

Year-End Reports of Council and University Committees, 1979-80.

Community Relations

The 1979-80 membership of the Committee on Community Relations:

<i>Chairperson:</i>	Louise P. Shoemaker (Social Work)
<i>Faculty:</i>	Norman D. Day (Urban Design)
	Michael Katz (Education)
	Denise Koval (Nursing)
	James M. Larkin (Education)
	Herman Segal (Oral Medicine)
	Anthony R. Tomazinis (City Planning)
	Sol Goodgal (Medicine)
<i>Administration:</i>	Gillian Norris-Szanto (President's Office)
	Carrie B. Spann (CWEP)
	Lauren Taylor (Physics)
<i>Students:</i>	Ellen Gartner (Wharton '81)
	Sue Cannon (School of Social Work)
<i>Ex Officio:</i>	Ronald Bond (Director, Recreation)
	Thomas C. Corl (Director, Community Relations)
	Stephen Goff (Director, Annenberg Center)

The Committee continued to work on issues and projects begun the previous year.

A meeting with Jeremy Alvarez, City of Philadelphia planner newly appointed to West Philadelphia, and his colleague, Cornell Pankey, helped clarify for the Committee what the city's plans are for West Philadelphia.

George Brown, executive director of the West Philadelphia Corporation, also met with the Committee. Information and agreement for mutual clearance and communication was established with both Mr. Brown and the city's planning representatives.

Richard Buford, the University's director of real estate development, presented the University's long range plans to the Committee. The Committee gave its backing to the University's objection to placing housing on the PGH site and commended Mr. Brown and Mr. Buford on the efforts of their offices in identifying appropriate sites in West Philadelphia as alternative sites for low-cost housing.

Three members of the Committee formed a policy group, meeting with Tom Corl as staff. The work of this group helped define more clearly the charge to the Committee and resulted in a revision of the charge when the Committee was approached by the Committee on Committees to update the Council's charges to its committees. The revised charge adopted by the Council is: "The Community Relations Committee shall advise on the relationship of the University to the surrounding community. It shall work with the Office of Community Relations to assure that the University develops and maintains an appropriate relationship with the community."

A report to the University Council on the work of the Committee was made in April by the Chairperson. The Committee had hoped to present

a recommendation (below) for action by the University to take leadership in developing an overall approach to West Philadelphia as "community" with indigenous groups and businesses. The Council's Steering Committee returned the recommendation to the Committee for further work.

On April 25, an invitational breakfast meeting was sponsored by the Committee at the Faculty Club. Community leaders were invited as well as the University personnel known to be interested in working with the community. The positive response led the Committee to recommend a continuation of such breakfasts with a continuing agenda of defining mutual community/University issues and methods for working on them.

The continuing support of the University administration was helpful in the services of Tom Corl as half-time director of the community relations for the University.

— Louise Shoemaker, Chairperson

Recommendation from Committee on Community Relations

The University Council Committee on Community Relations believes that the University of Pennsylvania should play a leadership role in maintaining the economic and social diversity of West Philadelphia and securing the vitality and amenity of its neighborhoods.

The University is a major institution in an area that is made up of businesses, diverse commercial activities, health and educational institutions, and a broad range of racially and socioeconomically mixed neighborhoods. West Philadelphia offers a setting rich in amenities for work and residence. At the same time there are serious problems in health, education, housing, employment, and inter-group relations around the University. The University stands in sharp contrast to many of these surrounding problems. It is a symbol of prestige and affluence in an environment full of social and economic problems.

Within the scope of the University's educational and research missions, the University meets its broader social responsibilities to its environment. The commitments and talents in the University should be brought to bear more directly on the problems of West Philadelphia.

The University Council Committee on Community Relations recommends that the University Council endorse the establishment of a West Philadelphia Task Force.

The West Philadelphia Task Force would first study the problems of the area and focus attention on the nature and magnitude of such problems. Second, the task force would assess the resources, programs and experts that have been and could be marshalled to address the problem. Third, the task force would be a highly visible support for plans, programs and other efforts to improve the quality of life in West Philadelphia. Fourth, the task force would bring additional resources and talents to bear on the problems of the area.

The West Philadelphia Task Force should attempt to increase the vitality of area, extend amenities throughout the area, and preserve the diversity of people and activities. The work of the task force would address the following areas:

education, health, mental health, employment, economic development, housing, neighborhood revitalization, transportation and crime.

The University should take the lead in establishing such a task force. It must secure the participation of a range of people who will bring expertise, visibility, legitimacy and influence to the project. On the local level, the task force would show the University's concern and commitment to its community and would serve to demonstrate that the University, working with others concerned about the community, could make West Philadelphia a better place to live and work for all of our neighbors.

The task force should consist of high-level representatives from community organizations, educational institutions, health institutions, business, finance, commerce, social service agencies, the City Planning Commission, the Office of Housing and Community Development, and other community leaders. The University's own representatives should include trustees as well as administrative and faculty personnel.

The total process, its impact and findings should have clear implications for replication in other parts of the city and in other metropolitan areas. There is a lively potential for significance on a national scale, which should attract not only funding but also some of the best minds in the University and in the larger community.

Educational Planning

The Educational Planning Committee (EPC) met ten times during the past year. A number of subcommittees met, sometimes a number of times, regarding specific programs and institutes. A number of faculty members not on the EPC participated in the work of these subcommittees. The following matters were considered by the committee and recommendations passed on to the Provost:

- The pilot program in Dental Education
- The Master's degree in Liberal Studies (Graduate School of Education)
- Changes in the determination of the Ph.D. dissertation fee
- A joint program between the Law School and the Department of Economics
- The Higher Education Finance Research Institute (HEFRI)
- Reorganization of the School of Public and Urban Policy (SPUP) and the departments of City and Regional Planning and Regional Science
- Center for Advanced Studies in Legal History

Still in train are the following: a study of faculty participating in the policy-making of the University Press; a review of long-range planning in the Law School and the Faculty of Arts and Sciences; and a subcommittee studying the mechanisms of long-range planning (Phase I).

An abiding concern is our strong sense that both the EPC and the Budget Committee (BC) are not involved in long-range planning in a systematic and timely way. The suspension of the joint subcommittee of EPC and BC, which met during the previous year, has left a discernible void in faculty participation in University planning. We are convinced that academic and budgetary planning cannot be effectively pursued in isolation, and that the difficulty regarding confidentiality in the budget-making process is not insuperable. The EPC has frequently felt that its deliberations are hampered by a lack of budgetary information.

Our immediate hope is for greater cooperation between EPC and BC this coming year, and more regular consultation with the president and the provost. The Phase I subcommittee on the mechanisms of planning hopes to complete its work early in 1981. At that point it will be appropriate to consider the more permanent reorganization of the two committees. One possibility is the consolidation of EPC and BC, and then a new division into short- and long-range planning committees. Such a plan might entail the assigning of much of the current specific business of EPC to another body, e.g., the Council Committee on Research.

—David J. DeLaura, Chairman

Facilities

During the 1979-1980 academic year the Committee on Facilities met eight times and considered a broad range of topics. The issues of energy utilization and conservation, and problems associated with transportation and parking, were recurrent themes in many of our discussions.

During the year the anti-litter campaign, initiated by the Committee, was brought to the campus with the distribution of anti-litter posters. It

is difficult to judge the effectiveness of this effort, and one of next year's tasks for the Committee will be to assess the campaign and decide how to proceed. Perhaps it is important to emphasize to the University community that a cleaner campus not only enhances the workplace, but can have a significant impact on operating expenses.

The Committee reviewed the problem of deferred maintenance and was surprised to learn that the current estimate of University projects in this category exceeds \$7.1 million! The funds presently available to support deferred maintenance will cover no more than 10% of the identified projects. While this may seem like a precarious situation, the Committee wants the community to know that Penn has one of the most farsighted plans among our sister universities for dealing with this problem. The University takes 2% of the insurable value of each building which equates to a 50-year "straight line" depreciation charge. The deferred maintenance program was funded in fiscal 1979 at 7% of this 2% amount (or about \$750,000). The deferred maintenance funding will increase by 1% each year so that in fiscal 1980, 8% of the 2% insurable value (or about \$800,000) will be available; in 1981, 9% of the 2% or \$950,000 will be available, etc. These figures are of course approximate, and should increase as the insurable value of the property increases. The Committee was generally satisfied with this approach to the problem and urged the president and provost to support and maintain the current formula at its 1% annual increment. The Facilities Committee should review this problem annually, because if the current formula is tampered with, the magnitude of the deferred maintenance projects could quickly get out of hand with serious consequences to the overall physical plant.

A number of development projects were reviewed by the Committee. Perhaps the most important is the possibility that the University can expand into, and influence the development of, the old PGH site. The Committee hopes that the administration considers not only the financial well-being and academic excellence of the University, but also the needs of the West Philadelphia community as plans emerge for the use of this site.

Another issue was the proposed renovation of Dietrich Hall. The Committee wants the University community to realize that when work on this project begins (perhaps early in 1981) there will be some unavoidable disruptions to the core of our campus along Locust Walk. We feel, however, the Operational Services Department and the Facilities Development Office are very sensitive to this problem and have taken every step to minimize the inconvenience. We should all applaud this effort.

In reviewing other current projects (Leidy Lab renovation, Small Animal Hospital, and Dietrich Hall) the Committee was gratified to learn that new construction and renovation must meet stringent energy conservation guidelines. This is an important step in gaining a degree of control over the energy costs of the University.

The Committee reviewed various classroom issues and concerns as seen by the Office of the Registrar. It appears that the assignment of spaces designated as classrooms is controlled by a multitude of groups and organizations, and that less than half the available area can be assigned through the Registrar's Office. A computer system has been developed for centralizing and compiling information about classroom utilization, and this will greatly improve the efficiency with which classrooms can be assigned. The Committee was impressed with the fact that this system will have the capacity to provide information concerning the heating and air-conditioning of classrooms, as well as the safety features of classrooms (i.e., areas which should not be used on weekends or during the evening, etc.). The former is important for energy conservation, while the latter will permit more efficient use of campus security programs. The committee felt that many problems associated with classroom assignment could be overcome if the Registrar's Office had control over all classroom space. Support for this should come from the highest levels of the University.

The Committee discussed a number of issues concerned with parking and transportation. The Office of Transportation and Communications indicated that there will be no increase in parking fees in the coming academic year. The Committee felt however, that there should be a plan developed for differential parking rates for compact cars and standard cars in future years. The Office of Transportation was requested to present a plan regarding the implementation of such a differential parking

scheme, and this should be an early topic of discussion during the next session of the Committee.

Dr. Vukan Vuchic, chairman of the Subcommittee on Parking and Transportation, presented an extensive report concerning campus transportation goals, guidelines and activities. The plan, as outlined in this report, would urge the University to adopt a policy that encourages faculty, staff and students to live within walking distance of the campus. Furthermore, those members of the University community who travel to work would be urged to use public transportation, or car- and van-pooling networks. A general intent of the plan is to discourage the expansion of individualized auto travel to and from the campus. The report will be submitted to the administration for further consideration, and one of the tasks of next year's Committee will be to ensure that this important and carefully considered plan receives the widest possible review. The Facilities Committee should also make an effort to lobby for its implementation into administration policy.

Dr. Martin Pring, chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy, has been active in monitoring the energy conservation efforts of the University. The Subcommittee report indicated an active and multifaceted program by the Department of Energy Management, designed to gain some degree of control over severely escalating energy costs. The Subcommittee considered the consequences of a worsening energy situation and the actions that should be taken in responding to it. A series of recommendations was formulated and presented to the Facilities Committee. These were debated and approved and will be presented to the Council in the Fall. The recommendations are strong and will be controversial, but they reflect the urgency of the current energy problems faced by the University. The recommendations deal not only with technical solutions, but also with the changes in lifestyle that rising energy costs will inevitably impose on the entire campus community. These recommendations are detailed in the Subcommittee report below.

The Facilities Committee remains impressed with the Operational Services Department. There appears to be a high level of technical proficiency and a genuine concern for the facilities of the University and their operation. As chairman I wish to personally thank Fred Shabel, vice president for operational services, and his staff for their continued interest and interaction with the Facilities Committee. I am also very grateful to Ms. Virginia Scherfel for her excellent administrative assistance in Committee affairs.

—James C. Saunders, Chairman

Subcommittee on Energy (of the Facilities Committee)

The Subcommittee on Energy met approximately monthly during the academic year. Horace Bomar, director of the Department of Energy Management, and Tony Capuano, operational programs coordinator in the Department, were permanent guests of the Subcommittee. In addition, the Subcommittee met once with Fred Shabel, vice president for operational services, to discuss longer term issues related to the energy situation of the University. The Subcommittee was impressed with the technical proficiency of the staff of the Department and with the support and concern that they receive from Operational Services.

The year has been an eventful one on the energy scene. Events beyond the University's control have led to increases in energy costs variously estimated at between \$3 million and \$5 million annually, in a budget currently at about the \$10 million level. The central administration formed the Special Committee on Energy and Lifestyle (the Girifalco Committee) to consider how our mode of life can be adapted to meet this challenge. We eagerly await the outcome of their deliberations. The Department of Energy Management was formed from the former Energy Office within Operational Services, a reorganization designed to strengthen the University's operational capability in the field of energy conservation.

The Department of Energy Management fulfills its conservation mission by four main classes of activity:

- 1) by participating in the formulation and promulgation of University policies impacting energy utilization;
- 2) by outreach activities to explain and popularize these policies within the University community, and to encourage personal habits leading to conservation;
- 3) by identifying and defining engineering projects that are fully or partially justified by expected energy savings, and promoting their performance; and
- 4) by representing the University before outside bodies, such as the Public Utilities Commission, the Governor's Council on Energy, and the federal Department of Energy.

Of these, the subcommittee has been an active participant in the former two and has maintained oversight over the latter two.

The Subcommittee reviewed and endorsed the policies prepared by the Department of Energy Management for climate control during the heating and cooling seasons, and for the restriction of activities during the various breaks within them. It further addressed itself again to the questions of the energy impact of space allocation and the location and scheduling of teaching during those periods of comparatively light activity. It recommended, via the Committee on Facilities, that the Space Committee eschew and, insofar as possible, reverse existing mixed usage of buildings for both year-round functions and those restricted to the academic calendar, to maximize the opportunity for conservation during breaks and vacations. It similarly recommended to the Registrar that efforts to consolidate building utilization for teaching during periods of typically light activity be maintained and intensified, for similar reasons.

The Subcommittee reviewed with the Department of Energy Management their plans for outreach activities, and made various recommendations concerning them. This activity has tended to be somewhat sporadic, in part understandably so, since the Department has met with little response to these campaigns, and finds its time more economically invested in projects of an engineering nature. Furthermore, some plans have been held in abeyance to await the conclusions of the Girifalco committee. In that the cooperation and acquiescence of the University community will be necessary as more and more stringent conservation measures must be imposed, the Subcommittee feels that these activities should be pursued with all possible vigor.

The Subcommittee also considered the longer term impact of the inexorably worsening energy situation and actions that should be taken to prepare to respond to it. In order to achieve wide circulation and attention its proposals have been formulated as a series of recommendations to be presented to Council by the Committee on Facilities, together with explanatory material, that are reproduced below:

Recommendations of Committee on Facilities to Council

It should not be news to anyone that for the foreseeable future energy costs will pose a threat of mounting proportions to the already somewhat precarious financial stability of the University. The Subcommittee on Energy of the Council Committee on Facilities has therefore proposed and the Committee has discussed and endorsed the following recommendations.

The University is unfortunate in that an unusually large proportion of its buildings date from the period of rapid expansion of physical plant during the sixties, when energy was abundant, cheap, and apparently limitless in supply. Many of these buildings, as well as other, older ones, are seriously energy-inefficient. Furthermore, in many instances their mechanical climate control systems are nearing the end of their useful lifetimes and may during substantial periods of time operate at levels below their already poor optimum performance. The renovation and construction work that will be needed to make these buildings and systems reasonably efficient will be precisely identified by the forthcoming campus energy audit and will require a major capital investment that will be rapidly repaid in cost avoidance. It appears unlikely that any substantial proportion of these funds will be available from government sources. *We recommend* that the president, provost and vice president for budget and finance brief the trustees in detail on this situation and ask them to initiate action to identify suitable sources of funds.

The Department of Energy Management makes a unique contribution to the avoidance of energy costs. This contribution could be seriously impacted if the Department were to be subject to the budgetary and personnel restrictions that prudent management is likely to require for the University as a whole. *We recommend* that, while it be carefully monitored to assure the maintenance of a high standard of performance and cost-effectiveness, the president, provost and vice president for budget and finance accept the principle that the Department of Energy Management be given priority in obtaining resources and required personnel.

We note with pleasure that over the last few months the *Daily Pennsylvanian* has carried a series of responsible, accurate and generally approbatory articles concerning the Department of Energy Management and the energy situation, and that *Almanac* recently chipped in in similar vein. It is with dismay that we contrast this with the silence of senior officers of the University on these issues. *We recommend* that all official pronouncements concerning plans for energy conservation, such as the schedules and arrangements for the heating and cooling seasons and the various breaks, be issued under the signatures of the president and provost and accompanied by an explanatory statement by them. *We further recommend* that these officers from time to time on a regular basis (perhaps twice yearly) brief the University community on the energy situation, its impact, and the steps being taken to ameliorate it, and that they do so in such a way as to engender an appreciation by their audience of the problems and achievements of those who have operational responsibility for these areas.

We noted with approval the formation of the Special Committee on Energy

and Lifestyle (the Girifalco Committee), and eagerly await action by it. We caution against the temptation to hope that some simple, concrete engineering solution to the problem has been somehow overlooked, and to seek it. Instead we recommend that the Girifalco Committee move swiftly to address those questions on which it speaks with unique authority: namely, to delineate and require those changes of lifestyle in the conduct of academic, residential and recreational programs that will most effectively reduce energy wastage. To be effective these changes must bite deeply into ingrained habits and eliminate many conveniences that are currently taken for granted. As such they will be unpopular, and their successful promulgation will require the mobilization of the full stock of respect that the members of the Girifalco Committee have in the University community.

The recommendations outlined above presage profound and far-reaching changes in virtually every facet of the University. Failure to overcome these problems cannot be contemplated, but success will require complete and full understanding and cooperation by each and every member of the University community. This will depend on an intensive and continuing educational effort. We recommend that the president and provost develop and implement a plan for mandatory educational sessions for all faculty and staff, who will be required to disseminate information and awareness in every classroom, office, dormitory etc. within their sphere of influence. These sessions should give the dimensions of the problem, explain the steps being taken to address it, and seek feedback as to how best to minimize their adverse effects. No one should be left in any doubt that energy consumption is a major factor in every salary dollar available and every tuition dollar required, and that its control will directly determine the future viability of the University.

The Subcommittee sincerely hopes that Council will give these recommendations prompt and serious consideration and will act with expedition and vigor.

Una Deutsch

Alan Leifer

Martin Pring, Chairman

Faculty Grants and Awards

Following is an accounting of our grants and awards for the current year.

Applications Received	39	
Summer Fellowships	36	
Grants-in-Aid	14	
Awards		
Summer Fellowships	24	\$48,000
Grants-in-Aid	7	5,441
Total Awarded		\$53,441
Funds Available		
New		\$50,000
Carry-over from prior year		16,462
Total Available		\$66,462
Less Awards		53,441
Balance		\$13,021

Distribution of Awards by School and Department

Anthropology	1
Astronomy/Astrophysics	2
Economics	1
English	3
Music	2
Philosophy	2
Psychology	2
Romance Languages	2
Total Faculty of Arts and Sciences	15
Chemical Engineering	1
Mechanical Engineering	1
Systems Engineering	1
Total College of Engineering and Applied Sciences	3
Nursing	1
Social Work	3
Dental	1
Veterinary	1

University Summer Fellowship stipends are \$2,000 and are not generally subject to taxation. Grants-in-Aid varied in amount according to the nature of the application.

The chairperson of the Committee wishes to express thanks to members of the Committee, the coordinator, and the Office of Research Administration.

— Alice, Kelley, Chairperson

Fulbright Awards

This report can be brief and simple. The Fulbright Committee's task is concentrated within a few weeks in November. As in past years, the Committee as a whole met only for one afternoon to make a final ranking of the applicants. As in past years, preliminary work by James Yarnall of the International Programs Office, and by the Committee chairman, made this possible. Criteria for selection were well known to several members of the Committee, so that the work could proceed expeditiously. With two exceptions, members of the committee did a good job in interviewing applicants, appraising their statements, and reporting to the Committee. As in previous years, the careful and sensitive handling of the applicants in the course of their preparing their statements by Mr. Yarnall was greatly appreciated by the Committee.

As in previous years, the work of the Committee and Mr. Yarnall's office paid off in terms of grants. Of the 23 candidates we ranked, seven were given Fulbright grants. This is an excellent achievement, especially in view of the increasingly small total amount of funds available for these grants. It is my feeling that the University of Pennsylvania last year and this did as well as or better than any university in the country in the Fulbright competition.

It continues to surprise that as few as 30 or so students come to the advisory meeting on the Fulbright award presented by Mr. Yarnall; and it is also surprising that only 35 or so actually apply. But the superb caliber of the topmost of our applicants is well underlined by the number of grants.

—Martin Wolfe, Chairman

Honorary Degrees

In 1979-80 the Committee on Honorary Degrees met weekly from September 28 through November 26, 1979, and reviewed 74 names that had been submitted by faculty, students and alumni, as well as by individual members of the Committee. Additional names were submitted in writing, by letters, even after the last meeting, and these will be handed over to the Committee of 1980-81. Two names recommended the previous year were submitted once again. Of all names reviewed, nine were finally chosen to be forwarded to the president and trustees for action.

It is the policy of the Faculty Committee on Honorary Degrees to recommend the names of scholars and artists and scientists, and leave to the trustees the recommendation of candidates in the field of public and related government services.

The members of the Committee were:

Andrew R. Baggaley (education); Mildred Cohn (biochemistry and biophysics); Henry Hiz (linguistics); Harold Lief (psychiatry); James Pickands III (statistics); Jack E. Reece (history); George Rochberg (music); Reid Warren (electrical engineering);

Students: Jon C. Filderman (FAS '80) and Laura Kassner (law '80);

Ex officio: Eugene Nixon (Chairman, Faculty Affairs Committee).

—Judah Goldin, Chairman

Libraries

The Library Committee met on November 9 and December 14, 1979, and on April 11 and May 1, 1980. At its first meeting the Committee selected these topics for discussion during the year.

Finances. The costs of books and periodicals have in the past decade far outrun even our swift-moving inflation rate. Consider these increases in the prices of American periodicals between 1969 and 1979 (source: *Library Journal*, 1 Sept. 1979):

Law	240.9%
History	243.9
Medicine	326.7
Education	340.9
Journalism and Communications	417.1
Engineering	428.2
Chemistry and Physics	483.4
Labor and Industrial Relations	552.9

Increases in book prices have been equally dramatic; and books and periodicals purchased abroad with enfeebled American dollars (these constitute the greater part of our acquisitions) have further intensified

the financial problems of the University Libraries. The director tactfully termed the last years of the 'Seventies a period of "retrenchment." The first budget authorized by Provost Gregorian, however, signaled a significant reversal: the 1979-1980 allocation for books and journals was up 15%; and the 1980-1981 figure shows a 20% increase. Members of the Committee perceive very wide and enthusiastic support for such allocations of the University's limited resources in the several constituencies they represent.

Abuse of Faculty Borrowing Privileges. The Committee continued its discussions of the problem of faculty members' retaining unjustifiably large numbers of books for very long periods and the refusal by some members to return books recalled by other borrowers. Although the staff of the Libraries report significant progress in solving these problems, more vigorous measures than have thus far been employed may be necessary in the future.

The Coming of the Information Age. The title of Richard De Gennaro's Bowker Memorial Lecture, "Research Libraries Enter the Information Age," aptly describes another area the Committee attempted to address. Mr. De Gennaro has placed our Libraries in the forefront of the movement which the application of computer technology to research has opened up. Our Libraries are now linked with a dozen other institutions in the Research Libraries Group (RLG). A borrower may in a matter of moments and without expense determine the availability of a book he or she needs in any of the libraries of the group; the borrower can expect a requested book to arrive here from another member of the group within four or five days, our testing of the system indicates. On-line search services, available at modest cost, already highly advanced in the natural and social sciences, are being rapidly extended even in the humanities: a definitive bibliographical search can be executed in a quarter of an hour; a full printout can be delivered to the researcher within four weekdays. These and other applications of computer technology are currently available to facilitate the research of faculty and students, yet many — probably most — remain unaware of them or reluctant to test them out. The Committee, which devoted an extended meeting in December to exploring our computer-based library systems, perceives bringing these innovations to the attention of faculty and through faculty, of students as one of its responsibilities. Plans to implement a program to increase the community's awareness of the "Information Age" were, however, temporarily set aside when a more pressing problem was brought to the Committee by students.

Equitable Access to University Libraries for All Students. Randall K. Marks, who chaired the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly, brought to the Committee a resolution affirming the right of all students to access to all University Libraries. Policies of the Law Library and the Medical and Biological Sciences Libraries, restricting hours of accessibility for undergraduate students, occasioned the resolution. This topic was to preempt most of the Committee's attention through the Spring Semester.

The Committee noted with concern the problems of undergraduate students taking courses demanding reading in legal literature, but because the Law Library is not under the control of the Director of Libraries, it is inappropriate for the Committee to offer formal advice on its operation. Our attention focused, therefore, on the Medical and Biological Sciences Library. The Chairman and members of the Committee paid frequent visits to that library at a variety of times: on weekdays and weekends, early and late, in the middle of the semester and near examinations. Although crowded conditions were observed on some occasions, the Committee concluded that the restrictions imposed upon undergraduate users were not fully justified. The Director of Libraries concurred with this conclusion. We are confident that undergraduate students — and, indeed, all patrons — will find the Medical and Biological Sciences Library a more hospitable environment in 1980-1981.

The space problems which our Libraries face are related to the problem of appropriate study spaces outside the Libraries. Crowding at "Bio-Med" we found, could be traced to the inadequacy of study space in the neighboring Quad. Some residential areas, notably Hill House, afford quiet and comfortable spaces conducive to study; others do not. The differences have not developed fortuitously: the success at Hill is a tribute to masters of that house who have placed a high priority on ensuring that study areas are used for study.

The conversion of areas in residential buildings originally designated

for reading or for audio-visual learning to other purposes gives cause for concern. The Committee has invited the attention of the vice provost for university life and the director of residential living to the link between crowding in our Libraries and the availability of alternative study areas, and we hope to see early action to reverse an alarming trend.

Relationships Among the Several Libraries of the University. Shortly before the last meeting of the year, the Committee received a request from the provost that a subcommittee be created to assess the implications of joining school and departmental libraries more closely to the main library, and to recommend how and by whom budgetary allocations should be made. The Chairman-designate for 1980-1981, Roger M. A. Allen, has announced his intention to create such a subcommittee; he solicits the advice of all interested members of the community.

—Robert Regan, Chairman

For the academic year 1979-1980 the Library Committee consisted of the following members:

Chairman:	Robert Regan	English
Faculty:	Roger M. A. Allen	Oriental Studies
	Peter Conn	English
	Alfred P. Fishman	Medicine
	Frederick G. Kempin	Legal Studies
	Robert Koch	Astronomy
	Edward M. Peters	History
	Iraj Zandi	Civil Engineering
Administration:	Ronald J. Caridi	Director, C.G.S
Students:	Norman Novak	
	John Miller	
Library:	Richard De Gennaro	Director
	Joan Gotwals	Associate Director
	Valerie Pena	Head, Serials Department

Long Term Disability Board

The primary concern of the Long Term Disability Board during the 1979-80 academic year was the need to develop a revised plan which would be consistent with federal regulations and with the University's policies regarding disabled members of the staff. A continuing concern of the Board, which was a subject of discussion repeatedly during this past year and the previous year, is the need to provide rehabilitative employment and the difficulties in doing so. This concern will clearly continue to be on the Board's agenda.

The full Board met five times during the academic year. In addition the Medical Subcommittee held one formal meeting to review the records of all disability benefit recipients and held numerous informal meetings to review the records of individual applicants.

While the meetings of the full Board were primarily devoted to consideration of plan revisions, it was also necessary to review the appeals of several applicants who had been denied disability benefits on the recommendation of the Medical Subcommittee. In addition, the Board considered and postponed decision on a proposal from an outside agency to provide administrative services for the disability plan.

During the year, the administrative management of the disability applications from employees of the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania was transferred to the personnel office of the Hospital. Policy determination and overall supervision of the Hospital's portion of the disability program remains with the Long Term Disability Board and the plan administrator.

At its May 6, 1980 meeting, the Board approved a revised plan document which had previously been reviewed by the Personnel Benefits Committee and has since been signed by Gerald Robinson, the plan administrator, and Dr. Jon Strauss, the vice president for budget and finance. The revisions in the plan are extensive, but they may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. A new appeals procedure including review by the head of the Health Evaluation Center of the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania and the full Disability Board has been added.
2. The ceiling on monthly income from the Disability Plan and other disability income sources has been raised to \$2,500.
3. The procedure for reporting total annual income has been clarified to require an annual filing of a copy of a claimant's 1040 form with the Personnel Benefits Office.
4. The definition of disability has been changed from "inability of a covered participant to discharge his or her normal University duties in a satisfactory

manner" to inability of a covered participant to engage in any occupation appropriate to the person by reason of education, training, and experience." The purpose of this change is to allow for rehabilitative employment for a disabled member of the staff who is still able to perform productive work for the University but cannot resume his or her former duties.

Many of the changes in the plan document are clarifications of existing procedures, alterations necessary to bring the plan into conformance with the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and modifications in language to be consistent with the requirements of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act. Other changes result from the concern of the Board for providing rehabilitative employment.

—Dan M. McGill, Chairman

Personnel Benefits

Personnel benefits are complex in a University setting and our institution is no exception. During 1979-80, several issues carried over from the previous year and a number of new (or revived) areas were explored.

Age Discrimination

The impact of age discrimination laws was discussed as an information item. The main benefits impacted are Blue Cross/Blue Shield for employees age 65-70 (whether active or retired), Major Medical, group life insurance, and retirement plans. The Committee was assured that (a) the University is in compliance with the laws and that (b) Personnel Relations is striving to keep individuals who are affected fully advised.

Coordination of Benefits

Several Committee members are concerned that the benefits available to administration, faculty and staff are structured in an inflexible manner. The concept of "flexible benefits" that give choices to those affected was studied. A model is available at the Educational Testing Service in Princeton, New Jersey. The implications of flexible benefits are extremely complex and a subcommittee was appointed to review the matter. The subcommittee will continue its work into 1980-81 with no change in membership.

Long-Term Disability Income Plan

During 1979-80, the Long-Term Disability Board reviewed the plan in order to update it and to assure consistency with applicable government regulations. In addition, the plan was rewritten to increase maximum benefits and to encourage disabled employees to return to productive employment as soon as possible. The Personnel Benefits Committee was kept in touch through its chairman, who is an ex-officio member of the Long-Term Disability Board. In addition, a near-final draft of the revised plan was examined by the Committee in some detail. Appropriate recommendations were made to the Board concerning the definition of the expression "long-term disability."

Dental Insurance Plan

Representatives of the School of Dental Medicine presented a proposal for a prepaid dental plan for members of the University family. The plan has important educational benefits for the Dental School. Although this is a significant attribute of the plan, the Committee felt it lacked jurisdiction over the proposal. Recommendations for further action were made by the Committee and were submitted to the Dean of the School of Dental Medicine.

Extended Base for TIAA/CREF

In January, the Provost issued a memorandum extending TIAA/CREF benefits to all salary paid to eligible persons, effective July 1, 1980. In past years, the University's contribution to TIAA/CREF has been limited to the academic base salary, and excluded contributions based on supplementary stipends for summer teaching, College of General Studies, evening school, etc. The extension of coverages to all salary ("extended base") removes a perceived inequity between persons on nine-month contracts and those on eleven- or twelve-month contracts. Late in the year, the Personnel Benefits Committee met to consider whether to recommend that extensions of the base be voluntary or mandatory. Technical complications impinge upon this issue, and the Committee could not arrive at a clear consensus. Final determination of the issue for 1980-81 will be made without a strong recommendation from the Committee.

Tuition Benefits

Several members of the Committee, and some interested faculty, requested a review of direct grant and University tuition benefits available to faculty and staff. Although the issue surfaced early in the year, unexpected external matters preempted the agenda and precluded a complete discussion. The main considerations to be carried over to the agenda for 1980-81 are a change in the relationship between full tuition for children at Pennsylvania and the direct grant; possible narrowing of differences among different University employee groups; and the positioning of this benefit in the event a move to a more flexible benefit program is eventually made.

A Final Note

The subject of personnel benefits is an ever-changing one, and reconsideration of certain problems (such as tuition benefits) necessarily must take place periodically. In addition, changes in the environment of the University bring forward new issues of interest to the entire University community. Next year's agenda promises to keep the Committee busy. As chairman, I would like to acknowledge the invaluable service of Messrs. Gerald Robinson and James Keller of the Personnel Relations Office, and of our secretary, Ms. Jeanne Hitman, and wish to thank the Committee members and the University community for keeping us active and concerned.

—Richard S. Woods, Chairman

Research

The activities of the Council Committee on Research during the academic year 1979-80 were concerned with two major functions designated in its charge: monitoring of the research environment and adjudication of special administrative problems concerning faculty research.

Monitoring the Research Environment

1. A symposium dealing with the use and abuse of non-tenure research appointments in the Centers and Institutes of the University was held March 21, 1980. A descriptive program and general invitation to attend was extended to the University Community in March 20 *Almanac*. The symposium dealt with the use of such appointments from the viewpoints of the centers, the faculty and the administration. Professor Raymond Berkowitz, who chaired the session, also is supervising the transcription and editing of the taped proceedings for the purpose of making them available to the University community.

2. The committee developed a resolution supporting the establishment of an internal research foundation at the University. The resolution and response to it from Provost Gregorian appeared in the May 15 *Almanac*.

3. A resolution strongly endorsing financial support for additional graduate fellowships, in an effort to compensate for their loss under the new OMB A-21 guidelines, was formulated and submitted to the Council. This has been forwarded to the Budget Committee and to the administration for response by December 1980.

4. A resolution asserting the Committee's continuing support for the establishment of encumbrance accounting was adopted. The resolution, which acknowledges the already accomplished inclusion of purchase orders and accounts payable categories in the encumbrance system, urges further expansion of the system by inclusion of payroll disbursements as well. The resolution has been submitted to the Comptroller's Office and a response is in preparation. Both resolution and response are to appear in *Almanac*.

5. The Committee consulted with Vice Provost Louis A. Girifalco concerning modification of the University's patent procedures to assure an adequate return of funds derived from research to both the inventor and the research community. Newly adopted patent procedures have been formulated which will accomplish this. It provides sufficient financial motivation for the inventor and indicates that a high priority will be given to research needs with income derived from patents.

6. The Committee consulted with the special task force of the Comptroller's Office concerning the questionnaire it was developing to conform to the new OMB effort reporting requirements. It was noted by the Committee that the explanatory notes which accompany the questionnaire, while useful, are not likely to provide the necessary clarification for all segments of the faculty. It was suggested that a narrative account

of a fictional professor's activities over a one-year period might be of value in providing a needed framework for the fusion of academic and accounting terminology.

7. The Committee, through a representative provided part of the effort to rewrite the University's Guidelines for Acceptance of Sponsored Research. The document was approved by the Council in May 1980.

Adjudication of Administrative Research Problems

1. The Committee was asked by Vice Provost Girifalco to render a judgment as to whether computer software packages developed by faculty members as part of an ongoing research project should be considered as copyrighted or patented material. A waiver was being requested of the University's claim on a software package. The Committee advised Vice Provost Girifalco that he was authorized to negotiate an arrangement in which the University would make every effort to accommodate the desire of the faculty applicant to obtain commercial support.

2. ORA Director Anthony Merritt requested the Committee's judgment concerning the acceptability of a subcontract awarded to a faculty member which specifically requires that member to submit any resulting manuscripts to a government agency for approval prior to publication. The Committee noted that the freedom to publish was being regarded as less than absolute. It was disturbed that in this instance the restriction on publication appeared to be based on rather arbitrary grounds entirely under the control of the government agency. The Committee therefore urged that Vice Provost Girifalco and the concerned parties seek by separate negotiations a modification of the agency ruling which would make the subcontract compatible with the University's policy of academic freedom.

R. S. Berkowitz
M. Caspari
T. Dziemianowicz
L. Fleisher
S. Gale
M. R. Kare
M. Katz

N. H. Kefalides
P. Kleindorfer
H. M. Myers (chairman)
C. H. Parker
G. Prince
M. Santopietro
D. Weinsweig

Student Affairs

During the academic year ending May 19, 1980, three of the eight meetings of the Committee on Student Affairs were devoted to off-campus housing and security considerations. Reports of many violations of usually accepted standards of housing (off-campus) and of high-handedness on the part of certain landlords, coupled with deep concern for the security of students living off campus, led to the adoption of the following resolutions:

I. The Committee is strongly in favor of hiring a full-time professional administrator to oversee off-campus housing and act as liaison with community sectors.

II. This administrator is to take responsibility for establishing and maintaining a Student Tenant Association.

There were a number of recommendations which accompanied these resolutions: that the proposed administrator should:

1. maintain a liaison with landlords, students, the community, and the University administration;
2. direct a uniform housing inspection system, including factors affecting security (such as lighting, dead bolts, peep holes, intercoms, etc.);
3. carry responsibility for establishing and promoting a Student Tenant Association, to support consumer education, neighborhood watch, enforcement of safety standards, etc.;
4. work in conjunction with the Penn Consumers Board/Residential listing Service; and,
5. maintain contact with city offices, e.g., Licensing and Inspections.

A majority of the committee further recommended that the administrator for off-campus housing be located in the present Residential Listing Service office under the supervision of the director of student life and under the jurisdiction of the vice provost for university life. It was also suggested, with general support, that a group be established to advise the administrator on matters arising in relation to carrying out the abovementioned tasks.

In other meetings the Committee directed its attention to progress reports on:

Houston Hall: allocation of space, program development, and dining facilities
Supportive Services: the scope and impact of the services

University Counseling Services: the nature, scope, and staffing of services
PennCap Program for economically and educationally disadvantaged students

Career Placement Services: the re-organization and relocation of these services

In addition, this committee received a proposed new charge from the Committee on Committees, which reads as follows:

The Committee on Student Affairs shall have cognizance of the conditions and rules of student life on campus. The Committee shall, *inter alia*:

- (a) gather and analyze information concerning student life and student affairs and make recommendations to Council.
- (b) respond as appropriate to requests from and report information and recommendations concerning student life and student affairs to appropriate administrative officers.

The Committee on Student Affairs may establish such subcommittees as it deems necessary. Subcommittee membership need not be restricted to members of the full Committee. However, the chairperson of any such subcommittee shall be a member of the full Committee. Subcommittee reports and recommendations shall be made through the full Committee. No subcommittee report or recommendation shall be represented to be a report or recommendation of the full Committee without the express approval by the full Committee as indicated by a majority vote at a regular meeting of the full Committee.

The Committee on Student Affairs shall consist of the following voting members:

- (a) eight faculty members
- (b) two undergraduate students
- (c) two graduate or professional school students
- (d) the Chairperson of the Undergraduate Assembly, ex officio
- (e) the Chairperson of the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly, ex officio
- (f) the vice provost for University life

The Committee on Student Affairs shall meet at least once a month during the academic year. At least one meeting each term shall be open to the University community, with public notice of such meetings made at least two weeks prior to said meetings.

The proposed new charge was accepted by the Committee on Student Affairs with the following requests for modification:

1. that two administrators for the University Life area be selected by the vice provost for university life to serve on this committee (motion supported unanimously);
2. the expertise of student affairs resource persons can be utilized by including them as "sitting members" of certain subcommittees, without their being members of the Committee (a suggestion generally supported);
3. that the final paragraph of the proposed charge be amended to read, "At least one *forum* each term shall be open to the University, with public notice of such meetings made at least two weeks prior to said meetings" (a suggestion generally supported).

There is an inevitable blandness about recording resolutions passed by a committee within the context of an annual report. It is our intention, therefore, in closing, to call particular attention to the sense of urgency that was evident among the members during Spring term when the Committee on Student Affairs came to grips with some of the vexing questions associated with off-campus housing and security. It is the purpose of the chairman, as spokesman for the committee, to point out that there are compelling arguments for the implementation of the recommendations set forth in this report.

— Edgar A. Perretz, Chairman

Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid

During the 1979-80 academic year the Committee had 22 members distributed as follows: 9 faculty members and 1 administrator — selected by the Committee on Committees — five students, four dean's representatives and three ex-officio members (director of admissions, director of student financial aid and vice provost — (University life). Robert Lorndale served as secretary to the Committee. Of the four dean's representatives, two were faculty members and two were administrators. Hence the composition of the Committee was: eleven faculty, five students and six administrators.

The Committee met nine times with an average attendance of nineteen. The work of the Committee was largely carried out by six subcommittees:

Class Size	Recruitment
Financial Aid	Special Admissions
Publications	Transfer Admissions

Let me review the work of the Committee—starting with our consideration of class size.

I believe that this is the first year, in a number of years, that the Committee has fulfilled its obligation to make a recommendation with respect to the size of the incoming freshman class. That recommendation was:

That the freshman class should not exceed 2090 students and the size of the incoming class should remain at that level for the next five years.

This figure of 2090 compares with:

2020	for 1977
2134	for 1978, and
2049	for 1979;

or an increase of 70 students over the 1977 figure.

The Committee believes that there are valid reasons for limiting the size of the undergraduate student body to approximately the current level. We would like to assure that the quality of the undergraduate experience is not eroded by an ever-increasing student body.

The Provost advised the Committee that he wanted to offset a decreasing graduate enrollment with an increased undergraduate enrollment and that for the freshman class entering in September 1980 he sought 2130 matriculants. In order to assure this number of matriculants the Office of Admissions based admissions on an assumed return of 48% (approximately the same as last year's). As of May 28, 1980 the Admissions Office reports that 2200 have accepted admission, which, when the summer withdrawals are subtracted, will bring the number to around the 2130 target figure.

Other recommendations initiated by the subcommittee on class size and approved by the Committee are the following:

1. Adequate resources must be committed to advising.
2. The problem of bottleneck courses must be addressed and resources committed by the schools to alleviate troublesome areas.
3. The University should explore the possibility of developing a high quality summer session for high school students that would employ under-utilized, quality departments in the University.

The subcommittee on financial aid expressed concern that the level of expenditure from unrestricted funds (tuition and fee revenues) to student financial aid is too high and that it threatens to become even larger in the future. Hence, the subcommittee proposed the following motion which was adopted by the Committee:

That the University Council establish an *ad hoc* Committee on Financial Aid, consisting of trustees, faculty, alumni and students with various members of the administration serving as *ex officio* members. That Council mandate the Committee to investigate and recommend action on each of the following issues involving financial aid by December 1980 so that implementation will be possible in Fiscal Year 1982:

- A) Should the amount of *unrestricted* income devoted to student aid — graduate or undergraduate — be increased, decreased or stabilized at a fixed percentage?
- B) Should an effort to increase *restricted* income for student aid — graduate and undergraduate — be undertaken and, if so, how can this effort be effectively managed and how much should be raised?
- C) Should student aid be used more directly to recruit graduate and undergraduate students to Penn and, if so, what portion of aid money should be used for merit versus need awards?
- D) Which office or committee at the University should establish policy related to student financial aid and how should this policy be activated and administered? Further, how can the effectiveness of policy decisions be measured and how often should they be reviewed?

This motion was transmitted to the Chairman of the Steering Committee on February 6, 1980. The Steering Committee decided that the most appropriate mechanism for such a study would be a subcommittee of the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid, and so advised the Committee on April 3, 1980. It is expected that the Committee will conduct such a study during the next academic year.

The subcommittee on publications made a comparative study of the catalogues of a number of schools and determined that our undergrad-

uate catalog compares quite nicely with those of other schools. There seem to be no obvious deficiencies. Indeed, ours is very readable, with excellent type and fine photography — and it is packed with information.

The subcommittee on publications expressed a concern on the impact that the SCUE guide might have on the admissions process. About 1000 SCUE books are sold to high school seniors who have already been accepted. It was felt that the SCUE guide probably should not reach the student just as a decision is being made as to whether or not to come to Penn. Hence, the Committee approved the following motion:

That the vending of SCUE reports to high school seniors who have been accepted be delayed each year until they have made up their minds on acceptance.

The subcommittee on recruitment examined various documents prepared by the Office of Admissions. These included:

Regional Annual Reports for 1978-79
Master Recruitment Plan for 1979-80

They also interviewed:

The Associate Director of Admissions for recruitment and personnel in the Office of Planning Analysis.

The Office of Planning Analysis has been conducting studies to aid the Admissions Office.

Important issues concerning recruitment are:

1. The need to recruit from a wide geographical base — both to improve recognition and to cope with the shrinking and geographically shifting school-age population: The Admissions Office is moving strongly on this issue.
2. The use of alumni in recruitment. The Admissions Office has been working to increase the effectiveness and range of the use of alumni. It is the consensus of the Committee that an alumni network for recruiting purposes should be the responsibility of the Admissions Office.
3. A third issue raised by the subcommittee on recruitment is the need for evaluation by outsiders of the ongoing activities of the Office of Admissions. The Office has shown that it is eager to be innovative and to revise its operations as the need arises. The subcommittee suggests that such an evaluation could be provided by the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid. In some measure, the subcommittee on recruitment has provided that function this year and they appear to be happy with what they found.

Our subcommittee on special admissions has been relatively inactive. At the first meeting of the Committee last October, Janis Somerville suggested that the subcommittee should make use of a report relating to special admissions that was being prepared by John Free for a committee that reports to her office. That report has not become available and it is now understood it will not become available until midsummer.

The Subcommittee on Transfer Admissions has discussed transfer admission policy with administrative personnel in Wharton, FAS and Engineering. FAS has averaged about 300 transfer matriculants per year for the past five years. Wharton has approximately 80 to 100 and Engineering about 30. Many departments in FAS have excess capacity at the advanced undergraduate level and transfer students can help fill these classes without further overloading of bottleneck courses.

In discussions with the Provost concerning class size, he indicated that the Committee should recognize that the size of the freshman class must be related to total enrollment and to the balance between undergraduate and graduate enrollments. He noted that the policy announced by the president is to maintain a constant total enrollment. Transfer admissions can help achieve such a balance.

However, the Subcommittee believes that there is no general agreement about the direction that transfer admissions ought to take in the future. For the most part, decisions on transfers are made to help maintain a class size whose determination itself is an ambiguous enterprise. Hence, the Committee approved the following recommendation of the subcommittee:

That no substantial increase in transfer admissions be considered until a comprehensive review of the transfer program is undertaken.

The subcommittee expects to undertake that review in the 1980-81 academic year.

The Committee has worked with enthusiasm, and has received fine cooperation from the Director of Admissions and the Director of Student Financial Aid.

— Kenneth A. Fegley, Chairman