

Almanac

Published Weekly by the University of Pennsylvania
Volume 24, Number 25 March 28, 1978

- Employee Performance Review
- Of Record: Office of Computing Activities
- Photocopying for Educational Uses
- Report of the Provost's Task Force on the Study of Admissions

Annenberg Friends Contribute Funds, Support

The Annenberg Preservation Committee, a student organization headed by undergraduate Ray Greenberg, and the Friends of the Zellerbach Theater are helping the Annenberg Center meet its \$125,000 fundraising goal and ensure the continuance of a professional theater season here next year.

Approximately \$500 collected by the Annenberg Preservation Committee during the student sit-in March 2-6—which was in part sparked by the proposal to limit or curtail professional theater at Annenberg—was presented to Annenberg Center Managing Director Stephen Goff last week.

The committee is now offering for sale "Save the Center" t-shirts (\$3) and buttons (\$1). One dollar from every sale will go to the Annenberg Center. The committee is also arranging a special Penn All-Star Revue performance in May to benefit the Center.

Another group, Friends of the Zellerbach Theater, headed by Diana Dripps and trustee Robert Trescher, will sponsor a gala benefit performance of *Much Ado About Nothing*, which they are calling "Much Ado About Something." Seats will sell for \$50 and \$100, and anonymous donors have agreed to match funds raised from the special event.

In addition, all funds raised by both groups will be applicable to a challenge grant which may be awarded by the National Endowment for the Arts. NEA will announce its decision in August, Goff said.

Trustees Statement on Agreements of the Sit-In

The executive board of the trustees endorses the view of the Faculty Senate and the administration that implementation of the agreements reached in the recent sit-in requires, in many cases, consultation and review by established University committees and bodies. Some trustees have reservations about the agreements and wish to express their views to the executive board and to the administration. Furthermore, it is quite clear that some of the agreements require trustee review and approval.

While it is appropriate to proceed as quickly as possible with the review process, thoughtful and orderly implementation requires that a realistic view of the deadlines be set.

—Executive Board of the Trustees

Nominations Invited for Associate Provost

Applications or nominations are invited from within the University for the position of associate provost. The associate provost will have major responsibility for academic planning, academic budgeting and faculty appointments and promotions. A qualified candidate should possess strong scholarly attainments. Past experience as an administrator, while helpful, is not indispensable; but an interest in and likely capacity for administration is essential. Nominations of and applications from women and minorities are encouraged. Send suggestions and resumes to Prof. Clifton Cherpack, Chairman of the Search Committee, c/o Mrs. Mary Jack, Office of the Provost, 102 College Hall/CO.

Rabin to Speak Here

Former Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin will speak at 8 p.m., Wednesday, March 29, in Irvine Auditorium, as part of the Connaissance Lecture series.

Rabin was prime minister of Israel from 1974 to 1977 and Israel's ambassador to the United States from 1968 to 1973.

The lecture is sponsored by Connaissance, a student group which presents programs of political interest.



Book jacket from the University of Pennsylvania Press edition of *The Country Gentleman*.

"Lost" Comedy to Premiere

A Country Gentleman, a comedy written and banned in 1669 and considered lost for more than 300 years will have its world premiere Thursday, March 30, in a production by New York's Classic Theater.

The Restoration manuscript was discovered—titleless, dateless and anonymous—by University of Pennsylvania Professor Arthur H. "Joe" Scouten and Cornell University Professor Robert D. Hume in 1973 at the Folger Library in Washington, D.C.

Suppressed because it contained a scandalous attack on a member of the court of King Charles, the play, written by Sir Robert Howard and George Villiers, the Second Duke of Buckingham, was withdrawn in rehearsal—and not published until issued by the University of Pennsylvania Press in 1976.

"There was a challenge lately intended for the Duke of Buckingham upon Sr William Coventrys account. . . The occasion was a new play to be acted on Saturday last called the Country gentleman. . . But the King hath prevented all; and the play is not acted," wrote Samuel Pepys in his diary on March 2, 1669.

The Country Gentleman will play at the Loretto Playhouse, 20 Bleeker Street, New York, for three weekends. Thursdays through Sundays, at 8 p.m., March 30-April 2, April 6-9 and April 13-16.

SAC Resolution on University Governance

The following resolution was unanimously adopted by members of the Senate Advisory Committee present at the meeting March 10, 1978. Other faculty members in attendance concurred.

The Senate Advisory Committee (SAC) believes that changes in governance ought to be made through the orderly processes that are available on this campus. With this principle in mind, SAC offers, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, the following responses to the issues raised by the recent sit-in:

1. SAC supports the reestablishment of a Task Force on University Governance to be constituted along the lines of the original task force. The task force should be charged to take as its starting point the recommendations of the 1970 task force. It should consider the new problems of governance posed by the prospect of a shrinking University.

2. The steering committee of the University Council should review the specific proposals of the agreement reached the weekend
(Continued)

(continued)

of March 4-5, 1978 and determine which should be referred to the task force and which to appropriate committees.

3. In the interim, SAC encourages the students to pursue the more extensive contacts with the administration that were contemplated in the agreements.

4. SAC intends to invite undergraduate and graduate leaders to meet with it to discuss common problems.

Senate Advisory Committee Members

Jean Alter (romance languages)

Ralph D. Amado (physics)

Peter A. Cassileth (hematology-oncology)

Peter J. Conn (English)

Helen C. Davies (microbiology)

Irving B. Kravis (economics), *chairman*

Janice Madden (regional science)

Seymour J. Mandelbaum (city and regional planning)

Ann R. Miller (sociology)

Daniel Perlmutter (chemistry & biochemical engineering)

Former Senate Chairmen or Current Members of Senate Committee on Administration

Herbert Callen (physics)

Alexander Capron (law)

Jean Crockett (finance)

Larry Gross (communications)

Noyes Leech (law)

Peter C. Nowell (pathology)

Paul Taubman (economics)

Michael Wachter (economics)

Walter D. Wales (physics)

Editor's note: The Senate Advisory Committee will meet Wednesday, March 29 with undergraduate, professional and graduate student representatives.

Women College Administrators to Meet

What makes a successful leader? How do you make the most of your staff? On what resources can administrators in higher education draw?

Women college and university administrators will discuss these and other questions, April 10 and 11 at *Women Administrators in Transition: a Conference on Leadership and Personnel Management*. Sponsored by the College of General Studies and HERS (Higher Education Resource Services), Mid-Atlantic region, the conference will meet at the University City Holiday Inn.

Speakers include University Secretary Janis I. Somerville; Virginia E. Schein, associate professor of management at Wharton; Karen Farber, director of personnel at the University of Pittsburgh; and Jennie Farley, assistant professor at Cornell's School of Industrial and Labor Relations.

The conference is designed for women who are new to administration, are changing positions or are moving from a faculty to an administrative post. The conference fee is \$95, and registration deadline is April 3. For further information, contact Michele Steege, College of General Studies, 210 Logan Hall/CN, 222-1474.

Juvenile Justice Conference Set

Juvenile Justice: What is the Status? will be answered in a conference sponsored by students from the School of Social Work, Friday, April 7, at the University Museum.

Workshops will focus on juvenile law, police and social work, the impact of sentencing procedures on the juvenile justice system, family court services and the special needs of truant and delinquent youth. Speakers include Paul Lerman, professor of social work and sociology at Rutgers University; Dr. Louise Shoemaker, dean of the School of Social Work, and Dr. Samuel Sylvester, associate professor of social work.

For information, call Ext. 5511.

A Day for Cats

The Small Animal Hospital of the School of Veterinary Medicine will present a day-long symposium for cat breeders and cat owners on Saturday, April 15.

Five faculty members and two veterinarians in private practice will discuss such topics as ocular problems in cats, feline leukemia virus, feline viral respiratory disease and gastrointestinal parasites. This is the first time that a university veterinary school has presented for the public a program on diseases and care of cats.

The symposium, to be held in the auditorium of the Annenberg School, will cost \$15 including luncheon at the Faculty Club. For information, call M. Josephine Deubler, V.M.D., Ext. 8862.

Regulation for Dropping Students' Names from Class Rolls

The Council of Undergraduate Deans has recommended that instructors be permitted to drop from their rolls the names of students who do not *attend during the first week of classes*. The purpose of this procedure would be to make course space available to other students who wish to register during the drop-add period.

Forms for reporting the names of non-attending students will be mailed to departmental offices. Please note that, in order to be useful, these forms must be returned promptly to the departmental office at the end of the first week. If you have any questions or need additional copies, please contact Mrs. Margaret Campbell, Office of the Registrar, Ext. 6433.

—Patricia McFate, *Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Studies and University Life*

Community House Position

Community House, a freshman project in the Quadrangle, is offering a residential position for faculty members or graduate fellows for the 1978-79 academic year. The faculty/graduate fellow serves as a liaison between the faculty and the students of Community House and is responsible for organizing informal coffee hours between faculty and students. For more information, contact Raza Shah, assistant director of the Quadrangle, Ext. 8696.

Personnel Action and Time Report Form Submissions

I am writing to remind business administrators, budget administrators and all others who process Personnel Action Forms and Time Report Forms of their responsibilities concerning the preparation and timely submission of these forms. This reminder is necessitated because of an ever increasing number of late Time Report Forms and Personnel Action Forms, and because proper attention is not being given to account for sick leave for non-exempt personnel. Specifically, I ask that:

1. Weekly Time Report Forms be submitted on a timely basis. While the absolute deadline of these forms *in the payroll office is 10:00 a.m. each Monday*, unless otherwise noted, those departments who can are asked to submit their forms *beginning on Friday*. In order to insure timely receipt by the payroll office, all departments who can do so should hand-carry completed forms to payroll.

2. Personnel Action Forms for new appointments, changes and terminations be submitted as soon as a change becomes known. While there are published deadlines regarding the submission of these documents, please note that these are the last dates upon which such documents can be received to produce a proper paycheck for an employee. If all departments submit forms on the deadline date, it becomes virtually impossible, because of staff and processing requirements, to produce a computer-generated check for each employee.

In almost all instances, late Personnel Action or Time Report Forms demand that a check be produced manually. The associated

paperwork required to update earnings and withholdings data places an onerous burden on the payroll group.

3. Sick leave data for non-exempt employees be properly indicated on the Time Report Form on a timely basis. Failure to accurately reflect sick leave is costly not only to the University but also to those employees whose annual earnings are less than the FICA maximum, since sick pay is exempt from FICA tax for both employee and employer.

Your prompt attention to these matters will enable us to serve you better and will be appreciated.

—Alfred F. Beers,
Associate Comptroller

Employee Performance Review

The following bulletin was sent to deans, directors, department heads and business administrators by Gerald L. Robinson, executive director of personnel relations, on February 22, 1978.

Purpose

The employee performance review program provides for periodic appraisal of non-faculty personnel. The review process is designed to encourage constructive dialogue between employee and supervisor, to clarify job responsibilities, and to assure the recording of job performance and career development data as part of each individual's employment history at the University.

Procedure

1. Performance reviews of full-time and permanent part-time weekly paid personnel will be conducted starting the month of March each year. The performance of newly hired employees is reviewed prior to the end of the 90-day probation period, in conformance with University policy.

2. The performance review is conducted by an employee's immediate supervisor in all cases. Where there is also a unit supervisor, that individual participates in the review as well. After completing the performance review form, the evaluation is discussed with the employee and the form is signed by the employee and the reviewer(s).

3. The basis for a performance review is a clear understanding of an employee's job assignment. It is the responsibility of each supervisor to specify the duties an employee is expected to perform. Prior to the review, the supervisor and the employee discuss the duties of the job. When supervisor and employee share an understanding of job responsibilities, an objective evaluation can be achieved.

4. The performance review form provides for consideration of the following:

- A. Job performance
- B. Individual factors
- C. Overall appraisal of employee in relation to position
- D. Objectives for the future

The reviewer determines the appropriate rating and marks the form accordingly:

Satisfactory—performance meets standards required; quality and quantity of work are completely acceptable and satisfactory;

Needs improvement—performance is barely adequate; meets some requirements; substantial improvement is needed;

Unsatisfactory—performance does not meet minimum standards.

An exceptional rating may be recorded by checking the blank provided, writing in the rating which applies, and, under "comments," noting the reason(s) that rating has been entered.

5. In sections A and B, particular factors are included for evaluation. Add any other noteworthy aspects under "comments," as indicated above. Supervisors are strongly urged to support the ratings assigned with specific remarks.

6. In section C, an employee's overall performance is evaluated. If the overall rating is "unsatisfactory" or "needs improvement," then another performance review is scheduled. This reevaluation is conducted within two months of the initial review, allowing time for the employee to demonstrate improvement. Insufficient improvement in performance by the time of the second review constitutes grounds for termination.

7. Section D provides for recording future performance objectives. The setting of performance objectives applies to all employees and is not limited to employees with specific problems. For all employees the review provides a shared opportunity to clarify goals, to identify skills needing development, and to expand job know-how and the scope of responsibilities.

8. The performance review form is signed and dated by the reviewer(s) and the employee. Signing the review form does not necessarily mean that

the employee agrees with the evaluation. An employee's comments and signature on an accompanying paper may be submitted also, whether the form is signed or not.

9. Upon completion of the performance review, the supervisor or unit administrator retains one copy, the employee is given a copy, and the original is sent to the personnel officer designated to monitor reviews for the employee's unit. The original will be forwarded to the employee's central personnel file by the personnel officer. The copies held in office files or in the central personnel file may be examined by the subject employee upon request. Access to performance records otherwise is limited to authorized University personnel officers when required in conjunction with relevant personnel transactions. At all times and in every respect, employee performance review forms shall be afforded confidential treatment.

Grant Deadlines

National Science Foundation

4/7 Science for Citizens (SFC) feasibility studies (preliminary proposals).

4/8 Program for science resources: manpower, funding and output analyses.*

4/15 Human cell biology proposals (target date).

5/1 Science for Citizens Forums, conferences and workshop proposals (final proposals).*

5/1 Ethics and Values in Science and Technology (EVIST) (Preliminary proposals).

6/1 Antarctic research proposals.

6/1 U.S.-Latin American cooperative science program proposals.

National Institutes of Health

4/1 National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute minority hypertension research development summer program (letters of intent).

5/24 National Institute of Dental Research—determine the microbiological, immunological, biochemical constituents in dental plaque and saliva from tube-fed humans (RFP-NIDR-4-78-6R).

• National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism and Digestive Diseases requests applications—Title "Characterization of Animal Models for Diabetes Research" (regular deadline dates).

• National Eye Institute—applications sought for studies of the human visual system in health and disease using modern techniques of psychophysics and physiological optics (regular deadlines).

• National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases—studies on respirator disease agents (regular deadlines).

• National Institute of General Medical Sciences—research center grant applications in following special areas: 1) anesthesiology, 2) trauma and burns, 3) biomedical engineering, 4) pharmacology/toxicology, 5) genetics, 6) molecular pathology (letter of intent required prior to submission of full proposal).

Office of Human Development

4/21 Rehabilitation long-term training projects.*

Department of Agriculture

4/15 Plant biology and human nutrition.*

The National Foundation—March of Dimes

Announcement of new program for support of research in social and behavioral sciences. Principal concern—first three years of life.*

Human Growth Foundation

4/15 Clinical and basic research in mechanisms of statural growth of children.*

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

—Alton E. Paddock

*Brochure available in ORA.

Photocopying for Educational Uses

The enactment of a new federal Copyright Act has prompted a number of questions from members of the University community. One of the areas of particular interest and importance to the University is photocopying for educational uses. The following article was prepared at my request by Professor Robert Gorman of our Law School to give guidance in this area. It is based on a statement that has been prepared by the Association of American Law Schools. Readers should note that this article is limited in scope. It does not, for instance, deal with photocopying and other forms of reproductions by libraries and archives, as to which there are specific provisions in the new Copyright Act. A more general discussion will appear in an article by Professor Gorman in the April issue of the University of Pennsylvania Law Review.

Questions regarding the application of the new Copyright Act in specific situations should be addressed to my office. General information may be obtained from the Office of Research Administration.

—Stephen B. Burbank,
General Counsel

The enactment of a new federal Copyright Act, effective January 1, 1978, has produced much misunderstanding among teachers regarding the permissible amount of photocopying for educational purposes.

Only copyrighted works are protected by the act. This elemental point is often overlooked. Court opinions, legislative hearings and other government documents are not copyrighted, and may be freely photocopied. The same is true of works for which the copyright has expired, and of works which prior to January 1978 were sold or disseminated without proper notice of copyright.

There is a danger, however, of acting unlawfully when one photocopies without permission works which are covered by the act. The act applies to all "original works of authorship" in written (or other tangible) form, from the moment the work is created, whether it was created before or after January 1, 1978 and whether or not it has been published.

But even copyrighted materials may be photocopied without permission from, or payment to, the copyright owner, if it is a "fair use," a doctrine recognized by American courts for nearly a century and a half whose principal purpose is to protect the public interest in the dissemination of knowledge. This doctrine is endorsed in the text of the act, which explicitly refers to the allowable reproduction of copyrighted works for purposes such as "criticism, comment, news reporting, teaching (including multiple copies for classroom use), scholarship, or research."

Congress appreciated the impossibility of announcing in a statute an exact quantitative measure that would distinguish copying which is a fair use from copying which is an infringement. Rather, the act provides factors to be considered:

1. the purpose and character of the use, including whether such is of a commercial nature or is for nonprofit educational purposes;
2. the nature of the copyrighted work;
3. the amount and substantiality of the portion used in relation to the copyrighted work as a whole; and
4. the effect of the use upon the potential market for or value of the copyrighted work."

The making of a single copy of copyrighted material for a teacher's personal use in teaching, scholarship or research will almost always be a fair use. More difficult questions arise when multiple copies are made for distribution to students. Perhaps all that can be said is that the risk of infringement increases in proportion to (i) the amount of copyrighted material which is photocopied and (ii) the extent that the photocopying replaces what would otherwise be a purchase of copies of the work from trade sources by (or for) the students. Thus, the making of multiple photocopies of an entire or of a substantial part of an article will raise serious question as to whether such a use is "fair," while the reproduction of five pages of an article of 25 or 30 pages will generally be regarded as privileged. A teacher should try to avoid making multiple photocopies of copyrighted material which is not truly important for that teacher's pedagogical needs. In any event, students receiving such photocopied material should be charged no more than is necessary to cover the cost of photocopying and processing.

During congressional deliberations on the act, a group of educational associations and commercial publishers developed a set of guidelines which purport to announce the minimum reach of the fair use doctrine as applied to educational photocopying. The guidelines are set forth in an appendix to this article. In the report by the House committee submitting the copyright bill, these guidelines were said to constitute a "reasonable" construction of

the fair use doctrine. Several misconceptions about these guidelines have developed and should be dispelled.

Although some have read the guidelines as imposing limits upon educational photocopying, in fact they prohibit nothing. They purport to state only the minimum protection of the fair use doctrine and announce a "safe harbor" within which a teacher is assured of protection against claims of infringement. The guidelines acknowledge that there may be allowable photocopying beyond that which is set forth; they do not purport to state where the fair use privilege ends.

Although some have treated the guidelines as though they have the status of legislation, that is not true, either. The text of the act, strengthened in committee deliberations, explicitly adverts to "teaching (including multiple copies for classroom use)" as a classic situation in which the fair use doctrine applies. This is the statutory text Congressmen had before them when they voted, and it is the statutory text which the courts will construe. The extent to which the privately developed "guidelines" will pre-empt other "reasonable" interpretations of fair use is a judicial question.

A teacher should consider the potential consequences of an incorrect decision. If the teacher elects not to photocopy in circumstances constituting fair use, students must find the material in the library or elsewhere. Techniques for increasing student access to limited materials will vary; the question of permissible library photocopying for "reserve" purposes raises issues not addressed here.

If a teacher decides to photocopy for classroom use, the possible legal sanctions for an incorrect decision must be appreciated. As a general rule, a copyright infringer is liable for damages, measured by the loss of profits to the copyright owner and any additional profits acquired by the infringer. Since in the academic setting there will not generally be profits to the teacher or school, damages will be measured by the likely loss in sales of the copyrighted work, normally an uncertain figure. For this reason, the act permits the copyright owner to sue for "statutory damages" in lieu of actual damages, and the court is given discretion to enter an award between \$250 and \$10,000 (which may be increased to \$50,000 for willful violations). If, however, a teacher had reasonable grounds to believe that the photocopying was a fair use, he is not liable for statutory damages (although he may be liable for actual damages). In all cases, the court may issue an order against the teacher or the educational institution barring future infringements.

Without regard to legal implications, a teacher should be sensitive to the dictates of good practice and courtesy in the use of copyrighted material. Authors and copyright owners appreciate notification that uses are being made of their work. It is common for the copyright owner to permit substantial photocopying for educational purposes, provided that the author and copyright owner are identified and proper copyright notice is affixed.

Appendix

The following guidelines should be read and interpreted in light of Professor Gorman's discussion.—Stephen B. Burbank

Guidelines

I. Single Copying for Teachers

A single copy may be made of any of the following by or for a teacher at his or her individual request for his or her scholarly research or use in teaching or preparation to teach a class:

- A. A chapter from a book;
- B. An article from a periodical or newspaper;
- C. A short story, short essay or short poem whether or not from a collective work;
- D. A chart, graph, diagram, drawing, cartoon or picture from a book, periodical, or newspaper.

II. Multiple Copies for Classroom Use

Multiple copies (not to exceed in any event more than one copy per pupil in a course) may be made by or for the teacher giving the course for classroom use or discussion *provided that*:

- A. The copying meets the tests of brevity and spontaneity as defined below; *and*,
- B. Meets the cumulative effect test as defined below; *and*,
- C. Each copy includes a notice of copyright.

Definitions

Brevity

- i. Poetry: (a) A complete poem if less than 250 words and if printed on not more than two pages or, (b) from a longer poem, an excerpt of not more than 250 words.
- ii. Prose: (a) Either a complete article, story or essay of less than 2,500 words, or (b) An excerpt from any prose work of not more than 1,000 words

or 10 percent of the work, whichever is less, but in any event a minimum of 500 words.

[Each of the numerical limits stated in "i" and "ii" above may be expanded to permit the completion of an unfinished line of a poem or of an unfinished prose paragraph.]

iii. Illustration: One chart, graph, diagram, drawing, cartoon or picture per book or per periodical issue.

iv. "Special" works: Certain works in poetry, prose or in "poetic prose" which often combine language with illustrations and which are intended sometimes for children and at other times for a more general audience fall short of 2,500 words in their entirety. Paragraph "ii" above notwithstanding, such "special works" may not be reproduced in their entirety; however, an excerpt comprising not more than two of the published pages of such special work and containing not more than 10 percent of the words found in the text thereof, may be reproduced.

Spontaneity

i. The copying is at the instance and inspiration of the individual teacher, and

ii. The inspiration and decision to use the work and the moment of its use for maximum teaching effectiveness are so close in time that it would be unreasonable to expect a timely reply to a request for permission.

Cumulative Effect

i. The copying of the material is for only one course in the school in which the copies are made.

ii. Not more than one short poem, article, story, essay or two excerpts may be copied from the same author, nor more than three from the same collective work or periodical volume during one class term.

iii. There shall not be more than nine instances of such multiple copying for one course during one class term.

[The limitations stated in "ii" and "iii" above shall not apply to current news periodicals and newspapers and current news sections of other periodicals.]

III. Prohibitions As to I and II Above

Notwithstanding any of the above, the following shall be prohibited:

A. Copying shall not be used to create or to replace or substitute for anthologies, compilations or collective works. Such replacement or

substitution may occur whether copies of various works or excerpts therefrom are accumulated or are reproduced and used separately.

B. There shall be no copying of or from works intended to be "consumable" in the course of study or of teaching. These include workbooks, exercises, standardized tests and test booklets and answer sheets and like consumable material.

C. Copying shall not:

- substitute for the purchase of books, publisher's reprints or periodicals.
- be directed by higher authority;
- be repeated with respect to the same item by the same teacher from term to term.

D. No charge shall be made to the student beyond the actual cost of the photocopying.

OF RECORD



Office of Computing Activities

The following memorandum was sent to deans, directors and department chairmen by Provost Eliot Stellar on March 14, 1978.

After extensive consultation and review, my colleagues and I have decided to abolish the Office of Computing Activities. This action has resulted in a total reduction of \$115,625 in the indirect costs allocated to the responsibility centers for the second round of budgeting. You should proceed immediately to establish appropriate mechanisms for procurement of computing services by your faculty, staff, and students from one of the on-campus computer facilities (David Rittenhouse Laboratory, Engineering, Medicine, Wharton) or the UNICOLL Corporation.

Changes and Additions to 1977-78 Faculty & Staff Telephone Directory

White Pages

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|
| Beason, Eleanor A, Mrs | 8212 |
| Bomar, Horace | 4644/45 |
| Civan, Mortimer M, Dr | 8773 |
| Cole, Diane J | 5274 |
| Cuozzo, Ronald | 7886 |
| Fish, R David | 8725 |
| Grilikhes, Sandra B | 7027 |
| Haydar, Adnan F | 6038 |
| Hesbacher, Peter T, Dr | 4303 |
| Innes, Nita | 5887 |
| Johnson, Stanley E, Rev | 8456 |
| | 7540 |
| Karsch, Carol | 7414 |
| Lambertsen, Christian J, Dr | 8692 |
| Lee, Chuan-Shue | 8692 |
| Nicosia, Santo V, Dr | 6485 |
| Schoemaker, Paul, Dr | 5451 |
| Stevens, John K, Dr | 5219/7536 |
| Whitley, Lucy | 8692 |

Yellow Pages

| | |
|-----------------------------|------|
| Alumni Relations | |
| Asst: Doris S Cochran-Fikes | 7811 |
| Student Life, Off of | |
| Prog Coord: Nancy Ballard | 7583 |
| Budg Asst: Linda Smith | 6533 |
| Phila Transnational Project | 5392 |
| Dir: Norman D Palmer | 7662 |

| |
|---|
| Adm Asst, Gov't Study Ctr—SPUP/B1 |
| Dir, Energy Office—P-211 FBA/16 |
| Prof of Physiol—A-303 Rich/G4 |
| Editor, <i>Almanac</i> —513 FB/16 |
| Bus Adm, CI Studies & Small Animal Hosp—210E Vet/H1 |
| Res Spec, Physiol—A-205 Rich/G4 |
| Hd Annenberg Lib—ASC/C5 |
| Asst Prof Arabic Studies—843 WmsH/CU |
| Asst Prof Psych—133 S 36th/17 |
| Sec, Wh Exec MBA Prog—204 Vance/CS |
| Univ Chaplain—HH/CM |
| Home—3805 Locust 19104 |
| Student Teach Placement—C-29 Educ/CI |
| Dir Env Med & Prof Pharm & Exp Ther—14 Med Labs/G2 |
| Statistician, Env Med—14 Med Labs/G2 |
| Asst Prof Ob-Gyn—307 Med Labs/G3 |
| Asst Prof Mgt—W-196 DH/CC |
| Asst Prof Physiol—D-306 Rich/G4 |
| Prog Anal, Env Med—14 Med Labs/G4 |

EH/B2

HH/CM
2nd Fl., HH/CM
E-49 DH/CC
E-130 DH/CC

Professors Emeritus

Warren, Dr Reid S, Jr—Elec Eng & Sci—45 Server Lane, Springfield, Pa 19064 (omitted from directory)
Chambers, Dr Carl C—Provost's Office—Estero Woods Village, Apt 202, Estero, Fla 33928
Brainerd, John G, Dr—Provost's Office—The Crosslands, Apt. 227, Kennett Square, Pa 19348

Report of the Provost's Task Force on the Study of Admissions

With the appointment of Lee Stetson as director of admissions, the publication of the *Report of the Task Force on Admissions* is particularly timely. The report contains important recommendations for the future direction of the admissions office, and I urge the University community to acquaint itself with its contents.

— Patricia McFate, Vice-Provost
for Undergraduate Studies and University Life

Preface

The Task Force on the Study of Admissions was appointed by the provost as an advisory body charged with the following responsibilities:¹

- (1) to examine thoroughly
 - (a) the structure of the admissions office, considering such items as size, organization, and management, and
 - (b) the function of the undergraduate admissions process, considering University goals and procedures;
- (2) to evaluate its findings and to make recommendations for the structure and function of the admissions office that will lead to the most efficient and effective use of manpower and resources and the better fulfillment of its mission;
- (3) to define the place of the admissions office in relation to other offices within the University structure; and
- (4) based upon its deliberations, to prepare a written report to the vice-provost for undergraduate studies and University life.

There were *members*, *ex-officio members*, and *resource personnel* associated with the task force, as follows:

Members

| | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Joseph Bordogna | Frederick G. Kempin |
| Alexander H. Coy, III | Thaddeus R. Maciag |
| David K. Hildebrand | Norman Oler |
| Alice Kelley | Kenneth W. Taber |

Ex-officio Members

| | |
|--------------------|---------------------|
| Eleanor J. Carlin | D. Bruce Johnstone |
| Vincent Conti | H. Michael Neiditch |
| James E. Davis | Malinda Murray |
| F. Andrew Geiger | Gilberto Ramón |
| John N. Hobstetter | William G. Owen |

Matthew J. Stephens

Resource Personnel

| | |
|---|---|
| Admissions Office Staff | Gretchen A. Wood |
| Paul O. Gaddis (management of admissions office) | (coordination of recruiting and admissions activities) |
| Gerald L. Robinson | George S. Koval |
| (personnel practices) | (financial aid) |

The members of the task force met regularly in committee and obtained input from the other participants through documented interviews. All told,

the task force met in formal sessions 12 times¹⁴ and its members conducted 35 interviews, including two with the entire admissions office staff (see references 15-17, 19-31, 35, 37, 38, 40, 44, 45, 47, 48, 50-54, 56, 58, 60, 64, 66).

Introduction

Following its well-defined charge,¹ the task force did not address itself to questions of admissions policy per se but, rather, conducted research to understand how the admissions office structure supports the implementation of the University's present undergraduate admissions policy (the McGill report² and its subsequent modification⁴). More specifically, effort was focused on answering the question, "Is the present operation of the admissions office appropriate for achieving our admissions objectives, or is there another structural mode which may be more effective?"

A review of past documentation²⁻⁸ generated on campus since the publication of the McGill report in 1967 reveals great majority opinion that our present policy can be successful only through careful market analysis of the prospective student population and vigorous conduct of effective recruitment strategies based thereon. Further, the growing philosophical trend in these reports is to urge that greater stress be placed on *enrolling* or *matriculating* students as opposed to *selecting* them. For example, in a 1973 proposal,⁶ Schell pointed out that admissions resource allocation at Pennsylvania was then in the neighborhood of 70 percent for *selecting* (i.e., processing and evaluating applications, sitting on selection committee) with only 30 percent expended on *enrolling* or *matriculating* students; he recommended that the selecting process be streamlined to allow for reallocation of admissions office resources more toward 30 percent for selection and 70 percent for enrollment by 1978. In repeated attempts to implement this model directly, the admissions office staff have been frustrated by leadership turnover, misunderstanding of their purpose by some segments of the University community, and the financial exigencies forced on all facets of University operations during the 1973-77 period.

It is interesting to note, however, that the model recommended by Schell and others,^{3, 5, 7, 8} while not directly implemented, has been slowly evolving in the past several years in the way of increased faculty, student, and alumni involvement in the admissions process; there have been some success stories and significant experience has been garnered—but stress in the admissions office has mitigated against overall coordination of these efforts. It is on this facet of the admissions process that the Task Force on the Study of Admissions decided to focus and make recommendations. In particular, we addressed ourselves to formulating a model based on reorientation of the admissions office effort toward the management of a large "University-wide admissions staff" comprised of alumni, students, faculty, development officers, public relations officers, and friends of the University (e.g., members of the Board of Overseers). The task force believes that undergraduate recruitment must be viewed as a priority program for *all* University-affiliated personnel, not just the staff of the admissions office.

Of course, exacerbating the normal difficulty of implementing an effective admissions policy is today's radically changing financial and social milieu. Financially, budget cuts in the admissions office and the failure radically to shift emphasis from selecting to matriculating have severely hampered the ability of the admissions office staff to coordinate the efforts

of a "University family recruiting team." Also, continually rising tuition is hampering the ability of prospective students to afford a Pennsylvania education. Socially, the changing demographic scene and the reduction in total numbers of high school graduates available for matriculation portend problems for future enrollments. For example, of the 2,500 high schools contacted by the admissions office each year, only 200 represent those from which the bulk of our matriculants come—and these are located in regions where the country's population has begun its decline. As another example, data in the most recent COFHE report¹² on the student market show 1976 to be the threshold year for maximum number of high school graduates; from here on it's all downhill. Doermann¹³ indicates specifically that the annual number of high school graduates each year will decrease 15 percent by 1984, 22 percent by 1990. Furthermore, two statements by Doermann are rather chilling:

Colleges that attempt to raise tuition faster than family incomes rise and colleges wishing to raise dramatically the measured verbal aptitude of their entering students are likely to find these moves unexpectedly difficult unless they are also willing to decrease enrollment, or somehow are able to broaden and strengthen their applicant pool.

The number of students prosperous enough to pay the full tuition at private colleges and academically able to do satisfactory work at most of them is a relatively small portion of the total high school graduate population. The many colleges that plan to expand by enrolling more students of this kind will not succeed; the applicant pool is too small.*

Thus, following on the work of preceding University of Pennsylvania admissions study groups and believing that the admissions office has a primary role in the enhancement of student quality at Pennsylvania and in helping to represent to the outside world what the University is, the task force submits the following recommendations aimed at establishing the organizational structure and operational procedures through which a coordinated University-wide admissions process may develop and flourish.

Findings and Recommendations

Regional Organization. The present distribution of regional (i.e., geographic) effort in the admissions office is region I (N.J., N.Y., New England), region II (Commonwealth of Pennsylvania), region III (rest of world). Data¹⁴ indicate that the bulk of region III matriculants comes from Baltimore, Washington, and Florida. Also, recent census figures¹⁵ show that between 1970 and 1975 the number of people living in the 16 states of the South (the so-called "Sun Belt") grew by 5.3 million; this total is almost a million more than the combined growth in the rest of the country. These facts, coupled with the fact that the dip in prospective student applications in the state of New York is predicted to be greater than in most other areas,¹² make it imperative that our present regional structure be studied and realigned. While the specific realignment should be chosen by the admissions office, the following is one possible example:

Recommendation 1. *The regional distribution of Admissions Office effort should be revised, perhaps along the following lines:*

Delaware Valley

PennJerDel, Maryland, Ohio

New York, New England

Washington and South through Eastern Seaboard, Selected Gulf States

Selected Midwest States, Pacific Coast, Foreign

This "expansion" of regional units from three to five suggests, at first thought, a corresponding expansion in staff size; however, the proposed change would yield regional units of more compact, focused size and, with application of state-of-the-art automated office support services, each regional unit could conceivably be administered by one person instead of two, as at present. Additionally, a very human tangible accrues from the identification of each region through a single executive—high school personnel, prospective students and their parents, and alumni feel more comfortable interacting with the "top" person in the region rather than his or her "assistant."

An interesting change in admissions office structure has been proposed by William G. Owen.¹¹ Though not recommended at this time, the proposal is documented here for further study by the admissions office. Mr. Owen challenges the concept of the regional structure by suggesting that more stress be placed on programmatic distribution of effort based entirely on what he calls "pockets of potential"; e.g., high quality student program, diversity student program, minorities student program, etc. The task force finds this idea intriguing (indeed, some special programs already exist in the admissions office, but in addition to the regional set up) but believes it difficult to implement to the exclusion of the regional structure because of

the natural identification of alumni secondary school committees (the principal alumni admissions support mechanism) with geographical location.

Small Communities. The success of this program in enhancing both the quality and socioeconomic diversity of the student body prompts the question of its being expanded to a broader geographic base. . . say, into South Jersey and portions of Ohio.

Recommendation 2. *Geographic expansion of the Small Communities Program should be studied carefully as a means for adding talented students to the freshman class.*

Minorities Recruitment. The special need to identify high potential minorities candidates has not waned; rather, the pool is becoming more viable and can therefore add greater substance to the student body.¹⁶

Recommendation 3. *The admissions office should continue its minorities efforts with vigor, placing more emphasis on searching out students with leadership as well as academic ability. Closer ties with local and national minorities identification programs are encouraged.*

Alumni Involvement. During the course of the task force's work, alumni interest became apparent.¹⁴ They are eager to assist in all facets of the admissions process. Their interaction appears to be weakly coordinated, however, and there is confusion about where coordination derives. This situation is exacerbated by long delays in information flow and a puzzling view of the time-consuming alumni interview process. The members of the task force firmly support the use of alumni in recruiting prospective students and stress the need for effective coordination and communication in any system developed.

Recommendation 4. *The recently established Alumni Council on Admissions should be supported vigorously and its activities coordinated carefully through the Admissions Office. Specific tasks which have real impact upon selection and enrollment of students should be assigned directly to alumni groups.*

Interview Procedure. Experience indicates that the admissions office interview is for the most part perfunctory, not important in the great majority of cases, and significantly time-consuming, given the large number of applicants. In addition, prospective students and their parents, believing the interview to be a necessity because it is advertised in University publications, become frustrated when admissions office appointments have two-month lead times and in many cases are impossible to obtain. Thus, rather than interview the prospective student, he or she should be invited to interview people at Pennsylvania.

Recommendation 5. *The present admissions office interview process should be terminated and replaced with campus visits by prospective students (singly or in groups) to "interview" faculty, students, and alumni to determine if Pennsylvania meets their career interests and talents. There are a number of models of this process presently working successfully on campus.*

Application Reading Procedure. The many man-hours exerted by the admissions office staff in reading and summarizing each application could be spread among faculty members and interested alumni. The released time thus made available would be put to better use in recruiting activities. Reading applications would not be a new experience for many faculty members, since many already do so at the graduate level.

Recommendation 6. *An Admissions Office/Faculty Application Reading Committee should be appointed. Representation should be from the five undergraduate schools with each school reading applications pertinent to it. To be effective, the deans of the schools must consider this activity as a major committee assignment, and admissions office staff should guide the reading task.*

An organizational problem associated with the foregoing recommendation is the fact that admissions applications must leave the admissions office to be read in the homes or offices of faculty members of the reading committee. However, this is already the case with the present admissions staff. In order for this not to pose a real problem, the number of faculty members reading applications should be modest (say on the order of 20).

Selection Procedure. The following recommendation is based on the belief that the energies of the admissions staff should be conserved to deal with the difficult cases.

Recommendation 7. *The selection of students for admission should be a cooperative procedure conducted jointly by admissions officers and faculty members. Their responsibilities should be organized along the following lines:*

(1) The formal process of selection should be conducted with a slate committee composed of the chief admissions officer as chairman, his or her assistant for operations, and a number of faculty members—at least one of whom should be from a university school in which the applicants under consideration at a given meeting have expressed primary interest.

*Compared to the national average of 12 percent, 43 percent of University of Pennsylvania students receive over \$4,000 of support annually from their families.¹³

(2) *The operation of the slate committee should be overseen carefully by the entire admissions staff with the following responsibilities assigned specifically to the admissions officers:*

(a) *Specification, prior to slate committee meetings, of tactical decisions with regard to particular secondary schools, regions, special admissions programs.*

(b) *Identification, prior to slate committee meetings, of unusually talented and/or otherwise interesting students who can be admitted with little or no review.*

(c) *Review, subsequent to slate committee meetings, of all slate decisions prior to their implementation with prerogative to act as advocate for reconsideration of decisions.*

Implementation of this recommendation offers the faculty the opportunity to become more closely involved in the admissions process while simultaneously relieving the admissions officers from actually having to sit in on the lengthy slate meetings—yet sustaining their important influence on selection. The time saved for the admissions officers can then be spent more effectively on continued personal interaction with high school administrators, counselors, and teachers; alumni; and the prospective students themselves.

Note: The above speaks directly to the *freshman* selection process. A specific procedure for selection of *upperclass* students is not recommended, although the members of the task force do realize that there are differences involved. For example, while admissions officers can go into high schools naturally to recruit freshmen, they cannot enter four-year colleges in the same fashion to recruit upperclassmen. On the other hand, it is conceivable that a strong recruitment program could be developed for two-year colleges, where a greater proportion of prospective high-quality upperclass applicants may exist in the near future, as costs for private baccalaureate education continue to escalate. Upperclass recruitment and admissions are obviously areas for special study, perhaps by the University Council Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid. In any case, this task force leaves the specifics of upperclass (*i.e.*, transfer) admission to the chief admissions officer with the suggestion that the philosophy of the freshman recruitment, selection, and matriculation procedures portrayed above be followed.

Automated Word Processing. Among all campus entities, the admissions office probably possesses the most efficient word processing system. This being the case, enhancement of the system could provide increased communications efficiency between the office and its correspondents.

Recommendation 8. *The word processing system in the admissions office should be enhanced to bring it to peak efficiency. The enhancement should include both equipment modification and staff training. Resources expended here can reap significant benefits in overall performance of admissions and reduction in future operating costs.*

Computerized Data Processing. Computer handling of admissions data has improved steadily during the past several years, but lacks interactive, on-line capability. The task force believes the time is optimal for reviewing data processing procedures in the admissions office and effecting an improved approach based on solid experience. In particular, experience at other universities indicates that the size of support staff can be reduced significantly if interactive, on-line operation is available.

Recommendation 9. *A committee composed of faculty members and students with expertise in computerized data processing should be appointed to review present procedures and make recommendations for improvement. Special emphasis should be placed on integrating the word processing system with the computerized admissions data, on implementing interactive on-line operation, and on ensuring that the computerized data bases of the admissions office and financial aid office are compatible.*

Admissions Publications and the Application Form. The improvement in these documents during the past four years has been impressive—they are visually exciting and presented with care. Even so, the members of the task force believe certain recruiting and cost improvements can be effectively pursued at this time. Three items in particular are of importance to a great many interested parties: (1) making the bulletin or bulletin-like material available more readily to prospective students, (2) making the application less massive and foreboding⁶⁵ (there are 30 different pieces of paper in each applicant's file, and a large part of the admissions office workload is based on handling and organizing these papers), and (3) allowing some applications to be distributed through the hands of *selected* alumni recruiters and high school counselors.

Recommendation 10. *Modification of the admissions publications package should be pursued with the goal of getting bulletin-like material into the hands of prospective students at the earliest possible date.*

Recommendation 11. *The application form should be reviewed thoroughly to determine where length and complexity can be reduced and a study should be conducted to assess the value of putting application forms in the hands of selected alumni and high school counselors for distribution.*

Relationship of Financial Aid Office to Admissions Office. The office of financial aid, headed by a director who reports to the provost through the vice-provost for undergraduate studies and University life (VPUSUL), appears to be in control of the many complicated and sensitive facets of its operation. Interaction between the VPUSUL and the director seems effective, with both parties content with the reporting line of authority. Interaction between the office of financial aid and the admissions office is also good, but there are some problems which need attention. The members of the task force have not been able to define these problems well enough to put into the form of a recommendation but they are indeed important enough to list here for consideration by the parties involved:

(1) There seems to be no clear-cut agreement on the kind of admissions data the financial aid office needs, compared to the data available in the admissions office files.

(2) The time between class selection and notification of admission in mid-April is so brief that it creates great strain on the careful determination of financial aid packages.

(3) Whereas the socioeconomically disadvantaged (SE) designation appears on the slate committee's computerized printout for each applicant during the selection process, *detailed* determination of SE status is not done by the financial aid office until the applicant is admitted. Apparently, SE determination for slate committee purposes is done grossly by the admissions office alone without the benefit of the parent's confidential statement, the most important facet of the decision being identification as a minorities candidate. Determination of SE status by the financial aid office is, of course, based solely on need. Thus, the current situation is one in which some SE cases might be missed and possibly rejected before accurate financial need is determined.

(4) There is a commitment to financial aid matters in the admissions office of 1 1/3 staff persons; this effort seems redundant.

The Workload and the Budget. As with all campus entities during the past several years, the admissions office has experienced increasing workload with limited resources. For example, from 1966 to 1976 the workload changed as follows:¹⁴

(1) Recruitment contacts increased from 35,000 to 75,000 per year.

(2) Applications increased from 8,000 to 11,000 per year.

(3) Matriculants (freshman plus transfer) increased from 1,700 to 2,600 per year.

(4) Admissions office staff size remained constant at 35 persons.

The change in major budget factors (all dollar figures below in round numbers) during the same period can be summarized as follows:¹⁴

(1) Budget increased from \$230,000 to \$655,000 per year.

(2) Admissions office staff costs (with staff size constant) increased from \$188,000 to \$510,000 per year, but this cost was 81 percent of the total budget in 1966 and less (78 percent) of the total budget in 1976.

(3) Employee benefits increased from \$10,000 to \$77,000 per year.

(4) Mail plus telephone plus printing/duplicating costs increased from \$21,000 to \$98,000 per year.

With regard to the salary levels of the present admissions officers, study^{14, 35} has indicated their appropriateness when compared to such salaries at peer institutions.

Thus, it appears to the task force that the admissions office, in its present structure, has coped with escalating costs as well as other campus units have; it has kept its staff constant while significantly increasing workload and suffering severe inflationary costs. This situation has wreaked its toll, however, on the well-developed plans^{3, 5-8} for more effective recruitment coordinated from the admissions office. It is interesting to note, though, that while budget cuts in the admissions office forced canceling of its recruitment and publications activities, these activities have been picked up in varying degree by the undergraduate schools themselves. . . increasing school recruitment budgets in the process, but yielding great payoffs in student numbers and quality in return. Thus no one knows what the total cost of admitting undergraduates to Pennsylvania really is.

Recommendation 12. *The admissions office should conduct an analysis of total cost of the admissions process, including its own costs and those of other participants—the schools, the Alumni Council on Admissions, the alumni, etc.*

While members of the task force believe the admissions office has probably done the best it could with the structure and resources it has had in recent years, we also believe that not enough attention has been paid to creating new administrative structure which might produce greater efficiencies and coordination of activities. From knowledge of successful admissions stories

around the country it is almost a tenet that admissions can be successful only through the coordinated efforts of the entire campus community—admissions staff, students, faculty, administration, and alumni. And it is this background which has prompted most of the recommendations in this report. Likewise, a vigorous, innovative admissions team should have every opportunity to argue effectively and at the highest level of University administration for the structure and resources it may need to carry out its goals. In this sense, the members of the task force believe the budget of the admissions office should be a separate line item at a hierarchical level. In view of the difficult admissions market place predicted for the next decade (as described above in the introduction), an outstanding admissions process is akin to scholarly survival for a private university. Budgeting for so important a function should not be encumbered by placing it among student services, where it sits today.

Admissions Officers, Titles, and the Reporting Line. As a result of the evolving change in University administrative structure during the past several years, a conscious elimination of the title "dean" from all but academic/scholarly (i.e., faculty-type) administrative appointments has taken place. The last remaining such title outside a school is "dean of admissions." Thus with a new leader for the admissions team being sought,* there is a desire on the part of the administration for a title change. Normally, this issue would not be of great importance; after all, many admissions heads in other great institutions do not bear the title of "dean," the more common title being "director." However, the situation at Pennsylvania, resulting from the budget tensions of recent years, revolves around the belief that eliminating the title of "dean" is tantamount to a reduction in importance. The members of the task force do not subscribe to this belief, but certainly understand the sensitivity of the issue.

Another facet of evolving university administrative structure has been the establishment in the provost's office of a principal assistant for undergraduate education, namely, the vice-provost for undergraduate studies and University life (VPUSUL). Upon the appointment of the VPUSUL and charging her with responsibility for overseeing all undergraduate affairs, the present dean of admissions was asked by the provost to report to him via the VPUSUL—a practice reminiscent of 10 years ago when the dean of admissions used to report to the provost through the vice-president (and later vice-provost) for student affairs. In so doing, however, the provost has made it clear that he has not deferred his responsibility for final decisions with regard to admissions policy and operation. This move of the provost to structure his personal office such that his vice-provost oversees the day-to-day operations of the admissions office can be classified as normal executive management procedure; it is unfortunate, however, that the move has been interpreted by some as another indication of downgrading the position of the head of admissions.

In addressing the issue of "title," the task force considered five possibilities:

- dean of admissions*
- director of admissions*
- executive director of admissions*
- assistant vice-provost for admissions*
- associate vice-provost for admissions.*

Intense discussion^{14, 46} yielded no decision on this matter. Specific votes on "executive director of admissions" and "associate vice-provost for admissions" produced split decisions. Thus, no specific recommendation can be made on the title. This difficulty in agreeing on a title to be given the head of admissions reflects a problem much deeper and much more serious than a disagreement over definitions. The difficulty resulted from the desire of the task force members to ensure that the University in general and the administration in particular recognize that the head of admissions plays a critical role in the educational mission of the University and must be given authority and responsibility commensurate with that role.

Concerning the *responsibilities* of the admissions officers, there was no disagreement. In fact, the provost's consultative committee on the search for the head of admissions reviewed the job description proposed^{14, 46, 49} by the task force for the chief admissions officer and the following joint description was formulated.

Recommendation 13. *The head of admissions should be responsible for:*

- Recruiting, selecting, and matriculating undergraduate students.*
- Establishing an admissions process consistent with the educational policy formulated by the faculties of the several undergraduate schools.*
- Developing and implementing effective recruitment strategies.*
- Securing and coordinating the supportive admissions roles provided by the undergraduate deans, the faculty, the alumni, the*

student body, the development office, and friends of the University.

Apprising the deans and faculties of short and long-term recruitment and enrollment trends.

The head of admissions should report to the provost through the VPUSUL and sit as a member of the provost's administrative staff.

To carry out the above tasks effectively, the person selected as head of admissions should have experience in both academic and management pursuits.

This job description, in addition to identifying the kind of person desired as head of admissions, also summarizes the task force's feelings about the nature and significance of the admissions office.

Along with the chief admissions officer, his or her principal associates should possess talent for making innovative changes in the admissions process, particularly along the lines articulated in this report. Very specifically, these "associate admissions officers" must include in their career tools both marketing and research analysis.

Recommendation 14. *The associate admissions officers (known as regional and program directors in the current structure) should be responsible for:*

- Identifying market topography of region or program pool.*
- Recruiting relative to that topography.*
- Helping develop, organize, and train alumni recruiters.*
- Conducting analyses of secondary schools associated with region or program, yielding parameters meaningful for selection.*
- Spending time in the field after selection to secure matriculants and to begin recruiting juniors.*
- Reviewing slate committee decisions.*

Summary

In presenting this report, the task force ends its work by noting a unanimity of opinion, both among previous reports and the persons recently interviewed, concerning the need for *vigorous recruiting*. The exigencies of today related to high tuition and decreasing pool size force the task force to view *recruiting* by the *entire* University family as the only way to meet our high educational aspirations at the undergraduate level. Experience has shown the best recruiting device to be an enthusiastic friend of the University—a faculty member, an alumnus, a student, an employee. . . . In this sense, *effective coordination* of the recruiting effort must be identified as the most important task of the admissions office. The selection process, no matter how elegantly conceived and carried out, is meaningless if there is little of value from which to select.

References

1. Letter from E. Stellar appointing members of Task Force on the Study of Admissions, 8 July 1976.
2. "Admissions Policy for the Undergraduate Schools of the University of Pennsylvania," a Report of the University Council Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid, Dan M. McGill, chairman, 1 August 1967.
3. "Recruitment of Undergraduates for the University of Pennsylvania," a Report by the Subcommittee on Recruiting of the University Council Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid, Norman S. Fink, chairman, 28 September 1971.
4. Letter from Martin Meyerson, president of the University of Pennsylvania, to Peter T. Seely, dean of admissions, re admissions ideas, 30 May 1972.
5. "An Addendum to the Admissions Policy for the Undergraduate Schools of the University of Pennsylvania," a report of the University Council Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid, Thomas H. Wood, chairman, 1 August 1972.
6. "Undergraduate Enrollment: Prospectus for Progress," by Kent W. Schell, University of Pennsylvania Admissions Office, 5 May 1973.
7. "Report of the Subcommittee on Recruitment to the University Council Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and financial Aid," John Douglas Minyard, chairman, 5 February 1974, University of Pennsylvania.
8. "Report on Recruitment of Undergraduate Applicants from the Council Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid," Robert F. Evans, chairman (aside from minor revisions, this report is substantially identical to the Minyard Report, reference 7 above), 1 April 1974.
9. Letter from M.J. Stephens to P.A. McFate re Ivy League Policy on Financial Aid, 10 August 1976.
10. Letter from P.A. McFate to M.J. Stephens re financial aid, 1 September 1976.
11. "Annotations from 'Admissions Policy for the Undergraduate

* Editor's note: Lee Stetson has been appointed director of admissions, effective July 1, 1978. See Almanac, February 21, 1978.

- Schools of the University of Pennsylvania' (the McGill report, 1 August 1967, reference 2 above)," by Joseph Bordogna in memo to Members of the Task Force on the Study of Admissions, 18 October 1976.
12. "Enrolling the Class of 1979: Second Annual Report on the Student Market at Twenty-Three Private Institutions," Consortium on Financing Higher Education (COHFE), October 1976.
 13. "The Future Market for College Education," by Humphrey Doermann in *A Role for Marketing in College Admissions*, College Entrance Examination Board, New York, 1976.
 14. Provost's Task Force on Study of Admissions meeting notes: 17 September 1976, 1 October 1976, 8 October 1976, 15 October 1976, 22 October 1976, 29 October 1976, 12 November 1976, 19 November 1976, 3 December 1976, 17 December 1976, 18 February 1977, 30 March 1977.
 15. Notes on telephone discussion with Robert F. Giegengack, associate professor of geology, by Joseph Bordogna, 22 September 1976.
 16. Report of meeting with entire admissions office staff by Joseph Bordogna on 14 September 1976.
 17. Notes on interview with Eliot Stellar, provost, by task force, 1 October 1976.
 18. Memo to Task Force on Study of Admissions re "Remarks about Admissions Strategy" from Norman Oler, 1 October 1976.
 19. Notes on interview with Patricia A. McFate, vice-provost for undergraduate studies and University life, by task force, 8 October 1976.
 20. Notes on interview with Becky G. Collins, director of upperclass admissions, by Kenneth W. Taber, 12 October 1976.
 21. Notes on interview with Eleanor J. Carlin, chairman, SAMP physical therapy department, by Alice Kelley, October 1976.
 22. Notes on interview with Vincent Conti, assistant dean, FAS Academic Advising Services, by Alice Kelley, October 1976.
 23. Notes on interview with C.A. Brest, vice-dean of admissions, by task force, 15 October 1976.
 24. Notes on interview with D. Bruce Johnstone, director of the office of the president, by Frederick G. Kempin, 18 October 1976.
 25. Notes on interview with F. Andrew Geiger, director of recreation and intercollegiate activities, by David K. Hildebrand, October 1976.
 26. Notes on interview with C.A. Brest, vice-dean of admissions, by Alexander Coy, III, 22 October 1976.
 27. Notes on interview with Karen Benucci by Alexander H. Coy, III, 22 October 1976.
 28. Notes on interview with George S. Koval, director of financial aid, by task force, 22 October 1976.
 29. Notes on interview with Paul O. Gaddis, vice-president for management, by Frederick G. Kempin, 25 October 1976.
 30. Notes on interview with Matthew J. Stephens, vice-dean and director of Wharton undergraduate division, by Thaddeus R. Maciag, 27 October 1976.
 31. Notes on interview with Betsy Linton, former assistant for admissions region III, by Alexander H. Coy, III, 28 October 1976.
 32. "Technology in the Office: Word Processing," by Paul Chau, *Pennsylvania Triangle*, October 1976, pp. 7-11.
 33. Memo to Members of Task Force on Study of Admissions re "Alternative Selection Procedures," by David K. Hildebrand, 1 November 1976.
 34. Letter to Joseph Bordogna from Kim M. Morrisson, Assistant Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies and University Life re title of head of admissions office, 9 November 1976.
 35. Notes on interview with Gerald L. Robinson, Executive Director of Personnel Services, by Norman Oler, 11 November 1976.
 36. Memo to Members of Task Force on Study of Admissions from Joseph Bordogna forwarding Carol Black's Historical Sketch of Minority Recruitment at Pennsylvania, 16 November 1976.
 37. Notes on interview with John L. Wineland, Director of Admissions Region I, by Joseph Bordogna, 17 November 1976.
 38. Notes on interview with H. Michael Neiditch, Director of Alumni Council on Admissions, by Norman Oler, undated.
 39. Memo to Members of Task Force on Study of Admissions re "Title of the head of the AO," by Alexander H. Coy, III, 19 November 1976.
 40. Notes on interview with Gretchen A. Wood, Assistant to Dean of FAS for Liaison with Admissions Office, by Joseph Bordogna, 22 November 1976.
 41. Memo to Members of Task Force on Study of Admissions from Joseph Bordogna re list of schools which Pennsylvania's September 1976 non-matriculants are attending, 29 November 1976.
 42. Memo to file re report on Task Force work to Student Services Budget Work Group (Jon C. Strauss, Patricia A. McFate, Donald C. Carroll, Franklin Lindsay, Joseph Bordogna), 30 November 1976.
 43. "Mobile Americans: They're Still Heading South in Large Numbers," p. 89, *U.S. News & World Report*, 6 December 1976.
 44. Report of meeting with Expanded Admissions Staff (Admissions Office staff plus FAS liaison person, Gretchen A. Wood, and Director of Alumni Council on Admissions, H. Michael Neiditch) by Joseph Bordogna, 8 December 1976.
 45. Notes on interview with John E. Flowers, Director of Admissions Region III, by Joseph Bordogna, 8 December 1976.
 46. Memo to Provost Eliot Stellar re head of admissions job description, by Joseph Bordogna, 9 December 1976.
 47. Report of meeting with Stanley E. Johnson, Dean of Admissions, in his office re discussion of previous studies and reports in his files, by Joseph Bordogna, 13 December 1976.
 48. Notes on telephone interview with Karen A. Benucci, new Director of Upperclass Admissions, by Joseph Bordogna, 15 December 1976.
 49. Memo to members of Provost's Consultative Committee on Search for Head of Admissions from Joseph Bordogna re job description, 20 December 1976.
 50. Notes on interview with F. Andrew Geiger, Director of Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics, by Joseph Bordogna, 20 December 1976.
 51. Notes on interview with William G. Owen, vice-president for development and University relations, by Joseph Bordogna, 21 December 1976.
 52. Notes on interview with Malinda Murray, School of Nursing, by Joseph Bordogna, 21 December 1976.
 53. Notes on interview with Beverly Sanders, director of Minority Recruitment Program, by Joseph Bordogna, 21 December 1976.
 54. Notes on interview with Vartan Gregorian, dean of FAS, by Kenneth W. Taber, 26 December 1976.
 55. Minutes of the University Council Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid re report by chairman, Provost's Task Force on Study of Admissions, 6 January 1977.
 56. Notes on interview with Vartan Gregorian, dean of FAS, by Alice Kelley, 7 January 1977.
 57. Memo to members of Task Force on Study of Admissions re admission publications, by Joseph Bordogna, 11 January 1977.
 58. Notes on interview with Robert F. Duvall, FAS associate development officer, by Joseph Bordogna, 13 January 1977.
 59. Letter to Joseph Bordogna from Elliott Mossman, chairman, Faculty Senate Committee on Administration re job description for head of admissions, 20 January 1977.
 60. Notes on telephone discussion with alumnus Clifford Campbell, former member of admissions staff, now vice-president of enrollment planning at Point Park in Pittsburgh, by Joseph Bordogna, 24 January 1977.
 61. "The Applicant as V.I.P.," *Almanac*, 25 January 1977, p. 6.
 62. Memo from P.A. McFate to S.E. Johnson and C.L. Barnes, Jr. re proposed admissions-publications program for 1977-78, 26 January 1977.
 63. Memo to members of Task Force on Study of Admissions re admissions publications, by Joseph Bordogna, 1 February 1977.
 64. Notes on interviews with alumni: (1) Mr. Richard A. Eliasberg, leader in secondary school committee work in Baltimore area and president of First Federated Life Insurance Company, and (2) Dr. and Mrs. Thomas Newmann (DDS), leaders in secondary school committee work in Northern New Jersey, by Joseph Bordogna—reported in notes of task force meeting on 18 February 1977; see also Mr. Eliasberg's letter to Joseph Bordogna dated 31 January 1977.
 65. Notes on discussion about application form with C.L. Barnes, Jr., C.A. Brest, V. Clark, S.E. Johnson, J.L. Woneland, by J. Bordogna, 1 March 1977.
 66. Notes on interview with Douglas Landon, Wharton graduate admissions officer and former associate director of admissions at Brown University, 30 March 1977.
 67. Admissions office reports and data files made available by dean of admissions for use of Provost's Task Force on Study of Admissions:
 - a. Reports of the Consortium on Financing Higher Education (COFHE): Cost Study of Recruitment (January 1975), Analysis of '74 Student Market (September 1975), Advanced Placement Candidates Enrollment Data (May 1976), Financing Undergraduate Aid (May 1976).
 - b. American Council on Education Research—Summary Data on Entering Freshmen, Fall 1975.
 - c. Comparative study of merit scholars currently enrolled.

- d. Five-year statistics of northeast prep school applicants, admits, and matrics.
- e. Commonwealth statistics (by target schools; by counties; by public, private, and parochial schools; by Philadelphia; by five-county area).
- f. Region I statistical data.
- g. Region III statistical data.
- h. ATP summary report—highlights of 1975 freshman class (test data, high school record, college plans, etc.).
- i. Comparative review of recent ivy recruitment travel.
- j. Hammerberg study—preliminary view of University of Pennsylvania applicant pool.
- k. 1959-1975 chart of applicants, admits, matrics, and yield for each undergraduate school.
- l. Eastern group admissions directors (EGAD) full enrollment figures, 1975 (44 Private Eastern Colleges).
- m. EGAD survey of staffing and responsibilities.
- n. Transfer statistics, 1971-1975.
- o. Five-year statistical analysis by region of the number of schools from which Penn receives matriculants.
- p. Staff responses to the September 1975 COFHE Study.
- q. Analysis of where the admitted but *not* attending student chose to go.
- r. Five-year study by region of all the schools from which we have at least one matriculant.

Openings

The following listings are condensed from the Personnel Office's Bulletin of March 23. 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

***Accountant I** prepares monthly operating statement and balance sheet, reconciles computer reports with general ledger. Bachelor's degree in accounting, familiarity with data processing operations. \$9,275-\$13,000.

Administrative Coordinator (2/21/78).

Assistant General Counsel (1/17/78).

Assistant Health Physicist (2/21/78).

Associate Development Officer I (3/21/78).

Associate Development Officer III is responsible to the senior vice-president for coordinating the planning and execution of fund raising activities. Bachelor's degree, five years' experience in public relations and fund-raising. \$22,000-\$31,375.

Associate Director for Maintenance Operations has primary departmental responsibility for budget development, operations systems and maintenance functions of residential buildings. Master's degree in business administration or equivalent combination of education and experience; five years' experience in residence or closely related field. Salary to be determined.

***Director of Field Programs** assists in the development and improvement of accounting system methodology. Bachelor's degree with extensive course work in accounting, three to five years' experience in financial management and administration. \$16,625-\$23,725.

Director, Small Animal Hospital (1/31/78).

Fiscal Coordinator (3/21/78).

Junior Research Specialist (*two positions*) (a) concerned with biochemical physiology or endocrinology involving work with isotopes, enzymes, protein and steroid biochemistry and assays (bachelor's degree in biochemistry or biology); (b) participates in study of effects of prostaglandin synthesis on cell lipids, membrane phospholipids in smooth muscle (bachelor's or master's degree in chemistry or biochemistry, experience in lipid chemical techniques and radioisotopes). \$9,275-\$13,000.

Manager, Levy Tennis Pavilion (3/21/78).

Program Director (3/21/78).

Programmer Analyst I (3/7/78).

Research Specialist I (*four positions*) (a) provides aid to investigator in scientific research and assists in research project by instructing others (bachelor's degree in immunology, one to three years' experience in immunology with at least junior professional standing); (b) abstracts data from emergency department and files rescue forms, does library research, writes reports (bachelor's degree, registered nurse, experience in research or emergency care); (c) performs cellular and biochemical assays of radiation

induced damage and repair in cultured mammalian cells (master's degree in biochemistry or molecular biology, expertise in mammalian cell-culture techniques); (d) is responsible to principal research investigator for conducting research in instrumentation retrieval, mathematics or physics (bachelor's degree in science, one to three years' experience with junior professional standing in electron microscopy). \$10,050-\$14,325.

Senior Staff Writer (3/7/78).

Senior Systems Programmer (3/21/78).

Staff Writer II develops and prepares printed materials, coordinates project with designer, photographer and production coordinator. Bachelor's degree with course work in English and journalism, knowledge of typographical techniques and demonstrated writing skills. \$11,525-\$16,125.

Part-Time

Computer Programmer writes programs to generate auditory stimuli, uses speech synthesis facility. Two years' experience, knowledge of Fortran, LISP and interfacing real time programs. Hourly wages.

Conference Coordinator (*March-August 1978*) involves organizing conferences and writing report. Master's degree in health related field. \$1,200/month.

Nurse Consultant participates in the delivery of the Philadelphia Corporation for Aging's In-Home Services program. Bachelor's or master's degree in nursing, preferably in community health. Salary to be determined.

Nurse Practitioner I reviews in-home service requests identified by in-home coordinators and makes recommendations regarding home care needs. Bachelor's or master's degree in nursing in the field of community health. \$11,515-\$16,125.

Project Practitioner II develops health guidelines and procedures, acts as liaison with health community, supervises IHS staff and nurse consultants. Master's degree in public health nursing, experience in administration, program development and supervision. Salary to be determined.

Staff Nurse performs medical tests on drug-abusing patients participating in research programs. Registered nurse, experience and training in psychiatric nursing. Salary to be determined.

Support Staff

Accounts Payable Clerk (3/7/78).

Administrative Assistant I (*two positions*) (a) acts as secretary/receptionist, does budget work, supervises staff (B.A., M.A. degrees, five years' experience); (b) coordinates arrangements for three external training programs, has budget responsibility (excellent typing). \$7,150-\$9,150.

Admissions Assistant (2/28/78).

Cashier (2/7/78).

Clerk III (3/21/78).

Clerk IV responsible to business administrator for coordinating, organizing, monitoring and controlling matters pertaining to personnel and payroll management. High school graduate, some business or college courses preferred. \$6,700-\$8,575.

Facilities Coordinator (3/21/78).

Histology Technician II (3/21/78).

Junior Accountant (3/21/78).

Receptionist greets visitors, answers inquiries, has general receptionist duties. High school graduate. \$5,400-\$6,925.

Recorder, Book Invoice (3/21/78).

Research Laboratory Technician I assists in mastitis laboratory work, including milk culturing, media preparation, cell counting. Knowledge of bacteriological laboratory techniques and safety precautions, ability to interpret cultures. \$6,775-\$8,675.

Research Laboratory Technician II (2/21/78).

Research Laboratory Technician III (*7 positions*) (a) involves ordering supplies, protein preparation and determination, and gel electrophoresis (B.S. in chemistry or biology); (b) maintains laboratory, assists and conducts experiments (experience in biochemical analyses, using enzymatic and spectrophotometric techniques); (c) performs chemical assays using spectrophotometers (college graduate); (d) prepares protein solutions, measures gas ligand and ion binding, performs enzyme assays (bachelor's degree in science, preferably in biochemistry, physical chemistry); (e) tests pulmonary functions, analyzes blood gases and pH, assists with fiberoptic bronchoscopies (B.S. in biology or chemistry); (f) prepares tissue cultures and reagents, works with radioisotopes (college graduate in science preferably in biology); (g) performs experiments involving electrical stimulation of nerves in anesthetized animals (bachelor's degree in chemistry, biology or related science, basic experience in electronics). \$8,625-\$11,050.

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

Secretary III (*seven positions*) \$6,770-\$8,575.

Secretary IV maintains records of dean's memorandum file, handles travel

arrangements, coordinates Leon Lecture arrangements and administers budget. High school graduate, able to take dictation. \$7,700-\$9,850.

Secretary, Medical/Technical \$7,150-\$9,150.

Secretary, Medical/Technical involves typing letters, manuscripts, grant requests, filing, budget and travel arrangements. Degree preferred, previous secretarial experience. \$7,150-\$9,150.

Senior Admissions Assistant (*two positions*) (a) (3/21/78); (b) works on public relations materials, supervises work-study students (high school graduate). \$7,700-\$9,850.

Stack Attendant (*three positions*) (2/21/78).

Stockkeeper II (3/21/78).

Student Records Assistant (2/21/78).

Supervisor, Accounting (3/21/78).

Veterinary Anesthesia Technician I (3/21/78).

Part-Time

Bookkeeper (*one day/week*) acts as secretary to the annual membership campaign, responsible for cash advances, travel reimbursements. High school graduate, bookkeeping skills. Salary to be determined.

Laboratory Technician must be capable of doing semi-independent investigations in the areas of skin cancer and aging. Experience in small animal surgery, photographic dark-room techniques and tumor biology, thorough knowledge of histologic techniques for light microscopy and transmission electron microscopy. Hourly wages.

Receptionist (*20 hours/week*) records and tabulates research data, confirms appointments with patients by phone. Previous secretarial/clerical experience. Hourly wages.

Secretary (*two positions*) (a) provides general assistance to research coordinator (typing, bookkeeping experience, preferably experience related to psychological research); (b) (*five months only*) arranges scheduling of academic and clinical functions at school, develops fall activities with program director, types annual reports and routine correspondence (typing skills). Salary to be determined.

Typist (*two positions*) (a) (*minimum six months, three to four hours/day average*) transcribes dictation, correspondence, minutes, reports, prepares rough and finished copy in IBM memory typewriter (good speller, typing 65 w.p.m.); (b) types a variety of non-complex materials, cuts stencils, proofreads (high school graduate, clerical and typing abilities). Salary to be determined.

Things to Do

Editor's note: Please refer to calendar in this issue for events in April.

Lectures

The **DUMAND Project** is discussed by Professor Frederick Reines, University of California, in a Goodspeed-Richards Memorial Lecture, sponsored by the physics department, March 29, 4 p.m., David Rittenhouse Laboratory, Auditorium A2 (tea, 3:30 p.m., faculty lounge 2E17). § Metin Kunt, visiting professor at Columbia University and professor of Ottoman history, Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey, traces the **Transformation of Ottoman Provincial Administration ca. 1600**, March 30, 4 p.m., Williams Hall, fourth floor, east lounge, sponsored by the Middle East Center and the Oriental studies department. § The Health Services Research Seminar series examines **The Health Belief Model: Recent Formulations and Empirical Analysis** with Marshall Becker, Ph.D., professor, Department of Health Behavior and Health Education, School of Public Health, University of Michigan, March 30, 4:30 p.m., Colonial Penn Center, Boardroom. § The ninth in the President's Lecture series features **Contemporary Music—the Expressive Revival** with composers George Crumb, George Rochberg and Richard Wernick, professors of music at Penn, March 30, 4 p.m., Harrison Auditorium, University Museum. § Spouse abuse—its history and ritual—is the topic for a lecture in four playlets, **Charivari: Honor and Community in 17th Century Lyon and Geneva**, performed by Nancy Zemon Davis, Ph.D., history professor at Princeton University, currently with the Institute for Advanced Studies, March 30, noon, Houston Hall, Harrison-Smith-Penniman Room, sponsored by the Women's Studies Program and the history department. § William Hinton, author of *Fanshen*, a documentary of a village in the early years of the Chinese revolution, reports on his **1977 Revisit to a Chinese Village**, March 31, 8 p.m., Stiteler Hall, Room B-6, sponsored by the Penn Committee of the U.S.-China People Friendship Association.

Films

Annenberg School's Exploratory Cinema series reviews "Anthropological Exploration: Adaptation and Transformation" with **Tobriand Cricket: An**

Ingenious Response to Imperialism, Les Maitres Fous and Changing, March 29, 7 and 9:30 p.m., Studio Theater, Annenberg Center (students with I.D., \$1; others, \$2). § **Nothing but the Best** will be shown by the Wharton Film series, March 30, 6:30 p.m., Vance Hall B-1, and March 31, 11 a.m., Dietrich Hall, E-9. § Two of Wim Wender's films, **Kings of the Road** (March 30, 7:30 p.m.; March 31, 4 p.m.) and **Alice in the Cities** (March 31, 7:30 p.m.), will be screened by International Cinema Series 4, International House's Hopkinson Hall (\$1.50, matinee \$1). **Wim Wenders**, a leading director of the "new German cinema," will discuss and answer questions about his work, March 31, 9:30 p.m., co-sponsored by Annenberg Cinematheque. § Penn Union Council presents three showings of **The Rocky Horror Picture Show**, March 31, 8, 10 and midnight, in Irvine Auditorium (\$1).



Mixed Bag

Morris Arboretum begins a six-part course on plant families at the Morris, April 4, and has two workshops April 1 on basic pruning and rose pruning. Call CH 7-5777. § The Organic Theater Company's production of Ray Bradbury's **The Wonderful Ice Cream Suit** is performed at the Theater of the Annenberg School March 29 (preview March 28) through April 16. Box office: Ext. 6791. § **Strategic Imperative: Stepping Out to Step Up** is the theme for the fifth annual conference of the Whitney M. Young, Jr., lecture series, March 31, University Museum, sponsored by the Black MBA Association of the Wharton School. § The Faculty Club serves a **pre-theater dinner buffet** April 5, followed by the Annenberg School's **The Wonderful Ice Cream Suit**. Reservations: Ext. 4618.

ALMANAC: 515 Franklin Building (16) Ext. 5274

Editor..... Diane Cole

Associate Editor..... Marilyn Ackerman

Editorial Assistant..... Gordon Schonfeld

Design..... Jane Whitehouse