be a greater faculty involvement in the process of advising students." When our professional staffs for these services are reduced, those faculty skilled in sympathetic guidance can expect that their time and talents will be called upon more than has been the case in the recent past. During the course of this term, the Provost, the vice-provosts, and the Council of Deans will be developing a set of appropriate policies and practices. The contributions of faculty are particularly welcome in the life of our college houses, where programs must inevitably be run with less support from University funds than we would wish. Perhaps we can also provide greater opportunities for graduate students from every school to participate in these special environments, both offering guidance to their younger fellow students and themselves sharing in the community of the intellect that reaches from freshman to senior professor.

- Our doctoral programs will continue to confront problems both in the decline of external support for graduate training and in the decline of traditional academic employment in all but a few disciplines. We must therefore assure that the Ph.D. programs we offer are superb, that they attract superlative students—including the very best of our own undergraduates—and that they offer the superior fellowship support that underwrites the candidates' desire to study with our best faculty.

To maintain such a standard, we ought to accept fewer students than we have prepared in the past—those with the brightest promise, best able to profit from what we can offer—and we should fund them better. One of the results of higher standards of admission may well be that we shall maintain fewer graduate groups granting the Ph.D. The report that the Academic Planning Committee, superseded just over a year ago by the Educational Planning Committee, presented to University Council in November, 1976, enunciated a succinct set of norms for measurement and priorities for supporting those programs which are already nationally preeminent, highly promising, or central to the core of our enterprise. The deans, through the Provost, will continue analysis, budgeting, and staffing plans on the basis of such criteria. Applying such guidelines should so strengthen

our programs as to bring us fledgling student-scholars whose future contributions will add special lustre to the graduate groups who trained them, and to our University.

- Many students know that some doctorates are limited assets in today's economy, yet they wish to explore in further depth, to extend their knowledge and competence beyond what undergraduate studies normally permit. In addition, many students come to Pennsylvania sufficiently well prepared and energetic that they are able to complete a B.A. in less than four years' time. Vigorous master's degree programs in arts and sciences as well as the professions are required to challenge accelerating students, to acknowledge the achievements of those who exceed undergraduate requirements, and to provide further mastery short of a scholarly doctorate. Smooth integration of undergraduate studies with these master's degrees, as well as provision for such degrees to those who had been undergraduates elsewhere, should attract talented, highly motivated students to the unique potential that Pennsylvania's variety can promise. The dean of each school, particularly of arts and sciences, is being asked to propose to the Provost and his staff new patterns for extending students' knowledge in this fashion.

- Professional education at Pennsylvania will in most cases continue to be in great demand. Our highly prized, nationally ranked professional schools must nonetheless continually reexamine their goals and programs, in part to insure that their graduates leave Pennsylvania broadly educated men and women, as well as experts. In some professional schools, where capacity permits and student demand is high, we should probably plan to increase enrollments. Deans of schools where growth is appropriate should be able to call upon colleagues in the arts and sciences disciplines to help provide instruction in some of the theoretical bases for their professions.

Many opportunities exist for cooperation between the professional schools and the arts and sciences, to the enrichment of both and the wise concentration of our intellectual resources. The recently formed biomedical faculty of graduate groups, for instance, might be asked to teach jointly the professional preclinical programs in the basic life sciences of the health schools, and to develop a new undergraduate major in the life sciences given our strengths in this area, one of unparalleled magnificence. I have urged the Vice-President for Health Affairs, working through the Provost and with the dean of arts and sciences and the health deans, to extend the emerging possibilities offered by formation of the Biomedical Council.

- Responsibility center management has been an important asset to the development of our budgets and our academic plans. It has made the numerous decision-makers in the constellation of schools that forms our University very well aware, first of the costs of their programs and the revenues available to support them, then—inevitably—of the importance of reducing their costs and increasing their revenues. However, as resources have grown scarcer, responsibility center budgeting has also helped to induce the melancholy result Judge Learned Hand once described: "A society in which each is willing to surrender only that for which he can see a personal equivalent is not a society at all...." It is specifically not "one university."

In this period of economic stress, the centers must become less self-absorbed and separate hoarders of resources, more willing contributors to each other and to the University as a whole. As I have said, they should be prepared to offer teaching power to others' programs, with an informing vision of the whole University's curricula before them. Provost Stellar and I, with a committee of five deans which we have established, will develop promptly a system for appropriate exchange that better combines relative autonomy for each school with central University objectives, including particularly but not exclusively financial responsibility. The present tendencies are too centrifugal. One existing device to combat the parochialism that austerity brings is use of the Provost's reinvestment fund, a pool of money set aside from general income and from achieved cost-reductions to strengthen our highest priority programs. Difficult as the task may seem in a period of economic stress, we shall aim to increase this fund and its impact. In addition, the Program for the Eighties should generate significant new money to support an Academic Opportunity or Venture Fund, which will allow us to take advantage of other creative initiatives for academic improvement.

- In order to concentrate upon academic priorities, our schools and all parts of the University need to save on their controllable costs: clerical and other support services, space use, travel, telephones, equipment, supplies. To help move to more austere patterns of operation, I have asked the Executive Director of the Budget to prepare for this year an alternative method of budgeting that runs parallel and acts as a check to our customary procedures.

In consultation with the deans and others, the Budget Director has therefore designed a set of "minimal expense budgets," based not upon prior

prior years' activities but upon contractual commitments to faculty and upon certain modest but realistic assumptions for support staff and services of the most skeletal nature consistent with maintaining programs. These minimal budgets will be used as benchmarks to test the relative effectiveness of plans to overcome next year's projected shortfall. We shall now collaboratively develop guidelines such as suggested ceilings on administrative expense within the centers. Beginning with fiscal 1979 and increasingly thereafter, the Provost and I will use these minimal expense budgets as a starting point for setting University subventions to the schools and the other centers. Minimal expense budgeting is a rudimentary form, but an operationally feasible form, of zero base budgeting.

- The uncontrollable costs of operating the University—insurance, energy and other utility charges, wages and benefits set by collective bargaining agreements, interest, and the like—will continue to rise. But some of the other charges for central administrative services borne by the schools and centers as indirect costs, however, offer some potential for savings, even though large and painful savings have already been made. Across-the-board paring of administrative staffs and budgets will not suffice either to achieve savings in the amounts needed or to maintain responsive services at an appropriate level. Rather, consolidations and reductions in scale are needed, for example pooling the personnel, space, and budgets of offices that perform related necessary functions. The integration now underway of all student billing agencies into a single, consolidated bursar's office is an example.

I am charging the Senior Vice-President for Management and Finance with coordination of the vice-presidents and directors who manage our financial and operational services in working out such arrangements for pooling, based upon variance in peak work-loads. The Comptroller's, Treasurer's, and Budget Director's offices are an example. In addition, all offices throughout any given building require large amounts of clerical services; more centralized use of word-processing and other techniques for the automation of office work is long overdue.

Offices such as development and communications, vital as their operations are to the long-range welfare of the University, must find ways to rely more on volunteer help, both inside and outside the University. To this end I am asking the Senior Vice-President, Program for the Eighties, and our Vice-President for Development and University Relations and their associates to set forth their priorities so that spare expenditures on fund-raising will have the greatest possible impact on our operating budget and best amplify the efforts of the Trustees who are ultimately responsible for the success of the Program for the Eighties. I shall review their suggestions with the Development Policy Committee of the Trustees, along with our specific plans for a modest mid-course correction in the direction of the campaign developed by our Associate Provost. Meanwhile, I am asking our Vice-President for Administration to help reduce the costs of our communications operations and yet to enhance the quality of the most essential services.

The consequences of such consolidation to the style of our daily lives are sharp. Moreover, as new positions in faculty and administration ranks become increasingly scarce, we must be especially sensitive to the social and human concerns of a period of retrenchment. In spite of the small number of new positions available, we must keep alive our commitment to the principles of affirmative action on the appointment of women and minority group members. When our affirmative action plan—the first in this region to be approved—was prepared in 1973, support was strong; since then, we have had mixed success. The number of women on our faculty has increased considerably and the number of minority members noticeably, though from such a tiny base that the challenge has just begun to be met. While it is difficult to make great strides at a time when little hiring can occur, we must respond with increased commitment and imagination. The Provost and I have therefore asked our Council on Equal Opportunity, composed of faculty and staff representatives from each school and administrative office, to review our plan, our goals, and our means for achieving them.

Finally, the central administrative structure of the University is being carefully examined with the aim of reorganizing for the best use of the time, energies, and capacities of our officers. A committee of Trustees chaired by Robert Trescher, and just recently a faculty committee led by successive Senate chairmen Robert Lucid and Irving Kravis, each have submitted reports proposing various changes for our structure and governance procedures. They will help my administrative colleagues and me as we absorb the alternatives before us and work toward sensitive solutions to the complex problems of managing our University.

- As the figures I noted earlier suggest, the decline in federal sponsorship for scientific research and the current high level of effort in most parts of the University capable of attracting federal funding make it unlikely that we can do vastly better. But some schools, departments, and areas of operation still

can improve their record in attracting federal awards. Therefore the Provost and I are asking the Vice-Provost for Graduate Studies and Research to select and assign a staff member to monitor, encourage, and extend the advantage we take of opportunities for federal support, wherever in the University it may be appropriate. Further, since various key persons much involved in governmental affairs—from tax legislation to compliance with regulations on employment and construction—are located throughout the University, I have asked our Vice-President for Administration, who formerly served as administrative assistant to Senator (now Vice-President) Walter Mondale, to bring these many people together in ways that provide good coverage without unnecessary duplication of efforts.

- Finally, we must face the special issue of Commonwealth support. In the midst of our recent half year's travail in Harrisburg, I was sometimes tempted to fantasize about the \$350 million of added endowment that would be required for the University to operate without state funds. Such fantasies were especially tempting when members of the General Assembly felt impelled to intervene in the labor dispute on our campus. I was ruefully reminded of one of life's facts for university presidents these days: payers of pipers—whether the federal or state government, or donors from the private sector—are often inclined to call the tune. It is therefore necessary for distinguished universities to set the limits of intervention, to decide under what circumstances we accept funds.

As a safeguard to our independence we also diversify our sources of support, maintaining a "mixed economy" as I frequently term it, a mixed economy that includes Commonwealth support. The University's eighteenth-century charter contained a provision for public support, though aid was sporadic in the nineteenth century until, in 1895, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania appropriated \$205,000 for our use. Support for us has been continuous now for 75 years, an example of public-private collaboration virtually unique in America.

This year will be a time of change in Harrisburg, change that challenges the University to rebuild our relationship to the Commonwealth on a new and firmer foundation. The leadership in the General Assembly is substantially new, and a new governor will be elected later this year. Moreover, representatives from all spheres of Pennsylvania post-secondary education, under the aegis of the State Board of Education, are engaged in preparing a periodic master plan to coordinate the efforts of higher education throughout the Commonwealth. This master planning process will culminate in the months to come. It affords an opportunity to attempt to point the direction of our state relations for the future. We shall use this opportunity, first of all, to state anew the contributions we make to the Commonwealth: the largest non-governmental payroll in southeast Pennsylvania; the winner of a third of all federal research grants to the state; the great yardstick of quality advanced education; the educator of most veterinarians, of research physicians and dentists, of key members of the bench, of distinguished academicians for the Commonwealth. Furthermore, though our students are drawn from across the nation as well as within the state, a very high proportion of both groups remain in the Commonwealth to contribute economically and intellectually throughout their careers.

Now is the time not only to reassert our historic role in Commonwealth education, but also to establish a new compact with the state. As part of our participation in the new master plan for higher education in Pennsylvania, my associates and I shall work with the Governor, State Board of Education, and other representatives from the state executive and the General Assembly, to explore revised and equitable arrangements for our future affiliation with the Commonwealth. In this enterprise we shall need to enlist the advice and counsel of Trustees, alumni, and indeed all friends of our University and of excellence in education in this state.

My report on the state of the University during the past two years and my sketch of the immediate future are as full of problems as of promise. It is true that, even as inflation sapped the country's economy and our assets, we have to date been roughly holding our own in our financial performance, in attracting students of high calibre to seek a Pennsylvania education, and in the gifted faculty and broad range of programs constantly renewed that they find here. To enhance these achievements in the future, more will be demanded of us, both in adding income and in cutting costs. To do as much or more with fewer resources has been our task for the last few years and must continue to be our task.

This review of the opportunities offered by our nature, however, shows that—in contrast to many other colleges and universities—hopeful avenues do exist for Pennsylvania. The quality and the attractiveness of our educational enterprise do not depend entirely on the amount of our resources. There are academic steps we can take to utilize our greatest faculty strengths and redirect our existing resources, when we cannot expect incremental additions to them.

The mood this report calls for, I believe, is one of subdued and sober resolution, the expectation one of sacrifice. The demands upon us can be viewed as a set of challenges, which I here append in summary:

- The ratio of our students to our faculty will probably have to increase over the next decade, by changing one or both of the variables. But we cannot and will not remove the chance for advancement of the junior faculty, nor reduce the personalized attention that is the hallmark of expensive private education.
- Salaries and wages will have difficulty exceeding inflation.
- We shall work to expand our sources of institutionally funded financial aid. Meanwhile, undergraduates must expect their aid to include large portions of self-help from loans and from work.
- Our present planning, for academic as well as administrative service functions, will give close examination to opportunities for consolidation to achieve savings on overheads.
- Those who work at the University must come to think of themselves as playing a number of roles. Wider latitude in our endeavors is required of us all. The coach should be called upon for more than one sport, the secretary should rarely type for a single person, the faculty member should serve as adviser and admissions recruiter for undergraduate and graduate students, as well as scholar and teacher. The challenge is to accomplish as much as we have with less means to achieve it.
- We respect the financial constraints and the competing demands on the resources of the Commonwealth. Yet we are convinced that we serve it and its citizens well at low cost. We must persuade state leaders anew to support

our University and the Commonwealth's other institutions of higher education, not only financially, but also in the pursuit of quality.

These efforts, in finances and in lifestyle, are summoned from every individual and every program in the University. To maintain our educational character yet attain the necessary fiscal relief requires them, and I set them before us now as an agenda for 1978. We need as never before a sharpness of focus, yet also a measure of zest and a vision of common purpose.

Women's Center Offers Courses

Penn Women's Center, at Houston Hall, is offering courses and programs on assertiveness training, consciousness raising, sexuality, leadership and math anxiety starting the week of February 6. For further information, call the Women's Center at Ext. 8611.

Master for Stouffer

Tenured faculty members interested in the mastership of Stouffer College House for a term beginning either this spring or next fall are cordially invited to express their interest to Dr. Samuel Martin, chairman of the Search Committee, Ext. 5611, or to Robert Hill, associate director of Residential Living, Ext. 7515.

Speaking Out

Turnabout

To the Editor:

During the fall semester the University community was bombarded with a series of public statements from the University administration which were designed to justify the firing of the housekeeping workers last August for the purpose of saving money. We were told again and again that the firings were final and that the employment of outside contractors would accomplish a great deal to reduce the University's deficits. We were urged to write to our state representatives to ask them to pay no attention to the lobbyists for the Teamsters Union and to vote for the University appropriation.

The December 13 issue of *Almanac* reported that the University has completely abandoned its former stand and has surrendered to the demands of the teamsters. Now we find that the administration has, in effect, admitted that it was wrong to do what it did since it has offered to pay the difference between unemployment compensation and previous take-home pay.

What possible justification can be given for this fiasco? The University has been made to look ridiculous to the public and in addition, much money has simply been wasted. We are continually told by the administration that money is short and that we must reduce expenses everywhere, and yet, when some harebrained scheme such as the firing of

the housekeeping personnel is proposed, there seems to be money to burn. Why is it that when expenses must be cut it is always the educational units of the University that must do the cutting?

In order not to sound completely negative, I would like to offer the following money-saving proposals: fire the entire University administration from the president on down to the lowest official and hire an outside contractor to perform all necessary administrative services. The outside contractor would, of course, be held to strict standards of competent performance. Who knows how much money could be saved in this way and how much more efficient our administration could be?

—Paul M. Lloyd,

Department of Romance Languages

Gerald Robinson, executive director of personnel relations, responds: One of the lessons learned by the University administration as a result of the labor dispute with Local 115 is that the University, because it is subject to public scrutiny and to political pressures, is, in actuality, not a private institution subject to the same decision making process or application of the law.

Many factors contributed to the decision to discontinue the housekeeping operation, specifically economics, legalities, and the union's refusal to bargain alternative cost savings. The

economic justification was obvious. We could save \$750,000 by discontinuing our housekeeping operation. Certainly private business would have made the same decision with success, providing it bargained the decision with the union. The University acted on sound business principles and in accordance with legal precedent in attempting to bargain the discontinuation of the housekeeping operations.

It is our responsibility to continually seek opportunities to reduce costs without affecting the quality of education, and this was one opportunity to do so. However, this was not so obvious to the legislators in Harrisburg, who, unfortunately, were influenced by union lobbying. With the addition of this new dimension, the University was confronted with yet another economic decision: that of sacrificing \$17 million to save \$750,000. The administration could not have sacrificed the \$17 million; that unquestionably would have had a serious impact on the quality of academic life at the University. The "make whole" provision devised in Harrisburg for the laid-off housekeepers materially assisted them and secured the University appropriation. After the union had indicated its willingness to discuss cost savings, the University agreed to reinstate the housekeeping staff.

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.

Openings

The following listings are condensed from the Personnel Office's Bulletin of January 26. Dates in parentheses refer to the Almanac issue in which a complete job description appeared. Bulletin boards in 13 locations throughout the campus list full descriptions. Those interested should contact Personnel Services, Ext. 7285. The University of Pennsylvania is an equal opportunity employer. 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 Director (12-20-77). **Assistant General Counsel** (1-17-78).

Assistant Dean (1-24-78). **Associate Development Officer I** (1-17-78).

***Associate Editor, Book Series** writes proposals; responsible for editing assignments; copy-edits. B.A., five years' writing and editing experience. \$11,525-\$16,125.

Department Head I responsible for all processing and personnel in the serial, periodical and binding sections. Master's degree in library science, knowledge of LC classification and cataloging, OCLC cataloging computer terminals. \$11,525-\$16,125.

Director, Small Animal Hospital has responsibility for financial and operational management. Five to 10 years of experience in hospital administration. Salary to be determined.

Editor (10-4-77). ***Head Nurse** (1-17-78).

Junior Research Specialist (1-24-78). **Programmer-Analyst II** (1-24-78).

***Research Specialist II** (one year) does archaeological research into prior archaeological work at Valley Forge. Experienced historic sites archaeologist required. Salary to be determined.

Space Auditor (1-17-78). **Staff Writer II** (1-24-78).

Support Staff

Administrative Assistant I (two positions) (a) (1-24-78—bookkeeping); (b) (1-24-78—secretary/receptionist).

Administrative Assistant to the Corporation Secretary (12-6-77).

Administrative Assistant II (two positions) (a) responsible for organization and coordination of executive director's work flow (business school graduate); (b) responsible for work flow and supervision of secretaries (college graduate or equivalent experience). \$7,700-\$9,850.

Cashier (three positions) should be available to work occasionally until 6:30 p.m. weekdays and on Saturdays. Hourly wages.

Clerk, Accounts Payable \$6,225-\$7,975.

Clerk III \$6,225-\$7,975.

Head Stockkeeper \$7,150-\$9,150.

Herdsman II responsible for all phases of animal husbandry for an experimental herd of cows, flock of sheep. High school graduate; farm experience. \$5,725-\$7,325.

Licensed Practical Nurse (two positions) weighs patients, obtains specimens, performs basic lab tests. LPN experience in OB-GYN patient care. \$7,750-\$9,500.

***Office Automation Operator** enters test on computer and proofreads copy. Highly developed typing skills. \$6,225-\$7,975.

Project Budget Assistant prepares monthly commitment and expenditure reports on the status of current grants, contracts and budgets. One to two years' experience. \$7,150-\$9,150.

Receptionist, Medical/Dental (one position) (1-17-78).

Research Bibliographer I researches and writes reports and financial histories, checks microfilms of newspapers. At least two years' college. \$7,150-\$9,150.

***Research Laboratory Technician II** provides technical assistance in setting up and running electrophysiological and psychological experiments on primates and humans. Basic knowledge of electronics/computers. \$7,650-\$9,800.

Research Laboratory Technician III (two positions) (a) (1-24-78); (b) has responsibility for the conduct of procedures on experimental animals in the field of brain blood flow, metabolism and stroke. B.A. or B.S. in natural or physical science or engineering; previous experience. \$8,625-\$11,050.

Secretary II (two positions) \$6,225-\$7,975.

***Secretary-Clinical II** \$7,150-\$9,150.

Secretary III (two positions) \$6,700-\$8,575. **Secretary III** (1-17-78).

Secretary IV (two positions) (a) (1-24-78); (b) requires communication with professors, staff, personnel, visitors (high school graduate, several years of experience). \$7,700-\$9,800.

Secretary, Medical/Technical (three positions) \$7,150-\$9,150.

Secretary Technician, Word Processing (1-17-78).
Typist \$5,400-\$6,925.

Part-Time

Three administrative professional and 12 support staff positions are listed. See bulletin boards for details.

Things to Do

Lectures

The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy is discussed by Dr. Gregory Possehl, assistant curator of the University Museum's South and South East Asia section, in an *Archaeology* series lecture on February 1, 5:30 p.m., Museum's Rainey Auditorium. § Alf Hiltzebeil of George Washington University's religion department talks about the **Water Buffalo, the Sacrifice and the Goddess** for the South Asia seminar series on February 2, 11 a.m., Room 138, University Museum. § **CO₂, Exchange in the Isolated Perfused Lung** is the topic for Robert A. Klocke, M.D., Department of Medicine, State University of New York, Buffalo, in a Department of Psychology Respiratory Physiology Group-Pulmonary Scoring Seminar, February 7, 12:30 p.m., fourth floor library, Richards Building.

Films

"Cinema or Verite: Exploration of Environment for Treatment of Emotionally Disturbed Child" is examined through the screening of **Warrendale**, February 1, 7 and 9:30 p.m., Studio Theater, Annenberg Center (students \$1, others \$2), as part of the Annenberg Cinematheque's Exploratory Cinema series. § **International Cinema Series 4** screens Stroszek (February 2, 7:30 p.m.; February 3, 4 and 9:30 p.m.) and **Vladimir and Rosa** (February 2, 9:30 p.m.; February 3, 7:30 p.m.) in International House's Hopkinson Hall (\$1.50, matinee \$1). § February 3, PUC features **The Front**, 10:30 p.m., Irvine Auditorium (\$1); February 4, there's **Bedazzled** at 7:30 and 10 p.m. (\$1) and the **Three Stooges**—six of Curly's best—at midnight (75¢) in Irvine. § Children take a trip to the **Phantom Tollbooth** on February 4, 10:30 a.m., Harrison Auditorium, as part of the University Museum's Children's Program. § The University Museum spotlights the **Lady in the Dark**, February 5, 2:30 p.m., Harrison Auditorium. § **Red Desert** (February 4, 7 p.m.; February 5, 9:30 p.m.), **Woman in the Dunes** (February 4, 9:30 p.m.; February 5, 4:30 p.m.) and the **11th International Animation Tournee** (February 5, 7 p.m.) are Annenberg Cinematheque's selections to be screened at Studio Theater, Annenberg Center (students \$1, others \$2).

Music

Penn Contemporary Players will perform three vanguard compositions—Peter Maxwell Davis's "Ave Maris Stella," Ralph Shapey's "Incantations" and Richard Wernick's "Introits and Canons"—on February 5 at 8:15 p.m., Lang Concert Hall, Swarthmore College. Richard Wernick will conduct the first two pieces, and Eugene Narmour will conduct Wernick's piece. § The Opera Company of Philadelphia and the University's Department of Music will sponsor a symposium on Georges Bizet's **Carmen: Opera Comique and 19th-Century France**, February 9 at 4:30 p.m. in the Rainey Auditorium of the University Museum. The symposium is being held in conjunction with performances of "Carmen" by the Opera Company of Philadelphia on February 14 and 17, in which Mme. Regine Crespin, a symposium participant, will portray Carmen.

Mixed Bag

A photographic exhibit of the first archaeological survey of Sind, Pakistan since 1930 is on display in Room 820 Williams Hall, sponsored by the South Asia Regional Studies department. § Learn the art of "keying out" specimens at the Morris Arboretum's **Winter Botany Workshop**, February 1, 10 a.m. (members \$4, non-members \$5). Call CH7-5777. § From stuffed cabbage to stuffed eggroll for \$2: You can get a bargain smorgasbord of ethnic culture at the International House's **Ethnic Folklife Festival II** the weekend of February 4-5. Call EV7-5125 for details. § The Faculty Club offers a **pre-theater dinner buffet** preceding the Annenberg Center's production of "The Torch-Bearers," February 8. For Faculty Club reservations, call Ext. 4618. § Have lunch and then see "The Torchbearers" at an **Annenberg Matinee Theater Party**, sponsored by the General Alumni Society, February 9. Call Ext. 7811 for reservations.

ALMANAC: 515 Franklin Building (I6) Ext. 5274

Editor.....Diane Cole

Associate Editor.....Marilyn Ackerman