

Year-End Reports, 1980-81

Some but not all of the year-end reports of Council and Independent Committees appear in this eight-page supplement. In hand, but delayed for lack of space are reports on the Bookstore, Communications, Disability Board, Honorary Degrees, Open Expression, Safety, and Student Fulbright Awards. Others either have not been received (Intercollegiate Athletics) or are not expected (Budget, Student Affairs).

INDEX

Community Relations.....I
Educational Planning.....I
Facilities.....I
International Programs.....III
Library.....III
Personnel Benefits.....IV

Research.....V
Undergraduate Admissions
and Financial Aid.....VI
...
Faculty Grants & Awards.....VIII

Community Relations

During the 1980-81 academic year the Community Relations Committee engaged in three major activities: community breakfasts; off-campus meetings with community groups; and the encouragement of a substantial deposit by the University in the West Philadelphia Community Federal Credit Union.

Community breakfasts: The Committee decided to continue the community breakfasts initiated in April, 1980. The purpose of the breakfasts is to bring members of the University and the surrounding community together in a relatively informal setting where they can begin to share ideas and problems. Each of the four breakfasts this year focused on a particular topic and featured at least two speakers. The topic for the first breakfast was Section 8 Housing in West Philadelphia and the speakers were Tom Massaro from the city and Dick Buford from the University. The second breakfast focused on the recent Indochinese immigrants in West Philadelphia. The main speakers were the director of the Nationalities Services Center and a Vietnamese-born lawyer working with immigrants. The third topic was the West Philadelphia Community Federal Credit Union. At the breakfast the University's deposit in the Credit Union was announced. Art Brandenburg, minister of the Calvary Methodist Church at 48th and Baltimore, and a leader in the creation of the Credit Union, and the Credit Union's manager, Leon Taylor, were the speakers. The final breakfast was used to introduce two new members of the administration, who also are residents of the community: President Sheldon Hackney and Maye Morrison, director of Off-Campus Living.

Off-Campus meetings: Early in the year the committee decided to hold most of its regular meetings off-campus at community agencies or organizations. The purpose of these meetings was to increase the members' knowledge of community activities and to demonstrate the committee's interest in the area around the University. Meetings were held at Calvary Methodist Church, the Spruce Hill Neighborhood Association, the West Philadelphia Corporation, and the Center for Philadelphia Studies.

Short-term goals: the Committee decided to pick a very concrete goal which it could realize during the year rather than to focus on macro-level problems. Thus, it shelved its earlier idea about the desirability of a commission to undertake planning for the area and substituted an attempt to encourage the University to make a substantial deposit in the West Philadelphia Community Federal Credit Union. The Credit Union, established in 1980, is dedicated to the redevelopment of the area, which it wants to stimulate through low-interest home improvement and business loans. Founded through the efforts of people associated with Calvary Methodist Church, the Credit Union is federally supervised and deposits are fully insured. After a meeting at the Church, committee members were convinced that the University should make a large deposit in the Credit Union. Thus, the committee chairman, Tom Corl, and

Dick Buford accompanied Art Brandenburg to a meeting with Jon Strauss. As a result of that meeting, the University made a substantial deposit.

Problems and plans: the largest problem faced by the committee was low attendance at off-campus meetings. By contrast, the breakfasts were very well attended by members of both the committee and the community. I am convinced of the value of the off-campus meetings and want to maintain them next year, even though this will probably mean a lower average attendance than on-campus meetings would draw. We will try to make the meetings more focussed around issues that will attract committee members other than the faithful core. We also plan to continue the breakfasts, which are enormously successful. And, finally, we are selecting another concrete goal which we can attain during the next year.

I would like to close by thanking Tom Corl, who has done all of the actual administrative work for the committee imaginatively, energetically, and efficiently.

— Michael B. Katz, Chair

Educational Planning

The following matters were considered at length by the committee and advice sent on to the Provost:

The Report of the Task Force on Graduate Education;
The pilot program in the School of Dental Medicine;
The future of the School of Public and Urban Policy.

Advice on the creation of the following Centers and Institutes was developed and transmitted:

WEFA Economic Research Institute
Center for Research on Marketing and Strategy
W. Norman Brown Center for South Asian Studies
Center for Dental Bioengineering
Center for Ancient Metallurgy
Wharton Center for International Management Studies
Penn-Hebrew University Research Center for Economics

A subcommittee on the mechanisms of long-range planning, called the Phase I committee, met weekly from the spring of 1980 through January of 1981. The committee, chaired by Prof. Dorteia Jameson Hurvich, presented its report to the President and the Acting Provost in early February. This report became the basis of the new University Planning and Budgeting Advisory Committee promulgated by the President later in the spring.

— David J. DeLaura, Chair

Facilities

The Committee on Facilities met eight times during the academic year and considered a number of both continuing and emerging issues. The charge to the committee encompasses or impinges upon essentially all of the areas that constitute the responsibility of Operational Services. In general it found that the administrators in these

areas represent a well-organized and professional team who serve the University well. The contributions of two of these, who have left or are shortly to leave the University: Fred Shabel, former Vice President for Operational Services, ably succeeded in an acting capacity by Arthur Hirsch, and Richard Buford, Director of Real Estate Development, are specially worthy of recognition at this time. The committee would also particularly like to thank Virginia Scherfel, Assistant to the Vice President for Operational Services, whose efficient staff work has been exemplary.

To supplement its permanent membership the committee routinely invites guests with special expertise or interest in the subjects of its deliberations. During the current year it has received input from, in addition to those cited elsewhere, Drs. Louis Girifalco and Mary Jo Ambrose, then Vice Provost for Research and his Associate, Liz Cooper, then Chair of the U.A. Residence Committee, and Garabed Sarkissian, Chair of the U.A. Energy Committee.

There follow brief summaries of some of the more important problems addressed by the committee.

Environmental Pollutants

Student leaders, very responsibly, alerted the community to the possibility of aerial contamination by asbestos in some of the residences. The committee received regular updates on this question from Fred Shabel and Arthur Hirsch. Because of student objection to the retention of the firm that had earlier surveyed the University, there were delays, for the most part unavoidable, in its investigation that were frustrating to all concerned. Once conducted, tests revealed acceptably low levels of asbestos. The situation should be watched and, especially in affected areas subject to damage beyond normal wear and tear, tests should be repeated at regular intervals. Residents have been informed and would do well to bear in mind that such damage is not only costly and anti-social but also dangerous.

Donald McAleer, Executive Assistant to the Vice President for Operational Services, reported that all electrical equipment on campus containing polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) as insulators has been identified. Emergency measures have been taken to contain leakage, and Capital Council has approved funds to replace or rectify all affected equipment.

Centenary Hall

Titus Hewryk, Director of Facilities Development, briefed the committee on the progress of the Dietrich Hall renovations and the temporary use of Centenary Hall by the Wharton School. The committee was concerned that disruption on Locust Walk could impact on the quality of campus life, but was reassured that, though some inconvenience is inevitable, every effort was being made to minimize its impact.

Lunch Facilities

The committee reviewed a letter from the A-3 Assembly complaining of the lack of cafeteria style dining on campus. Donald Jacobs, Director of the Dining Service, responded. He pointed out that his primary mission is to provide nutritious and attractive food for student contract diners, that this is an excellent buy for those with hearty appetites, and that all of the dining halls are open to University employees. The Dining Service cannot simultaneously provide competitive a la carte dining. There are numerous commercial outlets available, and of course food trucks with much lower overheads. The University exerts some quality control over food trucks that park on its space. Several members praised the quality of the food prepared by the Dining Service. It was strongly suggested that more publicity be given to the facts that employees may obtain lunch at any campus dining hall, that they can pay cash on a per meal basis or buy discounted meal books, and that they may find out in advance by telephone what food is being served (dial MENU).

Fire Protection

James Miller, the new University Safety Officer, and Norman O'Connor, Associate Director of Physical Plant, outlined steps that are being taken to test fire protection equipment and heighten public awareness of safety procedures. Recently instituted fire drills revealed regrettable levels of ignorance in some instances. Mr. Miller averred his willingness to address groups of faculty on this subject, and the committee instructed that the Provost's Office be asked to

urge Deans and Department Chairs that he be invited to do so.

The committee expressed concern at reported acts of vandalism to fire protection equipment. Enquiries of David Johnston, Director of Public Safety, elicited the information that, when culprits are apprehended, they are vigorously prosecuted. The committee unanimously endorsed this stance.

The committee also learned that in the past some items of safety and monitoring equipment have malfunctioned and others have been allowed to fall into disrepair. Arthur Hirsch reported that this is being rectified, and that Capital Council had recently approved funds to bring all residential University buildings up to an acceptably high standard of protection. Failure of safety systems is unacceptable; we must be vigilant that it does not recur.

Real Estate Development

Richard Buford briefed the committee on this area. It applauded the settlement of the longstanding dispute between the Sansom Committee and the University and noted that the way is now clear for the construction of faculty and staff housing at 34th and Walnut Streets. It was informed that planning for this is well under way, and was reassured that steps had been taken to ensure ultimate University control over these properties and their disposal, and to prevent speculation in them. Mr. Buford reported that plans for the development of the former Philadelphia General Hospital site are still uncertain. This is advantageous, since it remains possible for the University to persuade the City to grant it development rights to this site. At its periphery, the University has leased the former Nurses' Residence, now Centenary Hall, with a very attractive option to purchase.

Dogs

Arthur Hirsch reported that unruly dogs on campus were an increasing source of complaints. Of particular concern were incidents of attacks on the handicapped. The committee strengthens the existing policy on admittance of dogs to University buildings and extended its application to the campus grounds. Dogs must be either tethered or with and under the control of their owners at all times. Nuisances caused by violations of this policy will be punishable by fines or, in extreme cases, confiscation of the dog.

Deferred Maintenance

This is a major recurring problem that has exercised and deeply concerned the committee. Unfortunately it is easier to secure funding for capital construction projects than for the operation and maintenance of buildings. The University's increasingly aging physical plant has accumulated years of wear and tear and shrinking budgets have taken their toll on routine maintenance. Deferred maintenance that thus become necessary is funded through a budgetary formula based on the insured value of the buildings and charged to their occupants. This approach, albeit at a level that only supports a fraction of the more urgent projects, represents a rational, planned approach to the problem that ranks among the more farsighted in operation at comparable institutions. Arthur Hirsch described the deferred maintenance program to the committee, who approved its operation and organization and recognized that, though less than would be ideal, it is the best that we can afford. Fears were expressed that, with the increasing difficulties in balancing the University budget, even this was jeopardized, potentially leading to a maintenance backlog of unmanageable proportions. The committee strongly urged the President and the Provost to eschew the temptation to defer further by reallocating these funds. Future committees should jealously protect this program.

Space Scheduling

An ad hoc subcommittee chaired by the Registrar Leslie Pochos, succeeded by acting Registrar Vince Conti, was charged with the investigation of problems associated with the scheduling of classroom space. Among the problems are the poor physical condition of and lack of accurate information concerning much of the available space, and the fact that only a modest proportion of it is under the scheduling control of the Registrar. The unavailability of Dietrich Hall this year highlighted and exacerbated these problems. Unfortunately it also placed such a load on the principals of this subcommittee that it was unable to complete its work. Based on its interim report, the subcommittee has recommended that the Provost make

available funds for a survey to collect the necessary information over the summer, that the Registrar investigate the automation of the storage of this information, and that the subcommittee be reappointed with a more specific charge in the fall.

Energy and Water

The standing Subcommittee on Energy, chaired by Dr. Harbison Pool, has made a wide-ranging review of strategies to diminish the rapidly escalating costs of energy to the University. Horace Bomar, Director of the Department of Energy Management and Conservation, presented to the committee an ambitious plan for a campus-wide energy audit of major buildings. The committee strongly supported this and pointed out that the audit should be conducted as rapidly as funds for it could be made available and, further, that plans to finance the projects that it would surely identify as having significant impact and rapid payback should be laid in good time. The committee is pleased to report that the plan was recommended by Capital Council and adopted by the Trustees.

It became apparent when a drought emergency was declared that water and energy conservation have much in common and are indeed often complementary. Lynn Manko, Assistant to the Director of Physical Plant, briefed the committee of the University's response to this emergency. This in general went beyond the strict requirements of law and was uniformly applauded.

While much can be achieved by purely technological approaches to energy conservation, the subcommittee has rightly emphasized that public awareness and participation are equally essential. This ranges from turning off unused lights, through adopting habits of dress appropriate to the season, to accepting changes of lifestyle dictated by the need for increasingly strict limitations of energy consumption. It has therefore recommended a comprehensive outreach program that the committee has unanimously endorsed and recommended to Council and to the administration. This will include the mobilization of a network of Energy Wardens, one for each campus building complex, and a major energy conservation campaign to be planned over the summer and launched in the fall. The President has accepted the need for this and for the active participation of the senior echelons of the administration. The committee has appointed an ad hoc group to work over the summer to see it to fruition.

Transportation and Parking

The standing Subcommittee on Transportation and Parking, chaired by Dr. Vukan Vuchic, has continued to study the University's circulation and commuting problems in all of their aspects. Together with Steven Murray, Director of Transportation and Communications, they proposed a new schedule of parking fees that the committee approved. These reflect not only inflationary increases, particularly in energy expenses, but also for the first time begin to include a realistic real estate charge for the land occupied by parking lots. In accordance with the committee's long-term goals they introduced a discount for sub-compact cars. It is University policy to discourage commuting by singly occupied private vehicles, especially full size cars. Every inducement will be offered for this use of public transit whenever possible and, when not, to encourage the formation of car and van pools.

Essential to the full and effective implementation of this policy is the improvement of the quality and safety of SEPTA service. The University continues to lobby for this. In this context, Ruth Wells, Crime Prevention Specialist in the Department of Public Safety, described to the subcommittee plans being developed jointly by the West Philadelphia Corporation and SEPTA with her active participation. The committee enthusiastically endorsed this effort and offered several suggestions, for the most part directed at the improvement of security in the subway-surface stations.

Respectfully submitted,

Martin Pring, Chair
Mary Beerman
Vincent Conti
Thomas C. Corl
James G. Dinan
Gordon W. Ellis

Timothy W. Hurckes
Arthur F. Hirsch
Donald Jacobs
Harbison Pool
Donald W. Rucker
James C. Saunders

Yola Green
Bertram Greenspun
Melvin A. Hammarberg
Harry Hance

Richard B. Schlenger
Mary Spata
Vukan R. Vuchic
Virginia J. Scherfel, Staff

International Programs

The Committee met six times in the course of the 1980-81 academic year, in September, November, December, February, March and April. The matters addressed by the Committee in the course of the year are the following:

1. The taking of an inventory of the international resources and contacts of the University (subcommittee appointed). This project, began in the fall of 1980, reached completion of its first stage in the spring, and the document was circulated. Work continues on the computerization of the material, and the creation of an easily accessible data base which can be modified as needed.

2. The matter of foreign student orientation. A subcommittee was established to examine the adequacy of the orientation program for foreign students and to determine whether the University is adequately fulfilling its obligations especially in terms of housing. A letter was prepared and sent to the Vice Provost for University life, explaining the Committee's consensus that the University must demonstrate its commitment to its foreign student population and difficulties with short-term housing must be resolved.

3. It was felt by the Committee that communications between the Office of International Programs and College Hall with regard to matters of international interest could be improved. Liaison meetings have since been established between the Office of International Programs and representatives from the President's Office, the Provost's Office and Faculty of Arts and Sciences. These have continued throughout the year.

4. The Committee has monitored the establishment of two new exchange agreements:

A. International Christian University, Japan. In 1981-82, for the first time, a Penn student will be spending the academic year at ICU, while an ICU student visits Penn. This agreement has been several years in preparation, and we hope that it will result in a successful interchange.

B. University of Ibadan, Nigeria. An agreement for exchange at all levels has been signed by Penn and the University of Ibadan. The first exchange visits under this agreement will take place in 1981-82.

5. The continuation and development of existing Penn study abroad programs formed a major part of the Committee's business:

A. Reid Hall, Paris. The Committee determined that in view of the desirability of expanding the Reid Hall Program to attract more students in the social sciences, a faculty member from Political Science or History should be appointed to the Pennsylvania Reid Hall Committee.

B. Considerable confusion surrounds the matter of study abroad for Spanish-speaking students. The Committee felt that a program in Latin America would be a good prospect, and the Office of International Programs prepared a report on existing study abroad options for the Committee on Latin American and Iberian Studies.

6. The possibility of entering into an exchange agreement with Jagiellonian University, Krakow, Poland, had been broached in 1980 by President Meyerson and the Rector of Jagiellonian. A draft agreement was considered and the Committee decided to recommend that the proposal be endorsed but that caution against potential political problems be advised and that the University should be requested to inform the Committee before further action is taken.

All of these matters were discussed at some length. Others brought briefly before the Committee were the agreements with Paris IV and VI; the matter of the Jiao Tong agreement and of Chinese scholars at Penn (a Provost's China Committee has been established and will address issues related to China throughout 1981-82); and the financial situation of those Iranian students remaining at the University.

—F. Hilary Conroy, Chair

Library

The principal issues to which the Committee has turned its attention this year include the following: Space, the Cataloguing system, Energy, and Security. In what follows, a summary of each will be given in turn.

Space

A. Books

Many school and departmental libraries are already facing considerable problems concerning space. Problems for the Van Pelt Library are somewhat farther off, but, even with careful planning, it is predicted that the main library's stacks will be full within six years. The immediate problems of space are being solved at the moment by removing low circulation books from the stacks and storing them in a warehouse facility rented for that purpose. Books placed in the warehouse can be made available to readers on a 48-hour call basis.

This use of storage space, and a limited amount of conversion to microfilm, may alleviate the situation in the short term. However, the Library Committee feels bound to inform the entire University community that a great deal of long-range space-planning is necessary. If the University is not to find itself in a book-space crisis within the next five years, such planning should be underway now.

B. People

The Committee has been studying the problems of study space within the Library system. It is somewhat ironic that one of the primary virtues of a *circulation* library is that books may be taken out and read wherever and whenever the reader wishes. And yet, when the time for examinations approaches, there is great demand for study space in the Library. This problem is also the concern of Residential Life, in that little attention seems to have been given to the provision of study spaces in the various residences; in particular, the committee has often been told that the High Rise Buildings are unconducive to study because of the distractions of noise. The Committee Chairman and the Acting Director of Libraries have met with the Vice Provost for University Life on this matter, particularly in view of current planning for the renovation of the Quad.

In the meanwhile, the Library has agreed to continue its policy of extending hours during reading and examination periods.

Cataloguing

As is probably well known, the majority of libraries in the United States have long relied on the services of the Library of Congress in providing cataloguing information on printed cards and, for the past several years, on computer tape as well. Thus, LC's decision to "close" its card catalogues on January 2, 1981, at the same time as it adopted a new, internationally developed cataloguing code, AACR 2, was an event of considerable significance for libraries throughout the United States.

As of January this year, LC will not add to or adjust the information in its card catalogues. Records for newly acquired materials will be stored by computer only, and will be retrievable at a number of computer terminals. With regard to the University of Pennsylvania library system, the decision has been made to continue to add to the current card catalogue for the next four or five years, while continuing to build a machine-readable file for newly acquired material. But, in the light of the Library of Congress' decision, it appears that at some point it will be inevitable, and indeed desirable, to rely entirely on computer terminals for current cataloguing information. *It should be emphasized that the present card catalogue will not be removed.* It will be used for access to materials acquired before a certain cut-off date since the expense of converting all the information it contains to machine-readable form would appear to be prohibitive. It will simply not be added to.

The Library Committee has been considering ways in which this considerable but inevitable change in cataloguing can be explained to library users so that the transition to the new system may be as smooth as possible.

Energy

As part of a campus-wide project funded by a federal grant, the Energy Office has been experimenting with differing levels of light within the stack areas. A demonstration of this was held during the fall semester at which members of the Library staff and the faculty were invited to express their opinions. As a result of extensive discussions, it was decided that the best solution would be to lower the candle power of the lighting to an extent which would not significantly lessen the amount of available light, but yet would save a large amount of energy and also cut down on the amount of heat generated by the lighting, thus lowering the cost of air-conditioning during the summer months.

Security

The Library staff have been conducting a survey of usage of the Van Pelt Library in an attempt to determine how much the facility is used by people who are not members of the staff or students at the University. This is in light of an increase in the number of thefts of personal belongings within the Library. At the moment, access to the Library is controlled during the weekend hours, and, as the survey continues, it may become necessary to implement similar procedures at the entrance to the Library on a permanent basis.

Recommendations

It is clear that the University and the Committee will need to develop recommendations very soon in each of the following areas:

1. On the need for expanded library space and the possible alternative ways of filling those needs.
2. On making more permanent arrangements for adequate student study space.
3. On increased security procedures, something which may involve limitation of access to the library for non-University persons.
4. On implementing a campus-wide education program concerning new systems on library cataloguing, access, usage, etc.

—Roger Allen, Chair

Personnel Benefits

During the academic year, the Committee made a number of recommendations to the University Administration. Subjects included dental benefits, changes in tuition benefits plans, and several issues relating to TIAA-CREF. In addition a subcommittee addressed the general issue of "flexible benefits," a proposal to give employees some choice in deciding which benefits to elect from an available list. The latter subject is sufficiently complex that the subcommittee will carry over its work into the 1981-82 academic year.

TIAA-CREF

A change in IRS policy jeopardized the income tax status of benefits paid by the University on behalf of persons on scholarly leave for periods in excess of six months. The Committee recommended that the University compensate such individuals in an amount approximating the additional assessment of income tax.

An additional change in IRS policy cast doubt on a University practice of making retroactive TIAA-CREF contributions for employees who have elected to have their share withheld prior to expiration of the three year waiting period. To alleviate this problem, the Committee recommended that the practice of retroactive contributions be discontinued. However, the Committee also recommended that the waiting period for full participation in TIAA-CREF be reduced from three years to eighteen months for eligible employees.

In recent years, TIAA-CREF participants have become increasingly aware that the CREF portion of the annuity plan has not been a successful answer to the problems of inflation. Some participants have suggested that those eligible for TIAA-CREF be offered additional options such as money market funds to allow greater flexibility of choice in depositing both individual and University contributions. A subcommittee was appointed to consider the matter and recommended that additional options be made available. Due to the approaching end of the academic year, there was not time to place this item on the agenda of the full Committee. However, the report of the subcommittee was forwarded to the Administration for its consideration.

Dental Benefits

The University community is now well aware that there is a dental benefits plan in place. No plan could be successful without strong support from the Administration and support this year was forthcoming. Considerable research was undertaken by the Personnel Relations department and by representatives of the School of Dental Medicine. This made the Committee's task a relatively easy one. Two plans are available, one sponsored by the University's Dental Care Center and the other by The Prudential Insurance Company of America. Employees may elect either plan. Details were made available to all eligible employees, and were discussed in detail in the April 14, 1981 Special Edition of the Personnel Relations Newsletter.

Tuition Benefits

The topic has been on the Committee's agenda for the past two years. A policy change concerning only employees of the New Bolton Center was recommended, and subsequently implemented. Under the new policy, New Bolton employees are permitted to take job-related or degree-program courses at West Chester State College or the University of Delaware, instead of courses at Pennsylvania.

On the larger issue of major overhaul of tuition benefits, the Committee has recommended that direct grant tuition benefits be extended to dependent children of non-exempt employees; that the direct grant be substantially increased; and that benefits be limited to eight semesters (not necessarily undergraduate) for each dependent child. The economic impact of these recommendations is difficult to assess, and the Administration has elected to defer action until the proposal can be evaluated more fully. Regardless of the outcome, Committee members are convinced a revised program is needed that will more adequately balance benefits at the University with benefits under the direct grants. The direct grant was set many years ago at 50% of tuition at Pennsylvania, but this relationship no longer exists. A change to improve the direct grant has educational merit and would mitigate admissions problems that the existing program tends to foster.

Prospects and Credits

The forecast for next year is for a more difficult agenda. In addition to the unresolved tuition benefits proposal, work will continue on a possible program of flexible benefits. (Some existing benefit areas already provide limited choices, health and dental benefits providing an example. The Committee probably should review the concerns of employees who already are in their retirement years. As Chairman, I express my appreciation to the members of this year's committee, and to our ex-officio experts, Dennis Dougherty, James Keller, and Gerald Robinson. Also, thanks are due to Ms. Jeanne Hitman who served unselfishly as recorder. Other members of the University community, too numerous to list in this report, gave us valuable input and advice. We are grateful for their help.

Richard S. Woods, Chair

Research

The activities of the Committee on Research for the 1980-81 academic year dealt principally with five areas. These were:

1. Patent Policy
2. Effects of A-21 Regulations
3. Centers and Institutes
4. The Research Foundation
5. Computing

1. Patent Policy. As part of the continuing discussion over the rights and responsibilities of the University in patents generated through the work of the faculty and staff, the Research Committee reviewed three issues: the establishment of a Patent Board, the areas of responsibility of such a Board, and a proposed supplement to the existing University patent policy. As Vice Provost for Research, Dr. Louis Girifalco requested advice from the Committee on Research concerning the establishment of a Patent Board and its potential range of responsibilities. The intent, according to Dr. Girifalco, is that a Board be set up "because the existing patent policy can neither anticipate circumstances which will arise due to University patents, nor can it solve any disputes due to controversial issues."

The Committee's discussion focused, initially, on questions of academic freedom and the role that a Patent Board might play in regulating the intellectual independence of the faculty. Though there continued to be some fear that a Patent Board might not be sensitive to the needs of the faculty, it was generally agreed that such a board could, if properly constituted, represent both administration and faculty interests. It was recommended that the Board should be established and constituted as follows:

- (i) The Board should be empowered to review and make recommendations in all disputes concerning the nature and implementation of University Patent Policy and Procedures including (but not limited to) those relating to: the jurisdiction of the University over patentable inventions; issues concerning the timeliness of the University's response to requests for

patent information; and the review of all ongoing University policies with respect to the distribution of financial returns associated with patents.

- (ii) The University policies with respect to the establishment of such a Patent Board should indicate that the Board is not a "court of last resort" but that any faculty member or other University employee associated with a dispute over patent rights can also employ normal grievance procedures and/or other forms of conflict mediation.

- (iii) The Board should be made up of five faculty members appointed for three-year terms. These terms should be staggered so that, in any one year, no more than three new members would be appointed to the Board. These appointments should be made by the Provost with the advice of the Senate Committee on Consultation and the Council Committee on Research.

- (iv) The Vice Provost for Research should request that the Director of the Office of Research Administration and the University Counsel be available to act as staff to the Patent Board.

- (v) The Chairman of the University Committee on Research should be appointed as an ex-officio member of the Patent Board to ensure a close working relationship between the Board and the Research Committee.

Finally, the Research Committee was asked to review the following supplement to the patent policy:

"The University's share of returns from patents resulting from any invention or discovery from work carried out on University time will be used to support research at the University. Thirty percent (30%) of such revenues will be placed directly in the Research Foundation to be dealt with by standard procedures of the Foundation Board. Priority for the remaining seventy percent (70%) should be given to support research close to the origin of the work which generated the patent.

- (i) For net patent income less than \$100,000 per year: The 70% may be distributed by the Vice Provost for Research, after consultation with the home department chairman, in response to research proposals of merit from the inventor(s), from the home department(s) of inventor(s) and from faculty members from the home department and school of the inventor(s), with priorities in that order.

- (ii) For net patent income in excess of \$100,000 per year: The 70% will be distributed by the Board of the Research Foundation in response to research proposals from the inventor(s), from home department(s) of the inventor(s) and from faculty members of the home department and school of the inventor(s) with priorities in that order. The Board of Foundation will, however, have the responsibility of evaluating the importance and merit of these priority proposals in the context of the broader research needs within the University."

It was the Committee's view that such a change was warranted since the existing policy did not give sufficiently strong emphasis to reinvestment in the areas of research which generated the patent. Though there were some comments about the potential impacts of biased allocations, the Committee held that the rights of the faculty should be appropriately ensured with the proposed supplement and it, therefore, endorsed the change.

2. Effects of A-21 Regulations. Aside from a general review of the status of effort reporting, the Committee also examined some of the other effects of OMB A-21 regulations. Of particular interest were the changes in funding for graduate students and the potential impacts on the financial and educational status of different schools and departments.

The first issue addressed by the Committee concerned the changes in the ways in which tuition benefits have been funded at the University. Following the recommendation of the 1979-80 Committee it was proposed that a fund be established which would alleviate some of the immediate problems brought about by A-21 regulations. It was recognized, however, that such a fund would require a significant amount of time to develop and that some more immediate source of transition support was required. With this in mind, the Committee advised the Vice Provost for Research that it very much supported the establishment of contingency funds for graduate tuition. In addition, the Committee recommended priorities which should be applied to individual cases:

1. Research grants and contracts which originally had graduate students budgeted under the non-A-21 regulations and where the students required tuition support up to the University's 20-credit-unit enrollment requirements.

2. Research grants and contracts which originally had graduate students budgeted under non-A-21 regulations and where the students required tuition support in excess of the 20-credit-unit requirement.

3. Research grants and contracts which did not originally have graduate students budgeted during non-A21 regulations but which are now considering hiring students for the 1981-82 academic year.

4. All other requests.

The Committee recognized that some special cases may not fall clearly into one of the categories, and it therefore recommended that in such cases the Committee itself be contacted for further clarification of the intent of the recommendation.

There are, in addition to the direct impacts of changes in graduate student funding due to A-21 regulations, two areas of indirect impacts:

a) decreases in the absolute amount of funds available and, therefore, a potential for the loss of funded research, and

b) changes in the relative attractiveness of utilizing student assistants as part of a research project (since the cost of graduate students would be considerably higher where tuition must be charged as a direct expense). As part of the Committee's review of this issue, a small survey was done to try to determine the differential effects in various schools and departments throughout the University. The results of this survey are not yet complete but, when they are available, will be published as a separate report in *Almanac*.

3. Centers and Institutes. The Committee was approached by the Chairman of the Educational Planning Committee, Dr. David DeLaura, concerning the University's responsibilities for reviewing and making recommendations to the Provost for the establishment of centers and institutes. As part of this discussion, it was noted that the Educational Planning Committee did not have the resources to perform these functions in a timely manner. Furthermore, there appeared to be no accurate list of centers and institutes as the University. The Committee designed a short questionnaire concerning the status of centers and institutes which are a part of their respective responsibilities. The results of this survey are being organized and tabulated and will be published.

It was the opinion of the Committee that the difficulties associated with obtaining information on centers and institutes reflect a general problem in existing University policies. With this in mind, the Committee recommended that the results of its survey of centers and institutes be turned over to the Office of the Vice-Provost for Research with a recommendation that something like a "task force" be set up to examine the status of University procedures for review of such centers and institutes. Furthermore, in view of the high profile which centers and institutes command, the Committee felt that this issue should hold very high priority for the Vice Provost for Research.

4. Research Foundation. At the request of the Vice Provost for Research, Dr. Louis Girifalco, the Committee considered a request to review connections between faculty research and the proposed development of a Research Foundation. This review was to include:

- (i) The relationship between the faculty and the foundation.
- (ii) The mechanisms of faculty oversight and review.
- (iii) Distribution of funds.
- (iv) The innovated potential of the foundation.

After considerable discussion, the Committee decided not to make any recommendation until the Foundation has been established and a board appointed. In part, the rationale for this position was based on the Provost's desire to have an independent board. At the same time, however, it was recognized that the scope of the Committee's interactions on issues relating to the conduct and function of the Research Foundation could only be determined in cooperation with the board itself. The Committee did, however, wish it to be understood that it was fully prepared to cooperate with the Vice Provost for Research on any matters concerning the Research Foundation.

5. Computing. As part of the Committee's attention to the status of research facilities a number of matters were reviewed, including the condition and allocation of space, library facilities, and computing. Computing was singled out for specific attention as there have been a number of comments, by faculty and graduate students, to the effect that the available computing resources were severely limiting research capacity in a number of areas. Based on discussions with the Vice Provost for Research, the Committee recommended that an ad

hoc computing committee be formed to make recommendations to the administration. The Committee did, however, indicate that it hoped the administration would make some clear policy statement concerning the direction for the development of computing resources.

—Stephen Gale, Chair

Undergraduate Admissions & Financial Aid

The Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid of the University Council met eight times during the academic year 1980-81: September 16, 1980; October 31, 1980; December 5, 1980; January 16, 1981; February 13, 1981; February 19, 1981; April 3, 1981; and May 12, 1981. The members of the Committee were:

Chairman: John A. Kastor (medicine)

Faculty: Kenneth R. Atkins (physics)

Lee V. Cassanelli (history)

Christian C. Day (legal studies)

Nancy O. Debasio (nursing)

Kenneth A. Fegley (systems engineering)

Kathryn K. McMahon (French)

Paul Shaman (statistics)

Jeffrey Tigay (Oriental studies)

Wayne L. Worrell (materials science)

Deans'

Representatives: Morris Cohen (decision sciences), Wharton

John D. Keenan (civil & urban engineering), SEAS

Marian B. Sherman (student recruitment), Nursing

Paul Zingg (assistant to dean for admissions), FAS

Administration: Eric van Merkensteijn (Wharton)

Students: Jeffrey A. Ditesheim (FAS'81)

David A. Vise (Wh '82)

Jill A. Weinrott (FAS '81)

Timm Whitney (FAS '81)

Linda Henry (Law)

Ex officio: William Schilling (director, student financial aid)

Janis I. Somerville (vice provost for University life)

Willis J. Stetson, Jr., (director, admissions)

The Committee's work was carried out by 5 subcommittees with three to five members of the Committee serving on each Subcommittee. The subcommittees and their Chairmen were: (1) Admissions Office (Christian Day); (2) Applicant Impressions (Nancy Debasio); (3) Financial Aid (Eric van Merkensteijn); (4) Special Admissions (Kenneth Atkins); (5) Transfer Admissions (Lee Cassanelli). In addition, special attention was paid to two other topics which were discussed by the whole Committee: (1) class size; (2) parochial schools. The Committee also heard reports on several occasions by Willis J. Stetson, Jr., Director of Admissions, on the activities and progress of the Admissions Office.

Admissions Office:

Three recommendations were proposed by the Subcommittee and unanimously adopted by the Committee:

(1) The Subcommittee recommends that the University continue to support and fund adequately the Admissions Office. The level of funding and support must, at a minimum, keep pace with inflation and should not be permitted to decline.

(2) The Subcommittee recommends that the University continue to support the office's intensified recruitment efforts outside of the northeastern section of the United States.

(3) The Subcommittee recommends that the Admissions Office be supported in its efforts to upgrade its computer facilities and personnel.

Relationship Between Admissions Office and the Director of the Alumni Council:

The Subcommittee reported that Dr. Audrey C. Bedford, the director of the Alumni Council of Admissions, had personalized the admissions process for alumni children through letters and telephone calls to applicants and their parents. Dr. Bedford appeared to enjoy a good relationship with the alumni network coordinator. Committee members emphasized that alumni interviewers should be well informed in order to perform effectively. The Committee was informed that training sessions for alumni

recruiters were held just before Homecoming but that not many alumni had participated. It appeared to the Committee that further work in this area might be useful.

Title of the Chief Admissions Officer: The Subcommittee considered whether or not the title of the Chief Admissions Officer should be changed from Director to Dean of Admissions. However, the press of other duties prevented the Subcommittee from accumulating adequate information from other universities and from formulating its proposal during this academic year. The topic was referred to the Committee during the 1981-82 session. An historical review of the title was prepared by the Secretary, Mr. Robert G. Lorndale.

Applicant Impressions: The Subcommittee presented four recommendations, each of which was accepted unanimously by the Committee.

(1) The Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid should continue its relationship with Miss Sue Shaman in the Office of Planning Analysis.

(2) Student organized activities such as campus tours and Kite and Key weekends should be monitored to some degree by either the Admissions office or the Subcommittee on Applicant Impressions in order to maintain quality.

(3) The results of studies from the Office of Planning Analysis should be made available to members of the various schools on an annual basis.

(4) The current questionnaire used for students who have chosen to go elsewhere should be monitored to reflect the impressions of that group alone. Students choosing other institutions to attend may have special requirements not felt by those who accept the University of Pennsylvania.

The survey report of the Office of Planning Analysis was made available to the members of the Committee. Members felt that this report was very informative and should be studied by other members of the University community with a particular interest in the admissions process.

Financial Aid: Three recommendations were unanimously adopted.

(1) Financial aid policies and practices of the University of Pennsylvania should be documented in written form and made available to all appropriate groups and offices.

(2) Financial aid policies and practices should be reviewed with respect to the following issues:

- A. Stability of funding sources
- B. Alternative uses of unrestricted money
- C. Economic status of students
- D. Policy behavior of competing institutions

(3) A standing committee of the new budget and planning committee should be established to become knowledgeable and to advise in all matters concerning financial aid.

Special Admissions: The following recommendations were adopted.

(1) The Admissions Office should continue to identify students with potential academic difficulties (PAD) during the selection process. As soon as possible after he or she accepts a place in the entering class, the names and details of potential weaknesses should be sent to the school where the PAD has been accepted.

(2) Every PAD, whatever his admissions category, should be assigned to an advisor early in the summer preceding the freshman year. The main concern of the advisor at this stage would be to insure that the student does not enroll in courses for which he is not adequately prepared.

(3) All freshman summer programs should be continued and extended to all special admits and PADs who could benefit from them.

(4a) All data on students throughout the University should be computerized and coordinated in one readily accessible source.

(4b) Each year, as a matter of normal routine, certain aspects of these data carrying no information about individual students should be extracted, categorized, analyzed and tabulated according to

certain pre-arranged programs designed to accumulate a growing body of data about the academic performance of the student body.

(5) An office of research into the academic performance of students should be established.

Recommendations 1, 2 and 5 were adopted unanimously. Recommendation 3 was adopted by a vote of 7 in favor and 1 opposed. Resolution 4a was adopted by a vote of 5 in favor and 3 opposed. Resolution 4b was adopted with 5 in favor and 4 opposed.

Transfer Admissions: A review of the transfer admission policies of Ivy League colleges revealed that the University of Pennsylvania has the highest admission rate for transfer students but that the elements of our transfer admission policies seem rather poorly understood. The policy of Stanford University which appears to encourage transfers but is quite selective seemed to be an attractive position for the University of Pennsylvania to take. The Director of the Admissions Office reported that the target for transfer admissions comes from the Undergraduate Deans, and that the basis for the recommendation is maintenance of enrollment.

Five recommendations were proposed by the Subcommittee and adopted by the Committee, each unanimously except for motion 4.

(1) The University of Pennsylvania should make explicit its commitment to accepting qualified transfer students, not simply as replacements for students who will not return but as part of its educational and admissions policy.

(2) Efforts to encourage January admissions should be increased, especially for transfers to FAS and Nursing.

(3) The Admissions Office should continue refining the predictive indicators for transfers in order to select more successfully those applicants who will benefit from enrollment at the University.

(4) SAT scores should ordinarily be required for transfer applicants although the transfer admissions office may waive this requirement occasionally when appropriate. (Vote: 6 in favor, 3 opposed, 1 abstention).

(5) The University should commit adequate resources and personnel to the transfer advising process.

The following motion was tabled because of the need to receive additional information before proceeding further: "The transfer program be maintained at its present size until trends in freshmen and transfer applicants are established."

Parochial Schools: The Committee considered the content of a letter by Professor Paul J. Korshin to Vice Provost Somerville regarding the policy of the Admissions Office with respect to admissions from parochial schools. Professor Korshin, previously the Chairman of the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid, suggested that graduates from parochial schools can be especially well qualified for admission to the University of Pennsylvania and, in particular, are often better prepared than students from other schools in many areas and, in particular, in speaking, oratory or rhetoric and in composition and foreign languages.

Mr. Stetson responded that the Admissions Office was increasing its attention to parochial and, in particular, Catholic high schools and reported an increase in the number of visits to such schools conducted during the past year. He pointed out that the average predictive index at the University of Pennsylvania was virtually the same for applicants, admittees and matriculants from Catholic high schools and public high schools. Mr. Stetson emphasized that the admissions staff strives to identify well-prepared students everywhere regardless of the type of school attended.

It was the sense of the Committee that the position of the Admissions staff on parochial school admissions was appropriate, and the results of the discussion were conveyed by the Chairman to Professor Korshin.

Class Size: The following resolution was adopted by a vote of 10 in favor and 1 abstention: The Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid recommends that the size of the class of 1985 not exceed 1996 students, the number determined by the Council of Undergraduate Deans. Further, the Committee affirms a commitment to a stable-state pattern for overall undergraduate enrollment. The committee affirms the necessity that factors of selectivity,

resource availability and quality of life be maintained at least at present levels in the determination of class size. If the Provost wishes to exceed this number, the Committee wishes to be informed of the additional resources (teachers, classrooms, support facilities, funds) which the University will provide to insure that educational quality is maintained.

At the final meeting of the Committee for the 1980-81 academic

year, Mr. Stetson reviewed the work of the Admissions Office in recruiting and selecting the class of 1985. The Chairman gave his congratulations to the Director and his associates for their excellent work on behalf of the University. The Chairman then thanked the members of the Committee for their diligent efforts for the Committee during the past year.

—John A. Kastor, Chair

Faculty Grants and Awards

In the three years I have served on the committee, two of them as Chair, "Committee on Faculty Summer Grants and Awards" would have been more appropriate, not only because our only real work (and real work it was during our period of activity) was the reviewing of summer grant applications and the awarding of summer fellowships and grants-in-aid, but also because there was no mechanism for our becoming anything else. During the course of the year I received, personally, several requests for funding, some of them rather large, from faculty members working on campus on term-time projects. There was (as there had been for a number of years) some money left over from summer grant funds from the year before, and these applicants wished to tap into it. After all, our committee was set up to award grants-in-aid, they argued (and justifiably, I think) so why wouldn't we do our job? My response was twofold: first, the left-over money had been set aside for summer grants and I thought that the junior faculty, who receive these grants and often have no alternative sources of funding, couldn't afford to have their oasis drained; second, that, because there were no deadlines for in-term applications there was no way to make the funds available fairly: they would have been awarded simply on a first-come-first-served basis to anyone whose project seemed generally worthy, with no opportunity for competition according to degrees of merit. Others out there with equally valuable projects, I would argue, must be equally eager for funds but unaware that any university grant money might exist. So I refused to make a judgment on these individual cases and sent them on to Professor Girifalco for arbitration. (Evidently one or more applicants were successful since this year's summer grant funds were smaller than usual.)

Of course all this may be a moot point in the future since, for this year at any rate, there *are* no left-over funds. But I think the problem should be addressed in any case and the committee's responsibilities defined according to the solutions reached.

Smaller, more technical difficulties have arisen over the past few years and some methods adopted to solve some of them. When I first served on the committee there was no set of criteria agreed upon for judging summer grant applications, no clear form to use in evaluating them. This year we began using report sheets on which members of the committee could note the bases for their judgments, sheets that, when made available to the chair, often proved useful when candidates whose applications had been turned down would call for advice. Perhaps future committees might wish to polish these forms and make sure that they remain in a confidential file for the chair to use at his discretion.

Another problem that arose was that of making sure that junior faculty members were made aware of the existence of the grants. Newcomers are not always attuned to the ways of *Almanac*, and general notices often wash by the word-glutted eye. This year a letter was sent out over my name to all department chairmen, urging them to encourage their junior colleagues to consider applying, and to those junior members themselves, reminding them of the grant program's existence. Response seems to have proved this approach useful, though it also underscored the fact that research aid is scarce indeed.

A third problem, and one that may well have been unusual, came from the imbalance between the number of applicants from the

humanities and the number of committee members qualified to judge them. It would seem wise, from my perspective of three years, to have at least three humanists on the committee. A chemist judging an application from a literary theorist is likely to have as much trouble as a literary theorist would have judging an application from a chemist (alas, the two cultures!) Perhaps some active recruiting of committee members would help keep the judges sane.

—Alice van Buren Kelley, Chair

1981-82 Awards

TABLE I

| | | |
|------------------------------|----|----------|
| <i>Applications Received</i> | 55 | |
| Summer Fellowships | 48 | |
| Grants-in-Aid | 36 | |
| <i>Awards</i> | | |
| Summer Fellowships | 24 | \$48,000 |
| Grants-in-Aid | 13 | 10,021 |
| Total Awarded | | \$58,021 |
| <i>Funds Available</i> | | |
| New | | \$50,000 |
| Carry-over from prior year | | + 8,021 |
| Total Available | | \$58,021 |
| Less Awards | | - 58,021 |
| Balance | | -0- |

TABLE II

Distribution of Awards by School and Department

| | |
|--------------------------------|----|
| ANNENBERG | 2 |
| EDUCATION | 1 |
| FACULTY OF ARTS & SCIENCES | |
| American Civilization | 1 |
| Anthropology | 1 |
| Biology | 2 |
| Economics | 2 |
| English | 5 |
| Germanic Languages | 1 |
| History & Sociology of Science | 1 |
| Oriental Studies | 3 |
| Philosophy | 1 |
| Political Science | 1 |
| Regional Science | 1 |
| | 19 |
| MEDICAL | |
| Cardio-Pulmonary | 1 |
| Otorhinolaryngology | 1 |
| Rheumatology | 1 |
| | 3 |
| NURSING | 2 |
| SOCIAL WORK | 1 |
| VETERINARY | |
| Reproductive Studies | 1 |