

Almanac

Published Weekly by the University of Pennsylvania

Volume 24, Number 30

May 2, 1978

- News
- Wage and Salary Increases
- Guidelines on Open Expression
- Report of the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty

Faculty Senate Votes to Establish Review Panel

More than 600 faculty members voted overwhelmingly in favor of establishing "a faculty panel to review faculty concerns about the administration and to pursue with the administration measures to reestablish an atmosphere of confidence throughout the University," at a special meeting of the Faculty Senate, Friday, April 28. (The full text of the resolution appears below.)

The meeting—which some said attracted the largest crowd ever to attend a faculty meeting here—was called by Faculty Senate Chairman Irving B. Kravis after Robert Hartwell (history) presented him with a petition signed by more than 130 faculty members requesting a meeting "to assess the performance of the central administration." (See *Almanac*, April 4, 1978.)

At Friday's meeting, a substitute motion by Hartwell calling for "an immediate and exhaustive review of the administration" was defeated by the Faculty Senate, as was a motion by Richard Orkand (physiology and pharmacology, dental school) for a vote of no confidence in the administration.

Kravis opened the meeting with a summary of the events leading to the meeting. (See *Almanac*, April 24, 1978 for trustee Carl Kaysen's report on the meeting between a group of faculty leaders and trustees.)

Introducing the main motion of the afternoon—a resolution recommended by the Senate Advisory Committee—Kravis outlined three points of consideration: that, first, "in some important respects this administration has performed well," probably no "worse than its sister institutions since 1970 and in some notable respects, including faculty salary levels, it has fared better"; second, some trustees are "upset that internal turmoil" may frustrate their fundraising efforts; third, "the offices of the president and the provost may be so weakened that future occupants might be difficult to attract or that those who are attracted will be inhibited from taking necessary measures that may be unpopular."

Kravis described Provost Eliot Stellar's decision to resign as an opportunity "for a new start with a different combination of persons in the central leadership of the University. . . . I think that his [Stellar's] opinion was that the external costs to the University of a change in the provostship was the least expensive way of freeing up the internal situation for change."

Kravis told the Senate, "the choices were to either accept the present opportunities for a partial renewal of the central administration or to forge ahead for still further change. . . . I have no doubt that this faculty has the power to force further changes. . . . But I plead with you to weigh the costs. Our relations with our trustees may be permanently worsened, and private financial support of the University is likely to diminish. Since it will surely take time to resolve the issues, we may expect first an administration paralyzed by uncertainty. At a later stage, we may have to reckon with the completely unpredictable character of an administration appointed in a crisis situation by trustees (headed by a new chairman as yet unknown) whose rapport with the faculty will have been sharply strained."

Ralph Amado (physics), a former chairman of the Faculty Senate, introduced the SAC recommendation saying, "it is time to rebuild, to begin to heal, and to try to restore confidence, but by relaxing our vigilance, but by reviewing concerns, working with the administration and exercising our responsibility and perhaps even our power, to improve the University."

Hartwell, presenting his substitute motion, talked of "some of the collective concerns of this faculty." He cited mechanisms involved in various appointments, including administrative posts and

University professorships, the elimination of the office of computing activities, the handling of the labor dispute and problems in Harrisburg, the phase-out of SAMP and continuation of SPUP, the proposed cuts in athletic programs and professional theater (which led to the student sit-in of March 2-6), and the changes in graduate fellowship allocations. "Most, if not all, signers of the letter requesting this special meeting believe that no university can survive in a continual state of crisis," he said.

Hartwell's motion was to substitute the last paragraph of the SAC resolution with the following: "Resolved, that the Senate therefore instructs the Senate Advisory Committee to establish a faculty panel to conduct an immediate and exhaustive review of the president and his administration and to pursue all possible measures to restore the confidence of the faculty in the central

(Continued on page 2)

Resolution Passed by Faculty Senate

The Senate Advisory Committee, at a meeting on April 25, unanimously recommended that the Senate adopt the following resolution. It was approved by the Faculty Senate, Friday, April 28.

Whereas, the Senate welcomes recognition by the trustees and administration of serious concerns among faculty about the administrative functioning of the University

And, whereas the Senate recognizes the necessity for strong leadership in the presidency and the provostship

Therefore, the Senate instructs the Senate Advisory Committee to establish a faculty panel to review faculty concerns about the administration and to pursue with the administration measures to reestablish an atmosphere of confidence throughout the University and to report back to the Senate no later than the fall meeting.

Statement by the President and Provost

We were gratified by the expression of cooperation at Friday's Senate meeting, by the determination to solve concerns the perceptions of which we share, and by the recognition that a strong presidency and provostship are required. It is clear that there are important problems with which the faculty leadership, others, and we must deal.

The large attendance of our colleagues showed how deeply all of us care about the University. We are determined to improve our administrative pattern and system of governance not only to create an orderly transition to a new provostship, but also to plan and act effectively for the resolution of vexing financial and other issues which face us in the period ahead. Working together we can take advantage of opportunities for greater academic distinction.

—Martin Meyerson, President; Eliot Stellar, Provost

From the Senate Chairman

The outcome of the special meeting of the Senate provides an opportunity for the faculty and administration to work together in removing sources of faculty dissatisfaction with the administrative functioning of the University. This outcome was made possible by the recognition by the trustees and the administration of the concerns of the faculty. The task before us will be facilitated by the faculty's reaffirmation of the need for a strong presidency and a strong provostship. The Senate Advisory Committee will, I am sure, proceed promptly along the lines approved by the faculty. We all hope for early success in these endeavors.

—Irving B. Kravis, Faculty Senate Chairman

(Continued from page 1)

administration and to report back to the Senate no later than September 30, 1978."

Orkand then stepped forward with an amendment to the Hartwell motion "because I have the sense that this faculty did not assemble here today primarily to set up yet another committee to study the problem. . . . I suggest that our responsibility today is to advise our trustees as to our level of confidence in our president."

Orkand's resolution read: "Resolved that the Senate therefore instructs its chairman to inform the trustees that we lack confidence in the ability of this president to lead us through the difficult years ahead."

Provost Eliot Stellar's remarks were greeted with a large round of applause. "Any report that my resignation was involuntary is completely incorrect," he said. "This is a time to heal wounds. It is a time for courage, ingenuity and a high sense of purpose, for wisdom and statesmanship for all of us."

President Martin Meyerson stated that "our machinery of governance has not been working as it ought." Meyerson asserted that the University "is a very sound University both academically and economically," and that he was prepared to listen to the afternoon's proceedings.

In the debate that followed, the Orkand lack of confidence resolution was defeated by a large majority. Morris Mendelson (finance) commented, "a no confidence resolution would put the administration on trial without reply. . . it might be an exercise in futility."

Phillip DeLacy (classical studies), supporting the Hartwell substitution, summarized the problems he had encountered as chairman-elect and chairman of the Faculty Senate from 1973 to 1975. "What distressed me most was the inadequacy of our mechanisms for academic planning. . . . This assessment, as I say, was made in 1973-75. Recent events have given me no reason to alter it."

Law School Dean Louis Pollak spoke in opposition to the substitution. He urged due process and careful scrutiny of an itemized list of charges and concerns. "Due process must be carried through so the faculty can exercise their sovereign responsibility."

Phoebe Leboy (biochemistry, dental school) responded that she was "perplexed" by Pollak's call for due process, and that she believed there was a need to restore confidence.

Philip Rieff (sociology) noted "a certain rancor" in the Hartwell resolution and spoke in favor of the SAC resolution, citing its "power, generosity, judiciousness."

After further debate, the Hartwell resolution was defeated by a vote of 234 in favor and 370 opposed.

The SAC resolution was passed by an overwhelming majority.

\$4 Million Research Grant for SPUP

The University's School of Public and Urban Policy (SPUP) received a \$4 million research grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) on Monday, April 24. The grant, presented by Donna E. Shalala, assistant secretary for policy development and research, Department of Housing and Urban Development, is considered to be the largest ever awarded to a university. SPUP was selected over Washington University (St. Louis, Missouri), Harvard University working with Yale University and Wellesley College, and the University of Chicago working with the University of Houston and Northwestern University.

The four-year research study will determine the impact of HUD's multi-billion dollar Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program on low and moderate income families. (The CDBG program was initiated in 1974 to replace categorical grants and allow cities more leeway in deciding how funds were to be spent.)

Janet Rothenberg Pack, a lecturer in public policy, SPUP, and Stephen Gale, chairman of the Department of Regional Science, FAS, will direct the study, assisted by researchers from Princeton University, Rutgers University, the New School of Social Research and Queen's University, Ontario, Canada.

Individuals from several departments and schools of the University prepared the grant, and that these schools and departments will be full participants in the study.

Earlier this year SPUP received a \$500,000 endowment grant from the United Parcel Service Foundation (see *Almanac*, February 14, 1978). The grants come after a review of the school by the Educational Planning Committee (see *Almanac*, September 20, 1977) and a decision to continue the school with Dr. Britton Harris as dean (see *Almanac*, October 18, 1977, "Council").

Hey Day 1978: Faculty and Students Recognized

The 47th annual Hey Day ceremonies honored the University's outstanding faculty and students. Also featured at the traditional spring rite, Friday, April 28, were the collegiate changing of the guard, with members of the junior class marching with members of the senior class in the straw hat and cane march; the planting of the class ivy and the unveiling of the Class of 1978 ivy stone at College Hall.

Lindback Awards

This year's recipients of the Lindback Awards for Distinguished Teaching are listed below. There were eight winners—four from non-health areas and four from health areas. The winners will be honored by the Lindback Society, whose membership includes all recipients of the award since its establishment in 1961, at a reception May 9, at which time Dr. Charles Dwyer, president of the society, will formally welcome them as fellows of the society.

Selection procedures were the same as in previous years: In the non-health areas, the Committee on Distinguished Teaching, composed of faculty (former Lindback Award winners) and students, submitted to the Provost's Staff Conference a list of finalists from which the four winners were selected. In the health areas, an ad hoc committee of students and faculty representing the health schools selected four winners for approval by the vice-president for health affairs.

Non-Health Area

Dr. Morton Botel, professor of education. A reading specialist, Dr. Botel has written and edited numerous articles for professional and research journals, textbooks for teachers on reading study skills and mathematics, and textbooks and trade books for children on reading and study, language and communications, and spelling and mathematics.

Dr. Arthur Green, undergraduate chairman and assistant professor of religious studies. Rabbi Green is a scholar of Jewish mysticism, especially Hassidism, and an authority on cults and movements on college campuses.

Dr. German Gullon, undergraduate chairman of Spanish and assistant professor of romance languages. Dr. Gullon is a scholar and critic, specializing in literary theory and modern Hispanoamerican literature and the 19th century Spanish novel.

Dr. Abba M. Krieger, assistant professor of statistics and epidemiology. Dr. Krieger received an Anvil award for excellence in teaching from the Wharton Graduate Association in 1977.

Health Area

Dr. Harrison M. Berry, Jr., professor of roentgenology, School of Dental Medicine. Dr. Berry has taught radiology courses in the School of Dental Medicine since 1943 and was chairman of the Department of Radiology from 1962 to 1974.

Dr. Charles F. Reid, professor of radiology, New Bolton Center, School of Veterinary Medicine. A teaching clinician, Dr. Reid developed the center's large animal X-ray diagnostic and radiation therapy departments.

Dr. Alan C. Rosenquist, associate professor of anatomy, School of Medicine. Since 1970, Dr. Rosenquist has been course director of an interdepartmental course on medical neurobiology. He is currently a principal investigator in several research grant projects.

Dr. M. William Schwartz, assistant professor of pediatrics, Children's Hospital of Philadelphia. A teacher of pediatrics, nephrology and interdisciplinary courses, Dr. Schwartz is an education officer of the pediatrics department and chairman of a school-level subcommittee that evaluates the quality of courses.

Student Awards

Spoon Award—Mitchell Blutt, a senior in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, president of the senior class.

Alice Paul Award—Anna Marie Stein, a *Daily Pennsylvanian* staff writer, given by the Women's Faculty Club.

Bowl Award—Steven Glasgow, a senior in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, captain of the varsity wrestling team.

Cane Award—James Ramseur, a senior in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, chairman of the Black Pre-Health Society.

Spade Award—Ethan Goldman, a senior in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, senior class treasurer.

Royal Society of Arts Silver Medal—Sherrie Fishbein, a senior in the School of Nursing, vice-president of the Undergraduate Assembly of Nursing Students. This award is presented annually by the Royal Society of Arts of Great Britain in recognition of academic achievements and contributions to University life.

Althea K. Hottel Award—Trish Brown, a senior in the Wharton School, chair of the Undergraduate Assembly. This award was named for the University's former dean of women.

Gaylord P. Harnwell Award for outstanding service—Ellen Cooper, a senior in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, vice-president of the senior class. This award was named in honor of Dr. Gaylord P. Harnwell, president emeritus of the University and University Professor of Physics.

David R. Goddard Award for outstanding service—Amy Borrus, a senior in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, a features editor of the *Daily Pennsylvanian*.

Jean Brownlee Award—Lori Goldstein, a senior in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, director of Spring Fling, the annual campus spring weekend student celebration, and president of the Mortar Board this award was named for the former dean of the College of Women.

Sol Feinstone Awards—Beth Kaplan, a sophomore in the Wharton School, David Lieber, a junior in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, and Daniel Escobar, a senior in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. These awards are presented to students who have contributed to orderly and constructive social change.

Task Force on Governance Set in Motion

Members of the recently reinstated Task Force on University Governance are in the process of being selected. The task force will consider proposals to add one student and one faculty member to the Board of Trustees for a trial period on a non-voting basis—one of the agreements from the March 2-6 sit-in—review the recommendations of the 1970 Task Force on University Governance and consider governance issues posed by the sit-in.

Faculty on the task force are: Peter Cassileth (hematology-oncology), Peter Conn (English), Noyes Leech (law), Michael Wachter (economics) and Walter Wales (physics). Administration and trustee members are: Paul Miller, life trustee; Britton Harris, dean of the School of Public and Urban Policy; and William Owen, vice-president for development and University relations. Until a student constituency is elected, Mitchell Blutt, graduating senior class president, and Trish Brown, former Undergraduate Assembly chairman, will be acting members. President Martin Meyerson, Faculty Senate Chairman Irving Kravis and UA Chairman Mark Lerner will be *ex-officio* members.

Members of the Council Study Committee have also been selected. They are: Ralph Amado (physics), Steven Batterman (applied mechanics), Michael Cohen (physics), Peter Conn (English), chairman and liaison between the task force and Council committee, and Barbara Lowery (nursing).

The task force's first meeting took place Thursday, April 27.

Work-Study Program for 1978-79

The Student Employment Office (SEO) is currently gathering information for the 1978-79 academic year College Work-Study Program (CWSP) *Job Book*. University members who submitted an employment position for inclusion in the 1977-78 academic year *Job Book* will receive a copy of that job description—a CWSP *Job Book Update Form*, with instructions as to how to resubmit the position for inclusion or delete it from the 1978-79 CWSP *Job Book*.

Applications for Student Assistants will be distributed to all deans, directors, and budget administrators. These forms should be

used to submit any new employment positions that you wish to have included in the 1978-79 CWSP *Job Book*.

If you want to ensure that the work-study positions you wish to offer will be available next fall, complete and return either an *Update Form* or an *Application for Student Assistants* to the SEO, 233 Logan Hall on or before June 16, 1978.

—Randolph B. Winton, Assistant Director of Financial Aid

On Provost Eliot Stellar

These are very difficult times for universities and I can easily understand why a man who has given his all to the running of this University for five years would wish to return to his teaching and research. Eliot Stellar is widely admired on this campus as a man and as a scholar. We owe him a great debt of gratitude for his unstinting efforts on behalf of the University.

—Irving B. Kravis, Faculty Senate Chairman

Wage and Salary Increases for Fiscal Year 1978-79

All permanent non-union, non-faculty personnel hired before January 1, 1978 are eligible for wage and salary increases for fiscal year 1978-79 under the salary distribution policy.

Aggregate wage and salary budgets (for continuing positions only) will be increased by 5.5 percent effective July 1. Those funds are to be distributed primarily on the basis of merit after equalizations and critical market adjustments have been made. It is expected that the median increase will be between 4 and 5 percent, with a substantial spread in individual percentage increases. Recommendations for individual increases over 10 percent and below 2 percent must be accompanied by written reasons for those recommended actions, which must be reviewed and approved by the appropriate dean or senior administrator.

Areas with many small budgets can spread their distribution of the 5.5 percent increase over all budgets and not be limited to the 5.5 percent increase on any one of them.

All central administrative and professional staff whose total salary increase would be 6 percent or more, and whose salary would exceed \$30,000, will have their recommended salary increases approved by the president. In addition, there will be a post-salary review of all administrative and professional salaries by the executive director of personnel relations.

Market Adjustments

Based on 1977-78 survey data on the local non-profit markets, there are imbalances in a few of our clerical and technical grades. Only severe cases will be addressed at this time, and individual position adjustments will be recommended to budget officers by Friday, April 28.

Equalizations

Based on the principle of equal pay for equal work, recognizing experience and service time, certain salary adjustments will be recommended to provide for internal equity, also by April 28.

Wage and Salary Grades

Adjustments in our grades will not be made this year, because the grades were widened so significantly last year. Therefore, refer to the 1977-78 grades for next year's guidance. Any wages or salaries which will extend beyond the top of a pay grade should be discussed with Ms. Odessa McClain, compensation administration officer (Ext. 7752).

Rounding

In filling out gray book budgets, new annual salaries should be rounded to the nearest \$100.00 for base annual salaries of \$10,000 and over, and to the nearest \$50.00 for base annual salaries of less than \$10,000.

Effective Dates

Increases for personnel paid on a weekly basis are effective Monday, July 3, 1978, which begins the first weekly pay period in the new fiscal year. Increases will be reflected in pay checks issued July 13, 1978.

Salary increases for personnel paid on a monthly basis are effective July 1, 1978, and will be reflected in pay checks issued July 31, 1978.

—Gerald L. Robinson, Executive Director of Personnel Relations

Guidelines on Open Expression

[The following guidelines were approved by the University Council at its meeting April 12, 1978.]

I. Principles

A. The University of Pennsylvania, as a community of scholars, affirms, supports, and cherishes the concepts of freedom of thought, inquiry, speech and lawful assembly. The freedom to experiment, to present and to examine alternative data and theories; the freedom to hear, express, and to debate various views; and the freedom to voice criticism of existing practices and values are fundamental rights which must be upheld and practiced by the University in a free society.

B. Recognizing that the educational processes can include meetings, demonstrations, and other forms of collective expression, the University affirms the right of individuals and groups to assemble and to demonstrate on campus within the limits of these guidelines. The University also affirms that right of others to pursue their normal activities within the University and to be protected from physical injury or property damage.

C. The University should be vigilant to ensure the continuing openness and effectiveness of channels of communication among members of the University on questions of common interest. To further this purpose, a Committee on Open Expression has been established as a standing committee of the University Council. The Committee on Open Expression has as its major task: monitoring the communication processes to prevent conflicts that might emerge from failure of communication, recommending policies and procedures for improvement of all levels of communication, interpreting these guidelines, investigating alleged infringements of the right of open expression of any member or members of the University community, advising administrative officers where appropriate, and participating in evaluation and resolution of conflicts that may arise from incidents or disturbances on campus.

D. For the purposes of these guidelines, the "University community" shall mean the following individuals:

1. Persons who are in attendance as students or who have been in attendance in the past and are currently on an unexpired official leave of absence.

2. All persons who are employed by the University. This includes faculty, staff and administrative employees.

3. Trustees and associate trustees of the University.

E. For the purposes of these guidelines, a distinction is drawn between the terms "meeting" and "demonstration." A meeting is a gathering in a University facility previously reserved for the purpose. A demonstration is a gathering in a University facility not previously reserved for the purpose.

II. Committee on Open Expression

A. Composition

1. The Committee on Open Expression consists of 12 members: five students, five faculty members and two representatives of the administration.

2. Members of the committee are appointed by the steering committee in the following manner:

- a. Student members shall be nominated from undergraduate students, graduate students and graduate professional students by a means arrived at by representative student groups. If the students are unable to agree upon such a procedure, and instead propose several different procedures, the steering committee shall make an interim choice between the student proposals. Students selected by an interim process shall serve only until their peers have established a permanent selection process.

- b. Faculty members shall be nominated by the Senate Advisory Committee. The administration members shall be nominated by the president.

- c. Each member shall be selected for one year. Any individual may not serve for more than two consecutive terms.

3. The chair of the committee shall be selected by the steering committee from among the members of the Committee on Open Expression.

B. Jurisdiction—The committee shall have competence to act in

all issues and controversies involving open expression under these guidelines. The committee's responsibilities include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Giving advisory opinions interpreting the guidelines at the request of an interested member of the University community. If the committee does not give a requested opinion, it should indicate its reasons for not doing so.

2. Reviewing administrative decisions taken under these guidelines without prior consultation with the committee.

3. Issuing rules for interpreting or implementing the guidelines. Before adopting a rule, the committee should hold an open hearing on the text of the proposed rule and receive the views of interested individuals or groups. An affirmative vote of eight members is required for any such rule to be effective.

4. Recommending to the University Council any proposals to amend or repeal the guidelines. An affirmative vote of seven members is required to make such recommendations.

5. Publishing an annual report to the Council and the University on the status of the committee's work in the University journal of record.

6. Advising administrative officials with responsibilities affecting freedom of expression and communication, including particularly the use of University facilities for meetings and the utilization of force to terminate a meeting or demonstration.

7. Mediating in situations that threaten to give rise to incidents that may possibly violate the guidelines.

8. Evaluating and characterizing incidents which have resulted or may result in a member or members of the University community being charged with a violation of the guidelines. The committee shall not attempt to decide whether the individuals involved have in fact committed the acts charged, but rather whether the acts in question constitute a violation of the guidelines. This interpretation of the guidelines shall be conclusive in any disciplinary proceedings that may ensue.

9. Investigating and reporting on incidents alleged to have involved an infringement of the right of open expression of a member or members of the University community.

- a. Such investigations may be initiated at the request of any member of the University community. If the committee decides not to proceed with a requested investigation, it shall give its reasons for not doing so to the requesting party.

- b. The committee shall attempt to discover and recommend remedies for any failures in communication that may have caused or contributed to the incident.

- c. As a result of such investigations, the committee may decide the guidelines have been violated. Under such circumstances, all evidence gathered shall be provided to the judicial investigating officer, along with any conclusions the committee may draw based upon such evidence.

10. Adopting procedures for the functioning of the committee, varied to suit its several functions, consistent with these guidelines. Procedures that are not wholly matters of internal committee practice shall be published in advance of implementation.

C. Procedures

1. Seven members of the committee constitute a quorum. No member may participate in the consideration or decision of an issue in which he is or she is or may become involved.

2. The committee can authorize subcommittees, selected from its own members, to act for the committee in any matter except the issuance of rules interpreting or implementing the guidelines, or the making of recommendations to amend or repeal the guidelines.

3. The committee shall respect the privacy of individuals as its general policy and shall maintain the right to declare the confidentiality of its proceedings.

- a. If a person appearing before the committee requests that his or her testimony or information be kept confidential, the committee shall consider such a request. The committee shall then determine whether to honor such a request and shall inform that person of its decision before testimony is given.

b. Minutes of particular committee meetings may be declared confidential by the committee, or be so declared at the discretion of the chair, subject to review by the committee.

c. All committee documents containing confidential material, as determined by the chair, shall be clearly marked "confidential" and carry a warning against unauthorized disclosure.

III. Standards

A. The right of individuals and groups peaceably to assemble and to demonstrate shall not be infringed.

B. The substance or the nature of the views expressed is not an appropriate basis for any restriction upon or encouragement of an assembly or a demonstration.

C. The University should permit members of the University community, upon suitable request, to use any available facility or meeting room for purposes of open or private discussion.

1. The policies and procedures for assigning University facilities should be determined by the president or his delegates.

2. The Committee on Open Expression should be consulted in the determination of the substance of the policies and procedures and the manner of their publication by the University.

3. The policies and procedures should specifically address situations involving groups composed entirely or predominantly of persons not members of the University community.

4. Before a request of a University group to use any facility is rejected, for reasons other than the prior commitment of the facility or the like, the president or his delegate should consult with the Committee on Open Expression to obtain the advice and recommendations of that body.

D. Groups or individuals planning or participating in meetings or demonstrations should conduct themselves in accordance with the following standards:

1. Conduct that causes injury to persons or damage to property, or which threatens to cause such injury or damage, or which attempts to coerce action under threat of such injury or damage, is not permissible.

a. Demonstrations should not be held inside laboratories, museums, computer facilities, libraries, offices which contain records protected by law or by existing University policy such as educational records or student-related or personnel-related financial records or the like, because of the risk of loss, damage or destruction of rare or irreplaceable documents, collections or equipment.

b. Meetings and demonstrations should not be held in places where there is a significant hazard of fire or building collapse or falling objects.

c. Meetings and demonstrations should not interfere with the operation of hospitals, emergency facilities, communication systems, utilities, or other facilities or services vital to the continued functioning of the University.

2. Meetings and demonstrations should be conducted in a manner that keeps within reasonable bounds any interference with or disturbance of the activities of other persons. The reasonableness of conduct may be determined by such factors as the time and place of the demonstration and the general tenor of conduct.

a. Demonstrations should not be held inside libraries or private offices, or inside classrooms or seminar rooms in which meetings or classes are being held or are immediately scheduled.

b. Meetings and demonstrations should not interfere with free and unimpeded movement in and out of buildings and rooms and through all passageways. This will generally be satisfied if at least one-half of each entrance, exit, or passageway is free from obstruction of any kind.

c. Noise level is not of itself a sufficient ground for making a meeting or demonstration improper, but may possibly, in particular circumstances, interfere and disrupt the activities of others in an impermissible way.

IV. Responsibilities for Enforcement

A. It is the responsibility of the vice-provost for undergraduate studies and University life (hereafter referred to simply as the "vice-provost") to protect and maintain the right of open expression under these guidelines.

B. Observation of meetings or demonstrations, when deemed

necessary by the vice-provost to protect and maintain open expression, shall be the responsibility of the vice-provost, who may delegate such responsibility. This delegate shall have full authority to act in the name of the vice-provost under these guidelines.

1. An observer shall announce himself or herself as such to those responsible for the meeting or leading the demonstration.

2. The vice-provost shall attempt to inform the chair of the committee of upcoming meetings or demonstrations to which an observer shall be sent. The chair may then ask a member or members of the committee to accompany and advise the observer. Such a committee representative shall also be announced.

3. Except in emergencies, the vice-provost's authority under these guidelines may not be delegated to employees of the University department of public safety. The role of public safety personnel at a meeting or demonstration is defined below, in section IV-C-3.

4. An observer or committee representative who attends a meeting or demonstration shall respect the privacy of those involved. If there has been no violation of these guidelines, other University regulations, or applicable laws, an observer, committee representative, or public safety employee who attends a meeting or demonstration shall not report on the presence of any person at such meeting or demonstration.

C. The vice-provost or delegate at the scene may instruct anyone whose behavior threatens to violate these guidelines, the fire laws, and other laws, ordinances, or regulations relating to the use of University facilities to modify or terminate such behavior. Failure to obey such instructions promptly will in itself constitute a violation of these guidelines. Persons receiving such instructions who believe that the vice-provost's instructions were not justified may subsequently appeal to the Committee on Open Expression for an opinion if and only if they comply with the instructions. Prompt compliance with instructions shall be a mitigating factor to any disciplinary proceedings for the immediate conduct to which the instructions refer, unless the violators are found to have caused or consciously threatened injury to persons or damage to property or to have demonstrated willfully in a protected area, as defined in III-D-1 and D-2 above.

1. When the vice-provost or delegate considers that an individual or a group has violated the guidelines, he or she may request to examine their University identification. Failure to comply with this request is a violation of the guidelines.

2. In carrying out this responsibility for safeguarding the right of open expression, the vice-provost shall obtain the advice and recommendation of the Committee on Open Expression whenever feasible.

3. a. The vice-provost or delegate may request members of the department of public safety to attend meetings or demonstrations to help protect the open expression rights of those involved.

b. Any person acting as an agent of the department of public safety who attends a meeting or demonstration on campus shall be clearly identifiable as such and in normal duty uniform (arms may be carried if they are part of "normal duty uniform").

c. Public safety personnel may also attend meetings or demonstrations when requested to do so by the person or group responsible for the event, when prominent public figures are involved, or when the director of public safety or delegate determines that there exists an imminent danger of violence at the event.

4. Terminating a meeting or demonstration by force is a most serious step and frequently a mistake, as this may exacerbate existing tensions and lead to personal injury and property damage.

a. Avoidance of injury to persons by the continuation of a meeting or demonstration is a key factor in determining whether it should be forcibly terminated. Property damage and significant interference with educational processes are also factors to be considered, and may be of sufficient magnitude to warrant forcible termination.

b. Whenever possible, the vice-provost should consult with the Committee on Open Expression before seeking a court injunction against those involved in a meeting or demonstration or calling for police action.

c. The vice-provost or delegate should attempt to inform those involved that he or she intends to seek an injunction or call for police intervention before he or she does so.

d. When a meeting or demonstration is forcibly terminated, a full statement of the circumstances leading to the event should be published by the vice-provost within the University.

D. The department of public safety shall not collect or maintain information about members of the University community, except in connection with alleged crimes, violations of University regulations, or as specifically authorized in writing by the president. This regulation shall not affect personnel information concerning current, past, or prospective employees of the department of public safety.

V. Non-University Groups

These guidelines address themselves explicitly to the forms of

individual and collective expression on campus by members of the University community. These guidelines do not automatically extend and apply to groups composed entirely or predominantly of persons not members of the University community. The extent to which the privileges and obligations of these guidelines may be made applicable in particular circumstances, and the regulation of the conduct of meetings and demonstrations by such groups on the campus, shall be determined by the vice-provost; all participants in such meetings and demonstrations on campus are required to comply with the instructions of the vice-provost or delegate. Any decision by the vice-provost or delegate under this article made without prior consultation with the Committee on Open Expression may be reviewed by the committee at its discretion, and such decisions shall be binding and shall be complied with unless and until set aside by decision of the Committee on Open Expression.

Report of the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty

On April 19, 1978, the Faculty Senate approved the report of the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty with the following amendments, which were recommended by SAC:

- a. Recommendation 2 calling for the election by the faculty of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty be referred to the Senate Committee on Administration for consideration.
- b. Recommendation 4 calling for an elected body in each school to advise the dean on the distribution of discretionary increases be deleted.

1. General situation

The proposed 5.5% salary increase for 1978-79 represents a further erosion of the economic status of the faculty. It is below the inflationary rise in the cost of living (6.6%), Penn tuition increase (8.0%), and the average increase in American family income (9.5%). In terms of purchasing power, it represents a serious loss which, for many faculty members who will not get a 5.5% increase but only 3.0% "for normal performance," may amount to several percents of their real income.

Coming after several years of similar reductions in real income, this is all the more disturbing because it testifies to a worsening rather than an improvement in the trend. To reverse that trend, other Ivy League schools are planning increases between 6 and 8% for next year. Whether Penn's financial hardship is much worse than in these schools is uncertain and beside the point. It appears rather that the budgeting process of faculty salaries is at fault, and that it should be redesigned in a way to insure higher priority for increases as well as a greater input of the faculty in their determination. The following observations and recommendations are directed toward that goal.

2. Determination of salary increases

Repeating its previous experience, this committee had a minimal input into the determination of total salary increases for next year. Without having been consulted, it was initially faced with the Budget Committee's guidelines that set these increases at the arbitrary level of 6%. Further discussion and reduction of that percentage took place in the Budget Committee, and in consultation with the administration, without request for this committee's recommendations. It is true that the president and the provost have met with the committee during these later stages, and courteously heard its proposals; however, the latter had no perceptible effects on the final decision which remained based on budgetary constraints applied to the initial amount set in the guidelines.

Obviously this committee cannot substitute for the budget committee, nor the administration, and cannot be expected to suggest how the budget should be revised in order to allow for fair increases for all faculty salaries. On the other hand, the Budget Committee ought not to substitute for this committee, as it does now, by deciding what percentage constitutes a fair increase, without consulting a representative body of the faculty. Were this situation to continue, this committee ought properly to disband, and a different representation of the faculty's economic interests be established.

But there is another solution. In some ways, the faculty as an economic unit relates to the Budget Committee in the same way as various budgetary centers (schools, service centers, resource centers, etc.). When working on the first draft of the budget, the Budget Committee starts with an initial set of subventions to allocate to these centers. These first amounts are not arbitrary; they are based on "hard" figures derived from the previous year's needs. In later stages, as each center presents its future needs, these subventions grow somewhat "soft," as they are partly reduced or increased; but this redistribution does not seriously affect their total "hard" core founded on solid need, except for cases involving major shifts in priorities and an open debate. By applying the same mechanism to faculty salary increases, the Budget Committee would start with a "hard" base

representing the solid needs of the faculty, i.e., it would use a formula combining cost-of-living increases with other objective factors such as professional growth or merit increases. Such a formula could be determined in advance in consultation with this committee. During the later stages of budgeting, a certain number of "soft" components of that formula could be discussed and adjusted again in consultation with this committee, especially when market pressures, rate of promotions, cuts or hikes in taxes are involved.

Recommendation 1:

That the Budget Committee's guidelines provide for "hard" salary increases for faculty on the basis of a formula combining inflationary and other constant needs, and that further discussions of that formula include the participation of the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (SCESF).

3. Composition of the SCESF

Whether recommendation 1 is followed or not, it is imperative that the SCESF clearly represent the faculty in the defense of their economic status. Past experience indicates that the administration tends to regard this committee as only representing the personal views of its individual members. In order to be more effective, it should have a clearer mandate as a truly representative body of the faculty as a whole. Some form of election is in order.

Recommendation 2:

That the SCESF be elected by the faculty, and that the Senate Advisory Committee be charged to recommend the proper procedures.

4. Distribution of salary increases

a. Effects of past policies

The committee requested from the office of planning analysis a statistical study of salary increases by rank and income group for the last three years. The following figures represent the mean increases from 1975 to 1978 in FAS, Wharton and Engineering, for individual faculty members who remained at Penn during that entire period (for corresponding figures for A-1 staff, see Table 2). They may be subject to revision when a more detailed analysis is completed, but no significant changes are expected.

The relatively higher increases for promoted faculty are fair in view of the fact that only two promotional steps are available in the academic profession. They are also quite few in numbers. Higher increases for junior faculty and/or lower income groups can similarly be justified as conforming to the general curve needed to insure a proper compensation for professional growth, higher in the early than later years of the career. On the other hand, Table 1 indicates that senior faculty and higher income groups have borne almost all the brunt of real income losses over the past three years. As a compromise between its desire to preserve the differential between rate of income growth of junior and senior faculty (lower and higher income groups), and its wish to avoid further depressing the status of the senior faculty, the committee recommended originally that a 3% increase be mandated across the board, a 3% increase be distributed for professional growth and merit, and an additional fund be set for promotions. The administration followed this recommendation insofar as the 3% across-the-board is concerned, with a proviso that deans be urged to provide for promotions with additional funds "to the extent it can be accomplished with balanced budgets."

b. Across the board vs. discretionary increases

Within the total amount budgeted for salary increases, the committee recognizes the need to differentiate between *inflationary* increases, to which all faculty are entitled on equal basis, and which the central administration should mandate across-the-board and across all budgetary centers, and *discretionary* increases for professional growth, merit, promotions, equity,

Table 1
Mean individual increases for A-2 by rank and income: 1975-78

<i>Category by rank</i>	<i>(Numbers)</i>	<i>% of increase 1975-78</i>
Full Professors	(270)	17.58
Associate Profs. (not promoted)	(107)	18.56
Assistant Profs. (not promoted)	(89)	22.32
Associate Profs. (promoted)	(51)	28.20
Assistant Profs. (promoted)	(28)	30.76
<i>Category by salary base</i>	<i>(Numbers)</i>	<i>% of increase 1975-78</i>
Over \$28,000/year	(111)	14.63
20,000-28,000	(191)	20.12
16,000-20,000	(135)	21.56
12,000-16,000	(114)	24.22
Under 12,000/year	—	—

etc., which are more individual in nature and depend more on the specific needs and priorities of particular centers. If responsibility centers are to be truly responsible for their own life-style, they should be able to decide what use to make of this category of increases. The committee has thus recommended, and the administration has adopted, a policy whereby all salary increase funds remaining after the 3% across-the-board increase be for discretionary use by individual centers.

The committee is aware of dangers inherent in such a policy, which removes discretionary increases from any university-wide control, and from the committee's competence to assess them. It hopes, however, that the faculty of each center will demonstrate their interest in their economic status by forming appropriate elected bodies to advise their individual deans about the use of the discretionary increases.

Recommendation 3:

That there be two types of increases: an inflationary increase mandated across the board by the central administration, and a discretionary increase to be distributed by each center according to its own guidelines.

Recommendation 4:

That the faculty of each school form an appropriate elected body to advise the dean as to the distribution of discretionary increases.

5. Faculty vs. administration

a. Differences in salary increases

The committee also asked the office of planning analysis for a comparative study between the mean rate of increase of faculty (cf. above Table 1) and administrators/professionals grouped under the category of A-1. The following figures apply for A-1 staff either in central administration, or in FAS, Wharton and Engineering, for individuals who remained at Penn during the 1975-78 period. A more refined analysis is in progress, and the final figures may be modified, but probably without affecting the total results.

Despite some problems, the lack of some figures, and the possibility of revisions, the indication of a much higher rate of individual increases for A-1 than for A-2 over the last three years was found by the committee to be sufficiently disturbing to justify raising the question with the provost. In a March 15 letter to the committee, the provost addressed this point as follows:

"You have raised serious questions about the observed differences in actual salary increases between A-1 staff and faculty over the last few years.

If these differences are not explainable by factors such as growth of restricted budgets, equalization for affirmative action, marketplace competition, and promotion, then they represent a failure of our past and present policy of equity in salary increases across faculty and staff. The analysis we now have under way should indicate how much of the differences are due to these various factors. The analysis will also tell us how much of the A-1 staff increase in salary occurred on July 1 of each year and how much was due to increases given during the year for promotion and marketplace competition.

"When we complete the analysis, we will know the nature of the differences and what corrective action, if any, should be started in 1978-79 and what further steps need to be taken in the following years. I will write to the deans and to the central administration informing them of what we discover about the possible drift from equity across faculty and A-1 staff in salary increases in recent years and of steps that need to be taken to correct the differences once established.

"One step that certainly could be utilized is to put the same cap on A-1 staff aggregate increases as we do on the faculty. A second step would be to favor the faculty with increases above 3% for normal performance in the interest in restoring equity, starting 1978-79."

At the time this report is going to press, the analysis has not been completed. If it confirms the figures in Table 2, the faculty may hope to get somewhat more than the 3% increases across the board. The committee will press for such a "corrective" action. But the issue is more basic.

b. Separate budgeting of faculty salary increases

The provost's letter, and other explanations proposed by faculty and administration in order to account for differences in actual salary increases between A-1 and A-2, indicate indeed that budgeting salary increases for the two categories as if they were one is neither rational nor useful. A local and influential marketplace competition for A-1 contrasts with a national and more hypothetical marketplace competition for A-2. There are many steps in promotions for A-1 but only two for A-2. There is a great lateral mobility for A-1, with increased salaries resulting from changes in jobs, but practically no switching positions by A-2. A reduction in A-1 staff can normally be compensated by a higher productivity of the remaining staff, whereas a reduction in A-2 generally entails the loss of some specific program or quality of teaching. A budgetary projection for faculty salaries must take into account the programmatic plans of schools while the budgeting of A-1 salaries should be made in terms of efficiency of services, etc. In short, while subscribing to the equalization idea that, on an individual basis, A-1 should receive similar salary increases to A-2, the committee believes that this very goal will be better achieved if the aggregate salary increase funds be budgeted separately for faculty and for administrators/professionals, so as to enable their distribution according to the special needs of each group.

Recommendation 5:

That salary increases for A-2 be budgeted separately from those for A-1 (and A-3), but that the mean individual percent of increases for all categories remain comparable, and that corrective measures be applied over the next three years to compensate for any past deviations from that policy.

6. Conclusion

Some of these recommendations ask for action by the Senate, some of the faculty in various Schools, some by the administration and, in particular, the budget office. The administration has expressed its desire further to explore, with the committee, those recommendations which deal with the budgeting process. Should any real progress be achieved over this spring or summer, it will be reported at the fall Faculty Senate meeting.

Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty: Jean V. Alter (romance languages), Chairman, F. Gerard Adams (economics), Daniel R. Vining (regional science), Walter D. Wales (physics), Michelle J. White (economics), Margaret G. Wood (dermatology).

Table 2
Mean individual increases for A-1 in central administration and three centers (FAS, Wharton, Engineering) by income groups and in comparison with same groups of A-2: 1975-78

<i>Income group \$/year</i>	<i>% increase of A-1 in central admn.</i>	<i>(Numbers)</i>	<i>% increase of A-1 in three centers</i>	<i>Numbers</i>	<i>% increase of A-2</i>
Over 28,000	17.52	(11)	—	—	14.63 (111)
20,000-28,000	23.39	(26)	22.23	(?)	20.12 (191)
16,000-20,000	28.23	(29)	22.07	(?)	21.56 (135)
12,000-16,000	30.05	(39)	22.21	(?)	24.22 (114)
Under 12,000	43.00	(2)	30.43	(30)	— —

c
s

HERS-Bryn Mawr III: Deadline Is May 15

HERS Mid-Atlantic, a resource center for women in higher education, and Bryn Mawr College are sponsoring the third annual month-long residential Summer Institute for Women in Higher Education Administration, July 5-28 at Bryn Mawr.

The institute is designed for women with experience in college-level teaching or administration who want to move into higher administrative posts in colleges and universities.

Participants must be accepted by the institute and have the endorsement of their dean, director, vice-president or other senior administrator, including provision for release of time. A fee of \$1,500 covers all costs, including residence at Bryn Mawr.

Senior administrators at Penn are asked to encourage qualified women to apply, according to Dr. Linda Bradley Salamon, executive assistant to the president. Limited tuition funds may be available on request from the senior administrator.

How to apply: secure information and application from HERS (Higher Education Resource Services), at 3601 Locust Walk/C8 (Ext. 5426); consult with the appropriate senior officer to secure endorsement and make release time tuition arrangements; send completed applications with endorsement to Dr. Salamon, 100 College Hall/CO, to arrive no later than May 15.

Calendar Supplement: Corrections

The Office of Student Life wishes to correct the following information that was listed wrongly in the May Calendar of Events supplement to the April 24 *Almanac*. The Office of Student Life regrets the errors.

Saturday, May 6: 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Second Annual Conference on Adoption—not abortion, as incorrectly listed—sponsored by the Adoption Forum of Philadelphia. Fine Arts Building, Rooms 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 13. Admission: \$5.00.

Sunday, May 21: 2 to 3:30 p.m. Baccalaureate service, with Chaplain Johnson. Speaker: Art Buchwald. Irvine Auditorium. The service is, according to the chaplain, ecumenical and non-denominational—not, as incorrectly listed, a baccalaureate mass.

4:30 p.m. FAS Convocation. Irvine Auditorium (not 10 a.m.).

Openings

The following listings are condensed from the Personnel Office's Bulletin of April 27. 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

Administrative Coordinator (2/21/78).

Assistant Director, Alumni Relations works with alumni organizations on class organizations and functions. College degree, preferably from Penn, experience in public relations, fundraising. \$10,050-\$14,325.

Assistant to Director, Annual Giving II (two positions—4/24/78).

Assistant General Counsel (1/17/78).

Assistant Registrar (4/24/78).

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

Associate Development Officer III (3/28/78).

Associate Director for Maintenance Operations (3/28/78).

Coordinator (4/24/78).

Director of Internal Audit makes system reviews of accounting procedures. College graduate, MBA desirable, CPA mandatory; minimum of five years' experience with a public accounting firm. Salary to be determined.

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

Junior Research Specialist (four positions) (a) (4/18/78—salary commensurate with experience); (b) (3/28/78—\$9,275-\$13,000); (c) researches enzyme mechanisms (bachelor's or master's degree in chemistry or biochemistry, three years' experience); (d) prepares blood lymphocytes and immunological tissue cultures (bachelor's or master's degree in biology, experience in virology, immunology or tissue culture). \$9,275-\$13,000.

Manager, Special Functions controls special functions and catering for the dining services. Experience with a Philadelphia caterer, understanding of clientele. \$11,525-\$16,125.

Program Director (3/21/78).

Programmer Analyst I (4/24/78).

Senior Staff Writer (3/7/78).

Senior Systems Programmer (3/21/78).

Staff Writer II (two positions—3/28/78).

Support Staff

Accounts Payable Clerk (4/24/78).

Administrative Assistant I (two positions) (a) (3/28/78); (b) involves extensive budget work, ordering supplies, preparing grant applications. Dictaphone, administrative and secretarial experience. \$7,150-\$9,150.

Administrative Assistant II (4/24/78).

Cashier (2/7/78).

Clerk III (4/11/78).

Collection Assistant (two positions—4/24/78).

Facilities Coordinator (3/21/78).

Gardener I background and education in landscaping. \$8,650-\$11,075.

Groom (4/11/78).

Histology Technician II (3/21/78).

Operator, Assistant Computer Terminal (4/24/78).

Research Laboratory Technician II (three positions) (a) (two positions—4/4/78); (b) (4/18/78).

Research Laboratory Technician III (four positions) (a) (two positions—3/28/78); (b) (two positions—4/24/78).

Scientific Glassware Attendant operates high pressure autoclaves for sterilization of laboratory glassware. High school graduate. \$5,975-\$7,650.

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

Secretary III (14 positions) \$6,700-\$8,575.

Secretary IV (two positions) (a) (4/11/78); (b) (4/18/78).

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

Senior Admissions Assistant (two positions—3/28/78).

Senior Collection Assistant (4/11/78).

Stable Foreman (4/11/78).

Stack Attendant, library. Salary to be determined.

Statistical Assistant (4/24/78).

Steam Fitter (three positions) maintains heating and ventilating systems. Five years' journeyman's experience, trade school. Union wage scale.

Student Records Assistant (2/21/78).

Supervisor, Mechanical Systems receives information gathered by the JC80 computer, prepares statistical reports. High school graduate, five years' journeyman's experience. \$12,600-\$15,475.

Typist II (4/11/78).

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

Part-time

One administrative/professional and four support staff positions are available. See bulletin boards.

Things to Do

Lectures

On May 2 at 4 p.m., the Department of Metallurgy and Materials Science and LRSM present Dr. T.M. Decine, G.E. Corporation Research and Development Center, who will discuss **The Influence of Microstructure on Localized Corrosion of Two-Phase Stainless Steels**, LRSM Building Room 105 (coffee, 3:30 p.m.). § Dr. Joe Truro conducts **A Comparative Study of Mass Market and Library Market Distribution in Children's Book Publishing**, sponsored by the Graduate School of Education, May 8, noon, Room C-34, Education Building. § The Department of Dermatology's Third M.H. Samitz Lectureship in Cutaneous Medicine features the University of Oregon's Dr. Walter C. Lobitz, Jr., who will speak on **Atopic Dermatitis**, May 10 at 4 p.m. in the Children's Hospital auditorium.

Mixed Bag

Amy Orr displays fibers at the Faculty Club, May 2 through May 19. § Wharton and the Fine Arts sponsors an exhibition of Sharon Cross Seldin's **Color Field Paintings**, May 2-June 18, Vance Hall's Hoover lounge. § The Exploratory Cinema series of the Annenberg Cinematheque concludes May 3 with a **World Premiere: Student Explorations: New Student Films**, 7 and 9:30 p.m., Annenberg Center's Studio Theater (\$1, students with I.D.; \$2, others). § The Dental School presents a **Commemorative Concert and Champagne Gala** to benefit its scholarship fund on May 3 at the Academy of Music, featuring the **Philadelphia Orchestra** and pianist **Steven de Groote**, winner of the 1977 Van Cliburn piano competition. Information: Ext. 8951.

ALMANAC: 515 Franklin Building (16) Ext. 5274

Editor.....Diane Cole

Associate Editor.....Marilyn Ackerman

Editorial Assistant.....Gordon Schonfeld

Design.....Carolyn Andrews