

Almanac

Tuesday, November 8, 1983

Published by the University of Pennsylvania

Volume 30, Number 11



The University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania will celebrate one hundred years of accomplishment in 1986-87. I am announcing this great event tonight in the hope that you can join us in preparing for this festive year. There is much to be done.

As the nation's foremost museum of archaeology and anthropology, our scholars have explored mankind's history and cultural diversity in all parts of the world. Our collections are an extraordinary tribute to humanity. But great institutions cannot survive for long by looking only to their past. Thus, we want to join with our friends and colleagues during our Centennial Celebration to look to the future... and create with us a charter for the next one hundred years of accomplishment.

Robert H. Dyson, Jr.

November 3, 1983



Steven Siegel

Under the Faculty Senate Rules as amended April 22, 1981, formal notification to members may be accomplished by publication in Almanac in lieu of direct mail. The following is published under that rule:

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate
FROM: June Axinn, Chair
SUBJECT: Senate Nominating Committee

1. In accordance with the requirements of the Senate Bylaws, notice is herewith given to the Senate Membership of the Senate Executive Committee's 9-member slate of nominees for the Nominating Committee for 1983-84. The Nominating Committee nominates candidates for election to the Offices of the Senate (chair-elect and secretary-elect), to the at-large positions on the Senate Executive Committee, and to the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty and the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility. The nine nominees, all of whom have indicated their willingness to serve, are:

Jamshed Ghandhi (associate professor of finance)
Louis Girfalco (University professor of engineering and applied science)
Madeleine Joullié (professor of chemistry)
Phoebe S. Leboy (professor of biochemistry, Dental)
Martin Meyerson (University professor of city planning)
Janice Radway (assistant professor of American civilization)
Michele Richman (associate professor of Romance languages)
George Ruff (professor of psychiatry)
Ralph Smith (associate professor of law)

2. Pursuant to the Bylaws, you are herewith invited to submit additional nominations, which shall be accomplished via petitions containing at least twenty-five valid names and the signed approval of the candidate. All such petitions must be received no later than fourteen days subsequent to the date of this notice. If no additional nominations are received, the slate nominated by the Executive Committee will be declared elected. Should additional nominations be received, a mail ballot will be distributed to the Senate Membership.

The closing date for receipt of nominations by petition is Tuesday, November 22, 1983. Please forward any nominations by petition to the Faculty Senate Office, 15 College Hall/CO.

IN BRIEF

\$5 Million Encyclopedia: The Annenberg School of Communications and Oxford University Press, Inc., are starting the five-year, \$5 million project of publishing the first comprehensive encyclopedia defining the field of communications scholarship and practice. The four-volume *International Encyclopedia of Communications* will be edited by Historian Erik Barnouw, founder of the film division at Columbia, with Wilfred Schramm, a pioneer in communications research and scholarship, as consulting editor. The editorial board for the *International Encyclopedia*, chaired by Dean George Gerbner, will include Dean Peter Clarke of the USC Annenberg School; Penn's Professor Larry Gross as associate editor; and Tobias L. Worth, former senior encyclopedia editor at McGraw-Hill, as editorial director.

Tuition Benefits: On the Senate Fall Meeting agenda for November 16 (page 2) is another stage in deliberations on faculty children's tuition benefits. In this issue, the Economic Status Committee reports on page 3; the President and Provost respond on page 4; an ad hoc committee urges an alternative in *Speaking Out*, page 5; and the Personnel Benefits Committee's chair questions the routing of decision-making on such matters, also on page 5.

Restructure of Council: To a request that a task force look into restructuring the University Council (page 6), the President and Provost respond in the negative.

Student Reenrollment and Attrition: Student Data Director Vince Conti, chair of a committee formed last January to investigate student reenrollment and attrition, said the final report is expected to be released to the Vice Provost for University Life by mid-November. As indicated in his preliminary report (*Almanac* February 1, 1983), the study is broad-based, not confined to minority attrition as suggested by recent *D.P.* articles.

INSIDE

- **Senate: From the Chair (Axinn); Agenda; Resolution on Denial of Tenure, p. 2**
- **Economic Status Committee Report, p. 3**
- **Response to Economic Status, p. 4**
- **Speaking Out on Grandfathering, Process in Benefits, Structure of Council, etc., pp. 5-6**
- **Student/Faculty Interaction: Part I, p. 7**

SENATE

From the Chair

November 16: Tuition Benefits Tenure and Other Topics

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular fall meeting on Wednesday, November 16, 1983, from 3 to 5 p.m. in Room 200, College Hall. The agenda is published below, but some background discussion on action items may be helpful.

There are four resolutions on the agenda. Two involve relatively minor procedural changes. One of these is a proposal to increase the number of members on the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility and to eliminate the replacement pool members. The reason is simply that the experiment with the replacement pool idea did not work very well. Replacement pool members tended either to behave as full members, in which case they should be recognized as such, or not to participate at all. A second resolution formalizes the regular Senate meeting dates. Both of these resolutions may be found in the *Almanac* of October 18, 1982.

A more substantive recommendation is to be found in the Report of the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty. The details of the tuition benefit plan and the proposed additional option for faculty members are available elsewhere in this edition of *Almanac* (Report of the Faculty Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, p. 3; Response of President Hackney and Provost Ehrlich, p. 4.), and I will not restate them here. In brief, last fall at its regular meeting, and again in a mail ballot this past January, the faculty voted overwhelmingly for a plan restructuring its tuition benefits program. The new plan was proposed by the Senate leadership and the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, and endorsed by the administration. All agreed—and I believe continue to agree—that the new plan, now in place, presents fairer alternatives for most faculty members.

It does not, however, improve conditions for all faculty members. Quite the contrary. Some faculty members—those who planned for and depended on full tuition support for their children at this University—feel deeply deprived. For this reason, last April the Senate instructed its leadership and its committee on economic status to consult with the administration and with its own membership and find options that would ease the hardships faced by those adversely affected by the implementation of the new plan. A committee recommendation requesting that individual faculty members be given a one-time choice between the old plan and the new plan is on the agenda. The proposal was

endorsed unanimously by the committee and by the Senate leadership. A group of our colleagues have been hurt and in the spirit of *leges sine moribus vanae* the University should behave morally.

The fourth action item is a resolution which concerns the procedures to be followed when the president and provost propose to deny tenure in spite of a strong affirmative vote from the Faculty involved. The personnel committee of a faculty ordinarily considers the qualifications of an individual and makes its recommendations without knowledge of the relative strength of a department or a school. More broadly, it acts behind a veil of ignorance of academic or financial plans. Thus an opportunity to hear from, and respond to, the provost when tenure is denied on grounds the committee has been restricted from considering is essential to effective faculty governance.

When we welcomed the provost at a reception two years ago, the Senate Chair noted his "sensitivity to academic standards and his awareness of the link between those standards and a strong role in faculty governance." (*Almanac* October 13, 1981). Nowhere is this more directly the case than in a faculty's rights and responsibilities to determine its membership. So that the faculty may exercise that responsibility, the Senate Executive Committee has put a resolution on the agenda establishing formal consultation procedures between the dean, the personnel committee, and the president and provost, when the president and provost propose to deny a grant of tenure strongly recommended by the faculty.

In addition to the recommendations and resolutions, several major committees will report, requesting Senate discussion of their business, including the serious matter of the future of *Almanac*. In these uncertain times it is essential that the faculty of the University maintain a strong independent presence. Its publication, the *Almanac*, and its forum, the Senate, are crucial to this task. The Senate meeting on Wednesday, November 16, at 3 p.m. provides the faculty with the opportunity to participate—individually and collectively—in the governance of the University.



Agenda for the Fall Meeting, Faculty Senate Wednesday, November 16, 1983, 3-5:30 p.m., 200 College Hall

The agenda will include:

1. Approval of the minutes of 11/17/82, 2/2/83 and 4/20/83 (mailed to Senate members 11/3/83).
2. Report of the chair (comments by the chair appear in this *Almanac*).
3. Report of the provost
4. Report of the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility for *discussion only*.
5. Report of the Senate Committee on Publication Policy for *Almanac* for *discussion only*.
6. Report of the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (appears in this issue of *Almanac*) This is for *discussion and action*.
7. Resolution concerning the denial of tenure (to be published in *Almanac* 11/15/83). This is for *discussion and action*.
8. Proposed change in the Senate Rules (*Almanac* 10/18/83) for *discussion and action*.

No *Almanac* Tuesday, November 22, for the traditional Thanksgiving save-money break. Staff will be on duty to assist November 29 contributors. —Ed.

Almanac

3601 Locust Walk/C8
Philadelphia, Pa. 19104
(215) 898-5274 or 5275.

The University of Pennsylvania's journal of record and opinion is published Tuesdays during the academic year and as needed during summer and holiday breaks. Guidelines for readers and contributors are available on request.

EDITOR
ASSISTANT EDITOR
EDITORIAL ASSISTANT
WORK STUDY STUDENTS

Karen C. Gaines
Marguerite F. Miller
Linda M. Fischer
Kevin M. Dougherty
Amy L. MacMillan
Michael Markowitz
John Neumann

ALMANAC ADVISORY BOARD Eliot Stellar, chair; Jacob Abel, June Axinn, Jean Crockett, Carolyn Marvin and Ralph Spritzer for the Faculty Senate; Denise McGregor for the Administration Jane Bryan for the Librarians Assembly Edwin Ledwell for the Administrative Assembly Joseph Kane for the A-3 Assembly.

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

The charge given the 1983-84 Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty included an instruction to facilitate the implementation of the newly installed faculty tuition benefit plan. The committee examined a variety of ways of providing a smooth transition to the new, more balanced treatment of faculty offspring at and away from Penn—the new 75%-40% arrangement that has replaced the old 100%-\$900 one—and has a recommendation to make to the Faculty Senate.

In response to concerns expressed at the spring 1983 plenary meeting, the committee has examined different possibilities of alleviating the difficulties now facing some faculty members whose planning for their children's education depended upon full tuition remission at Penn. Direct subsidies or subsidized loans are devices that could be adopted, but we have concluded a different approach is preferred.

The problem is that as things stand, faculty members *must* shift from the old plan to the new. While balloting of last spring indicated most faculty prefer shifting, some would rather not. Instead of trying to lessen the disadvantage of shifting for faculty who would rather not, we think the appropriate action is to permit anyone to stay with the old plan if he/she wishes. Specifically, we recommend that each faculty member as of June 30, 1983, be allowed to return to the old plan if he/she signifies this preference by making a "one-time irrevocable choice" to that effect by (say) January 20, 1984. This choice would cover all future access to Penn faculty tuition benefits for any of their children not presently enrolled in an institution of higher education. The spirit of this new one-time choice arrangement is to leave faculty members choosing to return to the old plan situated exactly as they were before the new plan was instituted, with neither more nor less benefits than before. Faculty members remaining with the new plan will be covered by precisely the same terms as those spelled out in the July 12, 1983, issue of *Almanac*. Making available the opportunity to return to the old plan is not to be

construed as expanding the faculty tuition benefit so that one simultaneously can get the advantages of both. The Appendix to this Report spells out some detailed considerations that arise in applying this principle in special situations.

An additional observation about this recommendation is in order. The new faculty benefit plan was instituted with a view to simply rebalancing tuition benefits between faculty children attending Penn and other institutions. The parameters of the new plan, 75% and 40%, were selected to keep the expected cost per faculty child unchanged. No increase in the cost of the total program of the University was intended. However, provision of this new opportunity for some faculty to return to the old plan will inevitably carry with it an increase in cost. Adverse-selection considerations are hard to price exactly, but the committee's consultations with the administration have led to an estimate of cost which can be best summarized in terms of the following percentages of the total faculty wage bill: 1984-85, less than 1/10 of 1%, 1985-86, 2/10 of 1%, 1986-87, 3/10 of 1%, 1987-88, 3/10 of 1%, 1988-89, 2/10 of 1%, 1989-90, 1/10 of 1%, and 1990-91, 1/10 of 1%. The committee feels this represents an acceptably low price for securing the benefits of allowing individual faculty members to stay on the old plan if they wish.

Jean Alter (Romance languages)

David J. Hogan (education)

Robert Inman (finance)

Janice F. Madden (regional science)

Robert Summers, Chair (economics)

Anthony R. Tomazinis (city planning)

Ex officio: Jacob M. Abel (applied mechanics)

Jane Axinn (social work)

Murray Gerstenhaber (mathematics)

Appendix

The following, taken from the "Faculty and Staff Scholarships" announcement in *Almanac* July 12, 1983, indicates the relevant differences between the new and old plans:

Schedule of Tuition Entitlement

Undergraduate	Old Plan	New Plan
At Penn		
Students entering after Sept., 1983, and before June 30, 1985	Full tuition	\$7,320 or 75% of undergraduate tuition, whichever is greater
Students entering after June 30, 1985	Full tuition	75% of undergraduate tuition
At Other Institutions		
Students enrolled in 1983-84	\$900	\$1,000
Students enrolled in 1984-85	\$900	\$1,500
Students enrolled in 1985-86	\$900	\$2,400
Students enrolled in 1986-87	\$900	\$3,400
Students enrolled after July 1, 1987	\$900	Up to 40% of Penn undergraduate tuition

Professional School*

(Medical, Dental, Veterinary, Law School or Wharton M.B.A.)

Students entering after Sept., 1983, and before June 30, 1985

Full tuition 1982-83 tuition or 75% of current tuition, whichever is greater

Students entering after July 1, 1985

Full tuition 75% of current tuition

Other Graduate Programs

Full tuition Full tuition

*A student currently receiving undergraduate tuition benefits under the old plan who is admitted to a professional school after July 1, 1984, will automatically be on the new plan unless his/her parental faculty member opts for remaining on the old plan for all children entering the tuition benefit program in the future.

The committee's recommendation that faculty members be given the opportunity to return to the old plan is not to affect any of the terms of eligibility for participation in Penn's faculty tuition benefit program. In the special situations where a child's entitlement is derived from more than one employee of the University, the child's benefits will be defined by the new plan unless both employees choose to stay on the old plan. Ambiguities in particular cases will be resolved on an individual basis.

Next page: Response to the Committee

Response On Tuition Benefits

The President and the Provost respond to the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (page 3).

It seems appropriate for us to set out, as clearly as we can, the University administration's position concerning the tuition benefits program.

As you will recall, a year ago last summer, the Chair of the Faculty Senate set up a special committee, with a broadly based membership, to work with the administration on a new tuition benefit arrangement. The basis of that effort was the widely held view that the existing program, which provided full tuition for those with a child at Penn and \$900 annually for those with a child at another college or university, was highly inequitable.

It was agreed at the outset—by the Faculty Senate leadership, by the special committee, and by the administration—that any new arrangement should not increase the total cost of the tuition benefit. Many faculty had expressed the view that the cost of benefits, in relation to salaries, was already too high. The administration shared that view. All agreed that the total cost of the tuition program should not be expanded.

On that basis, we worked throughout the summer and fall of 1982 to develop a new arrangement that, in the view of the Faculty Senate leadership, the special committee, and the administration, was preferable to the existing arrangement. The process was long and difficult, and there were many compromises made on all sides. The new arrangement, as ultimately developed, provides a 75% tuition remission for those with children at Penn and an increasing direct grant of up to 40% of Penn's prevailing undergraduate tuition for those with children at other institutions. Further, the shift is phased over three years to cushion the effect on those whose children are accepted at Penn.

Soon after the final details of the proposed arrangement were ironed out, it was presented to the Faculty Senate at its fall meeting; the Senate voted in support of the new arrangement (*Almanac*, November 30, 1982). Subsequently, and after concerns were expressed about the shift, a mail ballot was held last January; the faculty expressed strong support for the new arrangement as opposed to the existing one. (*Almanac*, March 1, 1983).

Nonetheless, some faculty members voiced concern about the proposed new plan at the Faculty Senate meeting last April. The Faculty Senate leadership subsequently urged the administration to continue implementing the new arrangement, but to attempt to deal with the problems faced by those adversely affected by the new plan. The administration responded that it would indeed proceed to implement the new arrangement, but would also consider ways to cushion the impact on those adversely affected (*Almanac*, April 26, 1983). The new arrangement went into effect July 1, 1983 (*Almanac*, July 12, 1983).

In the intervening period, we have devoted substantial time to considering a variety of possible options to ease the impact on those who may be adversely affected. After careful review, we have concluded that the option of a subsidized loan program that we discussed with the Committee is feasible, although it does increase the total cost, contrary to the initial agreement. Under that subsidized loan program, those faculty and staff members entitled to tuition benefits whose children are admitted to Penn within the next four years (i.e. 1984 to 1987) would be eligible for a loan in the amount of the difference between 100% tuition and the percentage to be covered by the University. That loan would include a subsidized interest rate of six percent and would cover all years of these children's undergraduate tuition (i.e. through 1991). This is, of course, the proposal urged on the administration by the Chair of the Faculty Senate and the

Chair of the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty after the mail ballot (*Almanac*, March 1, 1983). We estimate that, in total, this proposal would cost in the range of \$500,000 over the period 1984-1991. Our agreement to this proposal is subject to a review of the results of a survey that is now under way to ensure that the costs are not substantially different from our projections.

Indeed, we underscore that we will agree only with great reluctance to any proposal that results in increased costs. As you well know, we are seeking ways to limit cost increases all over the campus to ensure that maximum possible resources are allocated to academic purposes. Further, we are particularly concerned about any increase in the benefit rate.

We should also add that, among the other options considered, we have weighed carefully the Committee's suggestion that faculty and staff under the tuition benefits program be given a one-time option to choose either the old arrangement or the new one. The cost of this proposal is much higher than the subsidized loan program outlined above, and is, in our judgment, simply too high. The fact that part of the cost could be recovered in grants does not really lessen the problem—as all those faculty doing sponsored research well understand. The same is true regarding the point that the cost would be spread over a period of years. Even considering that cost in terms of "discounted" dollars reduced by grant recoveries, it would be excessive in our judgment. Finally, we have substantial doubts about the wisdom or equity of a one-time choice by all faculty members—even those without children. You will recall that only 27.4% of the faculty voting in the mail ballot believed that the new arrangement should be implemented in such a way as to allow faculty members an individual choice between the old and the new plans, a strategy that was recognized as increasing the costs of restructuring (*Almanac*, March 1, 1983).

We agree with that faculty judgment. The administration would not have supported a shift to the new arrangement if it had been contemplated that significant cost increases would be involved. With the assurances of the Senate leadership and the special faculty committee that no cost increases would be incurred, we worked through the new arrangement in good faith. In fact, we believe that a quite different arrangement would have been concluded if cost increases in the range of those involved in the one-time option had been contemplated.

Nonetheless, we recognize the serious concerns with which some faculty members view this issue. We also recognize that few if any faculty members want to return to the old arrangement. We agree, therefore, though with great reluctance, to some increased expenditures during a limited transition period in the range indicated in this letter. We trust that this will be seen as a significant effort to meet the needs of those who may be adversely affected by the new arrangement.

We look forward to continuing our discussion of these issues with the Committee and with the University Council Personnel Benefits Committee. Since the Personnel Benefits Committee has important responsibilities in this area, as indicated in Professor Shils' recent letter, we stress the importance of collaborative efforts.

Sheldon Hackney *Tom Erlick*

Note: Professor Shils' letter, referred to above, appears on page 5 and is followed by the Provost's reply. —Ed.

SPEAKING OUT

The first letter below addresses matters raised on pages 3 and 4.

Cost of Grandfather Option

During last spring's plenary meeting, the Senate overwhelmingly resolved that any change in the tuition benefits "should only be implemented through individual agreements submitted by the Administration and signed by each member of the faculty. Such agreements should include the option for members of the standing faculty already employed by the University of Pennsylvania by July 1, 1983, of staying in the present plan or choosing a change to any other option offered by the Administration." It is important to note that the Administration chose to ignore this resolution of the Senate and to do as it pleased by implementing as of July 1, 1983, the new tuition plan in the form decided well before the faculty at large got involved. Even in the letter published today, the Administration has difficulty remembering the events and the inputs they received in the February 2 "information meeting" and in the April 20 plenary meeting. It is depressing, to say the least, to note that the Administration did not honor the Senate's wishes on a matter so crucially affecting the welfare of the faculty.

Now, we are presented with an explanation of why the Administration is so unwilling to meet faculty needs and concerns of fairness, even on explicit Senate mandate. The Administration, without disclosing formally the basis upon which their calculations are based, concludes that the cost of providing the option of staying with the old tuition plan for those faculty who need that option and depended on the University's long-standing promise for support for their children's college education, is "simply too high." One is at a loss which to refute first—the process or the judgment. One does not know how the Administration can, or does, reach its conclusion; nor do we know what is too high, just right, or quite low. The only benchmark that emerges is that the Administration appears prepared to support a subsidized loan program to the tune of \$500,000 for a transition period of eight years (1984-1992). What, then, would happen if the old tuition plan should prove to be less than this amount?

In the last few months the AHCFCTBFC has made several independent calculations of the costs involved, utilizing data from the Office of Student Aid, over the same eight-year period, in constant 1983 dollars, and making a number of pragmatic assumptions as is needed in all such calculations concerning future expectations. Our findings suggest that the cost for eight years will not exceed \$484,000 in constant 1983 dollars, or a \$60,500 average annual cost. This cost corresponds to 0.0002 of the total current University budget of \$251 million, or 0.0004 of the salaries portion of the budget. It is important also to note the finding that by 1991 the maximum annual cost will be only \$27,100 per year in constant 1983 dollars (less than 0.0001 of the University's budget). It was also found that by 1998 the option will expire for all effective purposes due to the expected age structure of the group within the option. If one wants to build into the constant-dollar calculations an inflationary escalation percentage, the cost will, of course, show

larger numerical values but their proportion will stay the same.

Are the above numbers simply too high to meet an important need of the standing faculty (and staff) and to respond positively to the broad sensibilities of this University's faculty? Notice that even the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty concluded that the costs, as it perceived them, represent minimal sums, considering the importance of the issues, and voted unanimously to recommend the provision of the option for the faculty members who need it.

The Ad Hoc Committee of Faculty Concerned with Tuition Benefits for Faculty Children (AHCFCTBFC) intends to provide documentation of these calculations and further elaborate of the rationale of this option during the Senate's plenary meeting on November 16. The Committee is also prepared to examine and discuss other calculations presented by the Administration for public scrutiny and discussion. The Committee will do so because it believes the option meets the concerns not only of those faculty members who anticipate the harm to the educational plans of their families, but also, and more importantly, because it meets the concerns of a broad spectrum of faculty members who saw, and were incensed by, a violation of an important principle of collegial life in the inequity that the transition to the new plan accorded their colleagues. We hope that the faculty will again demonstrate their sensitivity to the substance and the principle involved, and will add their support to the recommendations of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty on November 16.

—*Anthony R. Tomazin
Professor of City and
Regional Planning;
Secretary of the Steering
Committee of AHCFCTBFC*

The letter below was addressed to the Provost; its text and the Provost's reply were shared by the writers with Almanac.

A Committee of 'Good Faith'

The Personnel Benefits Committee of University Council met on Monday, October 24, at noon for a two-hour session. The meeting was fully attended by representatives of the many constituencies which comprise the University family of employees. Several agenda items should be made known to you because they are very important in the successful management of the University with respect to the recruitment and retention as well as the personal development of both faculty and non-faculty personnel. After two years as the Chair, I am beginning to realize that the various employee groups still look at University management as a type of institutional non-business responsibility. University of Pennsylvania is possibly the largest employer in Philadelphia today, and yet the determination and execution of many important personnel policies are not coordinated effectively as is required in a large, complex organization.

For example, the agenda included the results of a benefit evaluation survey prepared for the University by Johnson & Higgins . . . [which] should serve as a guide to the allocation of University funds for benefit planning in the future. There is no doubt that employees of the University are as interested, if not more interested, in the benefit program as in the salary program. This is borne out by the respondents whether they be faculty, administration, professional or support staff . . .

Our committee also reviewed a new, attractive publication entitled "Benefits-At-A-Glance," which is a very readable and attractive printed review of all the benefits which eligible employees receive in addition to the faculty-staff scholarship program—which is a subject I would like to address at this time . . .

Present at the Benefits Committee were Professor Robert Summers of Economics and Dr. June Axinn, who is the Senate Chair. Both were very helpful in spending an hour or so with us on the latest proposal by a group of faculty members that they be permitted a new one-time election to have 100% University support for their eligible children, were these children to be admitted to the University of Pennsylvania. We were advised by Professors Axinn and Summers, representing the Senate, that the Senate would meet on Wednesday, November 16 at 3 p.m., and that this proposal would be discussed and in all probability, if it were agreed upon, it would be sent directly to the Administration.

In the last two years as the Chair of Council's Personnel Benefits Committee, I and my colleagues have attempted to make certain that the Benefits Committee was truly representative of all constituencies in the University family and that we could serve as a coordinative agency in hearing proposals from various segments of the University and then make recommendations to the Administration which would be based upon equity and balance and further the concept of a unit in University Governance.

It is not our thought that that Council Personnel Benefits Committee would be an agency of the Administration or subservient to it. We believe that our charge is to consider all proposals made within the University in a thorough fashion, considering not only the value and the cost of the proposed benefit but also the interrelationship between the proposed benefit and other benefits enjoyed or to be enjoyed by employee groups within the University.

Certainly, were the Council Personnel Benefits Committee to consider further the pending Senate proposal, it would want to have quantitative information as to the cost of such a proposal. I would be willing to convene the Personnel Benefits Committee once again within the next two-to-three weeks to review the Senate proposal which emerges, provided that the Senate is willing to take its proposal up with us, knowing that we are a Committee of "good faith."

Mr. Provost, we would like you to advise us whether or not you still consider Council Personnel Benefits Committee as an integral unit within the University's governance system. We know that various constituencies have had a relative autonomy to bring their proposals directly to the Administration. When this happens, however, without the constituency's considering the role and responsibility of Council Personnel

Benefits Committee, the committee then ceases to serve the University in a coordinative capacity.

We are not in the "line" and we conceive our responsibilities as being advisory both to the University Council and to the Administration. The nature of our Committee makeup is that all employee groups are represented competently and adequately. We therefore can be and should be a forum for an integrative approach to problems of personnel administration and personnel benefits within the University. When we need expert counsel, we call on the various disciplines of the University to provide us with input.

With respect to the pending proposals to further amend the faculty-staff benefits program, we would like to have the Administration's assistance in procuring quantitative data which could be then reviewed by our Committee, the Senate Committee, and, of course, appropriate financial and educational people within the University.

—Edward B. Shils, Chair
Personnel Benefits Committee
of University Council

Importance of Collaboration

The Provost responds to Professor Shils:

I am responding to your letter of October 31, 1983, sent on behalf of the Personnel Benefits Committee of University Council. The administration does view the Committee as having a most important role in matters relating to personnel benefits. It is essential that the administration receive advice on all benefits issues from all affected constituencies within the University.

On this basis, we hope that the Committee will work collaboratively with the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty concerning the tuition benefits matters now under discussion. The letter that President Hackney and I just sent to Professor Summers, Chair of the Senate Committee, underscores the importance of that collaboration.

—Thomas Ehrlich

Purpose of University Council?

I have learned more about the inner workings of this university in the last six weeks than most students gather in four years. Sadly, I do not like what I see.

Two weeks ago, the University Council Steering Committee was asked, among other issues, to place the subjects of NROTC credit and "The Red and Blue" on the next Council agenda. More specifically, there have been two growing movements on this campus. The first, supported by 87% of the student body in a recent referendum and, by a 28 to 1 vote, the Undergraduate Assembly, would grant credit for NROTC courses that are deemed academically worthy. The second, with support unknown, would change a few words in a traditional Penn song. NROTC credit did not get on the agenda. The Penn song did.

I have been told by the President and Provost that the purpose of University Council is to pro-

vide a forum for students, faculty, and administrators to discuss and debate important University issues in an open atmosphere. If the few words in "The Red and Blue" are more important an academic issue, then Council Steering should say so. If NROTC credit is too controversial for Council to debate, then they should say so. If the Administration believes that taking a position on this issue, and others, will cause a backlash among faculty and students, then they should say so now.

The University Council is a body that does not work. Its decisions are not followed by the University. (The Law School recruitment policy is just one example.) It ignores issues that students are firmly behind. (NROTC credit is another example.) Many Council committees are ineffective and rarely meet. Non-members frequently are allowed to speak, denying time to those who were duly elected by their constituents.

These complaints are not new, for I am echoing the words of other concerned members of the University family. However, I would not be a dedicated University Council Member if I merely joined the chorus that criticizes without seeking a solution.

Therefore, I am asking President Hackney and Provost Ehrlich to respond to this letter by creating a task force at the next meeting to investigate the problems that they know exist in the University Council system. Moreover, I hope that they would themselves discuss this issue in the next issue of *Almanac*.

—Frank Luntz, Vice-Chair
Undergraduate Assembly

No Reason to Recast System

The President and Provost respond to Frank Luntz:

We are responding to your letter concerning the University Council. As you indicate, the Council is a "forum for students, faculty, and administrators to discuss and debate important University issues in an open atmosphere." From our perspective, the advice provided by Council members is enormously useful. The Council is an important source of insights on a wide range of key issues.

You are irritated that the Council Steering Committee decided not to place on the Council agenda an issue you care about—whether academic credit should be provided for NROTC courses—and did agree to the request of some students that another issue that you do not care about—a change in the words of "The Red and Blue"—was placed on the agenda.

The Steering Committee had a full and thoughtful discussion of the concerns regarding credit for NROTC courses. It agreed that since the issue requires a FAS faculty decision, that is the proper forum in which to raise the matter. We assume that the FAS Curriculum Committee will consider the issue and, if there is support for your position, bring it to the FAS faculty as a whole. In all events, it is not the kind of issue that can be best discussed in the University Council—not because it is academic but rather because it relates to a matter requiring the decision of a particular school's faculty.

We personally agree that the wording of "The Red and Blue" is a questionable matter for University Council attention, but the Chair of the Undergraduate Assembly urged that a significant number of students cared sufficiently about the matter to raise it, at least briefly. The fact that you, as we, disagree with this particular judgment, does not give cause to restructure the University Council processes, as you urge. Those processes work reasonably well; we often disagree with the particular results, just as you do in this case. But that is no reason to recast the system.

—Sheldon Hackney
—Thomas Ehrlich

Students Seek Faculty Advice

During the week of November 14, students will be registering for spring courses. The process of selecting a few classes from several thousand offerings is understandably difficult for students. These decisions are the foundation of each student's Penn education. Unfortunately, these very choices are often made without consultation with faculty or advisors.

As a member of the faculty, you can provide valuable advice based on your educational experiences, knowledge of your field, or even of the University. Any lack of familiarity with degree requirements should not be a barrier to your offering aid, for students need informal, personal counseling even more than they do advice concerning requirements.

We hope that you will extend an invitation to the students you teach to approach you with their questions and concerns related to course selection. If students have not approached you in the past, this probably reflects their hesitance as to how they will be received rather than a lack of interest in you or what you may have to say.

Your advice can do an enormous amount to improve the quality of education which students receive. We hope that you will offer your help.

—Pam Seidenman, Chair
The Student Committee on
Undergraduate Education

GSAC on Harrassment and Abuse

On October 11, 1983, the Graduate Student Associations Council (GSAC) approved the following statement regarding incidents of harassment and abuse:

We strongly support the Administration's statement regarding "Conduct and Misconduct on Campus;" and we encourage the newly convened Task Force to prepare its recommendations as quickly as possible.

We recommend that the University judicial system's present policy of secrecy be revised to permit publication of the number and types of judged cases of harassment and abuse, and the sanctions imposed on the offending parties.

To promote thorough consideration of these concerns, this statement is distributed as follows:
President Sheldon Hackney
Provost Thomas Ehrlich
Vice Provost for University Life, James Bishop
The Daily Pennsylvanian
Almanac
The Penn Paper
—Nancy Morgan, President of GSAC

SPEAKING OUT welcomes the contributions of readers. Almanac's normal Tuesday deadlines for unsolicited material is extended to THURSDAY noon for short, timely letters on University issues. Advance notice of intent to submit is always appreciated.—Ed.

At Council on October 12, the University began a year-long follow-up to questions on increasing student/faculty interaction that surfaced in the Report on Teaching Quality (Almanac April 14, 1981) and are emphasized in such planning documents as *Choosing Penn's Future and Building Connections*. As the Council Committee on Student Affairs undertakes a University-wide study for a report next spring, Deputy Provost Richard Clelland's call to deans has produced a set of responses from the four undergraduate schools. An excerpt from the report of the College, below, is the first in a four-part series.

Student/Faculty Interaction: The College

I think all of us in the College—students and faculty alike—believe that our interactions ought both to derive from and to nourish our academic mission. Faculty time and energy are valuable resources, and they need to be expended shrewdly. At the same time, and quite frankly, we on the faculty disagree among ourselves in estimating how well a particular activity might satisfy this criterion. Some of us have quite traditional views, which do not reach too far beyond the classroom (or laboratory or library) and its immediate surroundings. Others of us believe that almost any contact between students and faculty will ultimately (if sometimes quite indirectly) advance our common educational enterprise. In the following list, I move from interaction connected with classes and credit, to a variety of other sorts of contact.

Academic Interaction

Many of our undergraduate courses were purposefully designed either to enhance or to take advantage of extensive contact between faculty and students.

1. Independent study, either in the FAS departments, or through the College 99 mechanism, places faculty and hundreds of students literally in one-to-one relationships with each other for a semester, (and sometimes longer). Since independent study is typically reserved for advanced students, and since the students typically do much of the designing of their courses, motivations and accomplishment are often quite high. Many faculty report that some of the best undergraduate research and writing they've received have been produced in independent study courses. (It should be added, between parentheses, that faculty do not receive additional compensation for sponsoring these courses).

2. Some of our major courses resemble research colloquia. Here, students are part of a group, but the groups are often small, and student research programs are often individually devised and monitored by instructors.

3. The Freshman Seminar program was constructed a dozen years ago precisely to bring at least some of the advantages of a small course setting into the first year (and particularly into the first semester). It has been the case that a very large proportion of freshmen do enroll in these courses, that class size has been kept low (to fifteen or so), and that students receive a good deal of personal attention and even some advising in their seminars. It has also been the more problematic case that a substantial proportion of Freshman Seminars are taught by graduate students, and a relative few by senior faculty. This by no means diminishes the significant contribution of the program; nor, in any case, is the instructional balance amenable to casual change. Still, keeping this good project healthy must be a high priority, and that in turn must include engaging

4. With a few exceptions, the courses in the General Honors program are staffed by standing faculty, many of them senior. These courses thus also afford extensive opportunities for faculty-student interaction.

5. A good many courses across the spectrum of undergraduate studies include components which especially emphasize increased student-faculty interaction. I have been told, to pause only over a couple of examples, of day-long and week-end field trips (in connection with architecture, literature and geology courses) in which groups of students travel with their instructor to some site or building relevant to their study. Or, to give another kind of example, the instructors of several large lecture courses host weekly coffee hours—optional on all sides—to which smaller groups of students can come, talk about the course, or about related subjects in a relatively informal setting.

A number of undergraduates are the beneficiaries of unaccredited but real research opportunities each semester. It is easier to illustrate this anecdotally than statistically.

1. A senior professor of psychology has coffee with a junior whom she taught a year ago. The student is invited to visit the professor's lab and hear about research in progress. The student shows up, not once

Almanac asked the Office of Residential Living for a short summary of activities for residential students not in college houses. A short report from the director:

Reducing the 'Psychological Size'

The Resident Advisors who live on the corridors with undergraduates in the "Quad," the Superblock High Rises, and in North Campus have done much to help students get to know their professors on an informal basis outside of the classroom.

RAs took residents of their floors to lunch with selected faculty in Stouffer Dining Commons on September 6. In one area of South Campus, a group of RAs invited faculty to join them in Franklin-Foerderer Lounge for an Intercultural Dinner with 250 students. A Coffee House in Graduate Towers helped to introduce students to Southeast Asia delicacies and four faculty combined resources to present a lecture and slide presentation from the South Asia Department here at Penn.

Programs are also organized to address the normal developmental issues which every college student faces: the formulation of a personal value system; developing intellectual and academic competence; deciding on a career; establishing interpersonal relationships and developing a sex role and capacity for intimacy.

Professor Kenneth George of the Education Graduate School has presented seminars on sexuality and Ms. Chris Lyman, from Student Health/Gynecology, offers a workshop on birth control. Last year, Dr. Emma Weigley, of the Nursing School, participated in a workshop entitled "How to Stay Fit in the Fat Months." Assistant Deans of The College shared Sunday brunch with Quad residents and answered questions relating to Academic Advising.

Carol Brown from URIS (University Reading Improvement Service) has done frequent workshops in the Residence.

—Carol Kontos
Director of Residential Living

but regularly for two months, and receives what amounts to an intensive seminar in psychology.

2. A work-study student is assigned as research assistant to a history professor. The student eventually becomes interested in the historian's subject, and that interest eventually leads to an unaccredited tutorial in the material.

My generalization is this. A fair if undocumented number of students are taking excellent advantage of the research orientation of our institution, and are gaining informal but genuine access to the work of faculty.

Other Interactions

Faculty-student interaction also occurs in all sorts of ways and places outside the curriculum. Let me itemize just a few:

1. At my request, Randy Helm has drawn up an inventory of all faculty who have lived in residence over the past ten or so years. I count upwards of 60 names (plus another 17 who have served as non-resident Masters and Faculty Coordinators). Of these 75 or more people, about 45 have (or had) an FAS affiliation. That is not surprising, but it deserves remark nonetheless. As those of us who have taken on this assignment can attest, living in residence is to engage in "faculty-student interaction" on a virtually full-time basis.

2. In addition, a much larger number of our faculty serve as Affiliates of college houses. Affiliates often make remarkable contributions of time, talent, and imagination to their houses.

3. The oddly-named DOT weekends have included many FAS faculty over a dozen or more years. Unstructured in format, the weekends provide a chance for students to spend a couple of days with faculty members (and their families as well) in fairly private surroundings. The DOT weekends are essentially social, but they often lead to serious academic contact.

4. There is a good deal of loose talk—some of it by me, below—about the desirability of increased faculty advising in the College. We ought to begin by acknowledging the considerable amount of faculty advising that currently and routinely goes on. It is simply commonplace for instructors, especially in small classes, including Freshman Seminars and General Honors courses, to advise their students on all sorts of subjects. In addition, though the details vary from one department to another, all of our major programs take primary responsibility for advising their students. In further addition, many faculty have served on pre-professional advising committees over the years.

5. If the gargantuan committee system at Penn has any justification, perhaps it resides in the myriad opportunities the system provides for close contact between students and faculty. Some of my own most rewarding friendships with undergraduates have derived from colleagueship of this sort, and I know that my experience is not unusual.

This unscientific sampling exhausts neither the variety nor the extent of faculty-student interaction in the College. At the same time, I do not mean to suggest by it that we ought not to be doing more. Two projects, in particular, might repay our efforts.

I proposed above that quite a lot of faculty advising does quietly go on. Nonetheless, we in the College are working on a set of proposals to increase the faculty's role in advising, especially in the first two years.

Similarly, while our faculty is and has been deeply committed to the college houses, we are working with the Vice-Provost's office to increase the faculty's presence throughout the residential system. In particular, some of us would like to see more of the formal curriculum exported to the residences.

—Peter Conn, Associate Dean
for Undergraduate Studies

Update

NOVEMBER ON CAMPUS

Changes: The University Council meeting scheduled for November 9, 4-6 p.m., in Steinberg Hall-Dietrich Hall is moving to a larger room, Lecture Room 351, on the ground floor, the west end of the building.

Electra: The Annenberg production of *Electra* that was announced for November 27 in the pullout calendar was held in October. Notification of the change occurred after press deadlines.

MUSIC

11 Penn Composer's Guild performs new music for small ensembles, featuring music by students in the graduate composition program, including Christian Herzog's *Sonatina* for clarinet; Michael Fiday's *Triptych* for piano; Ruth Meyer's *Fragments of Sappho* for soprano, flutes and harp; Mark Ingleby's *Virgin Choir's Delicious Moan* for flutes; and Ari Ben-Shabetai's *Ruba'yat* for voice and mixed ensemble, 8 p.m., Music Building Annex. Admission is free.

13 AMICI presents *An Afternoon of 16th Century Italian Madrigals*, performed by Pennsylvania Pro Musica and directed by Dr. Frank B. Zimmerman; 2:30 p.m., Museum, Wistar Institute. Tickets for the concert and reception are \$8, \$5 for students. Call the Italian Studies Center at Ext. 8279 and ask for an order form to buy tickets in advance; they are also available at the door.

TALKS

9 Fresh Fish Poetry Series: Amiri Baraka and Eugene Howard, 7:30 p.m., Christian Association Building. Admission \$1. Information: Kerry at 386-1530. (Christian Association).

10 Some New Aspects of Bunyavirus Replication: Gordon Abraham, School of Science, Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia; 4 p.m., Room 196-A, Med Labs, Old Medical Education Building (Microbiology Graduate Group Seminar).

Usefulness of Epithelial Cell Cultures in Physiology: Dr. James Mullin, department of human genetics, Yale University; 4 p.m., Physiology Library, Richards Building (Department of Physiology).

The Aging of the Work Force: Implications for Society: Malcolm Morrison, visiting research associate, department of public policy and management; 3:30-5 p.m., Room 112, Nursing Education Building (Center for the Study of Aging Seminar).

11 Kidney Morphogenesis: Dr. Lauri Saxen, department of pathology, University of Helsinki; 11 a.m., Room 109, Leidy Labs (Analysis of Development Seminar, Department of Anatomy).

15 The Insomnias: Dr. Calvin Stafford, clinical director, Sleep Disorder Clinic, Crozier-Chester Medical Center; 11 a.m.-12:30 p.m., Room 1152, Gates Pavilion, HUP (Student Health Service/Psychiatry Section).

Alcohol Dependency: Dr. Martin L. Korn, chief resident in psychiatry; Dr. Marcus G. T. Webb, visiting professor of psychiatry, Trinity College, Dublin; 11:30 a.m.-1 p.m., Medical Alumni Hall, HUP (Department of Psychiatry).

The Role of Carbonic Anhydrase in Mammalian Metabolism: Dr. S. J. Dodgson, department of physiology, School of Medicine; 12:30 p.m., Physiology Library, Richards Building (Respiratory Physiology Seminar).

The Conversion of Armenia to Christianity: The Reign of Tiridates the Great: Robert H. Hewsen, professor of history, Glassboro State College; 7:30 p.m., Room 301, Houston Hall (Tarzian Chair in Armenian History and Culture).

Additions, changes and cancellations for the weekly *On Campus Update* must be received by noon Tuesday prior to the Tuesday of publication. The deadline for the December pullout calendar is noon, November 15. Address: 3601 Locust Walk/C8 (second floor of the CA).



Mercury, the ancient Roman god, is back home in his loggia after restorations at the Morris Arboretum. The Mercury Loggia was built in 1912 to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the John and Lydia Morris estate. Arboretum guides give free tours at 2 p.m. each Saturday and Sunday as well as a special tour at 1 p.m. on Thanksgiving Day, Thursday, November 24. Now through March 15, when darkness descends earlier, the Arboretum is open daily 10 a.m.-4 p.m. Admission is \$2 for adults, \$1 for children and senior citizens.

JOINING IN

Student-Faculty Interaction

The Student Committee on Undergraduate Education is pleased to announce that we will once again sponsor Take A Professor To Lunch Week. During the week of November 14 many local restaurants will offer lunchtime discounts to students who are accompanied by a faculty member.

Last year, over 1300 students and faculty participated in Lunch Week. We believe that greater interaction between students and faculty is needed in order to enrich Penn's educational environment. We hope that contacts made during Lunch Week will promote subsequent student-faculty interaction.

For further information, look for ads in the *D.P.* or call the SCUE office at Ext. 6945. Enjoy!

—Helen Dodick
and Monica Feinberg
Lunch Week Coordinators,
SCUE

Like to Skate?

For information about membership in the University of Pennsylvania Figure Skating Club, please call Caroline McCarthy, 471-6241; John Sweet, 662-5641; Marion Friedman, 342-8638, or the Class of 23 Rink, Ext. 1823.

—Marion C. Friedman
Secretary of the College

Morris Arboretum Public Lecture

Paul Meyer, assistant director of horticulture at the Morris Arboretum, will present a free public lecture and slide-program Thursday, November 17 at 8 p.m. in the Logue Library of Chestnut Hill College, Germantown and Northwest Avenues. This event is part of the Arboretum's continuing series of Members' Evenings to which the general public is invited; there is a reception following.

Mr. Meyer will concentrate on the Arboretum as an historic Victorian landscape garden, sharing his stories and photographs of the fine specimens in its living collection. For further information, call 247-5777.

Leuven-Penn Faculty Exchange

For several years informal faculty exchanges have been establishing a close relationship between the University of Pennsylvania and the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven in Belgium. This year such faculty exchanges are being facilitated by a grant from the Fulbright Commission for Educational Exchange between the United States, Belgium and Luxembourg. Funds for travel and salary supplements only are available for approximately six Penn faculty to visit Leuven for one to five months during 1983-84. Priority fields are U.S.-European relations, international economics, industrial relations, solid state electronics, philosophy and letters.

Please submit applications for participating in the exchange by November 30 to Professor Jan Van der Spiegel, chair of the Penn coordinating committee (356 Moore Building, Ext. 7116), or Dr. Joyce M. Randolph, director of the Office of International Programs (133 Bennett Hall, Ext. 4661).