

Almanac

Tuesday, November 20, 1984

Published by the University of Pennsylvania

Volume 31, Number 13

Holiday Reminder

Thursday and Friday, November 22 and 23, 1984, will be observed as the recognized Thanksgiving holiday by the University.

Christmas Day and New Year's Day will be observed on Tuesday, December 25, 1984, and Tuesday, January 1, 1985, respectively. In addition, the special vacation granted to faculty and staff between Christmas and New Year's Day will be December 26, 27, 28, 31, 1984. If an employee is required to be on duty to continue departmental operations for part or all of this period, the special vacation is rescheduled for some other time.

—Office of Human Resources

Council: Harassment Survey

After extensive debate, Council voted Wednesday in favor of a campus survey on various forms of harassment (related to race, religion and affectional preference, as well as sex). Debate centered on the design of the survey instrument and on participation by members of the Task Force on Conduct and Misconduct. A Harvard model dealing only with sexual harassment was challenged, and there were proposals to turn to outside experts for design of the Penn instrument. The nomination of Dr. Barry Cooperman, vice provost for research, to consult with appropriate persons or groups and to oversee the design and conduct of the survey was passed unanimously. The target date for results is April.

Consultation: GAPSA's motion to involve graduate and professional students in decision-making, particularly on retrenchment and reorganization, was passed with friendly amendments substituting policy-making for "decision-making" and adding graduate groups and administrative units to the specified "schools and departments."



The Complacent Champions: The Quaker clean-up of Cornell, 24-0, brings back to Penn a most-sought-after bronze by R. Tait McKenzie. See centerspread.

INSIDE

- **Senate: Agenda for November 28; Chair's Message; Economic Status Report and Response from the Provost, p. 2**
- **A Word on the Presidency (Gaefke), p. 3**
- **Microcomputing's Penn Printout**

A Blood Substitute Developed at Penn

Penn research under Dr. Henry A. Sloviter of the Harrison Department of Surgical Research has produced a lipid-coated blood substitute that Penn has patented and may have ready for marketing in about three years.

The University last week announced an agreement with E. I. DuPont de Nemours and Company of Wilmington, in which DuPont provides a \$1 million grant to continue research, and Penn grants DuPont a license under its patent to develop and ultimately market the blood "artificial blood" made by emulsifying the perfluorochemical by sonification (ultrasound treatment) to break the fluorochemical into particles about 1/40 the size of human red blood cells. Penn's process then adds a coating of lecithin (phospholipid derived from egg yolk) to prevent undesirable effects on blood coagulation and blood platelets—and it is this coating that differentiates the Sloviter substitute from other "artificial blood" preparations made elsewhere in the U.S. and in Japan.

Dr. Sloviter, an M.D.-Ph.D., and colleagues Dr. Biswanath Mukherji (a Ph.D.) and Dr. Rong Huang (an M.D.) have worked with animal models, and the material has not been tested with humans. No harmful effects were observed even

when large amounts of the blood substitute were infused, Dr. Sloviter reports, and the animals lived normally for a full life span. The next research stage is to accumulate data necessary for FDA testing.

Dr. Sloviter says the milky-white substance appears to be safe without regard to blood type; does not require refrigeration; and eliminates the risk of transmitting infectious diseases such as AIDs, hepatitis and malaria in transfusions. It can be mass-produced and kept in quantity for major emergencies.

Since the particles are much smaller than red blood cells, it is possible they may pass through partially obstructed vessels where red blood cells cannot, he said, and this suggests treatment of impending heart attack and stroke. Also, the substitute contains no iron and has potential for use with chronic anemia patients suffering from sickle cell disease and thalassemia (Mediterranean anemias). Its principle disadvantage, according to Dr. Sloviter, is that the material does not carry as much oxygen as red blood cells—and this means the recipient would need to breathe air enriched with oxygen to about 50 percent.

SENATE

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

To: Members of the Faculty Senate
From: Jacob M. Abel, 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 1984-85. 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:

Linda Brodkey (assistant professor of education)
Adelaide Delluva (professor of biochemistry/Vet.)
Sol Goodgal (professor of microbiology/Med.)
Ervin Miller (professor of finance)
Robert Palmer (professor of classical studies)
Irving Shapiro (professor of biochemistry/Dent.)
Peter Vaughan (associate professor of social work)
Walter Wales (professor of physics)
James E. Wheeler (associate professor of pathology/Med.)

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, December 4, 1984*. Please forward any nominations by petition to the Faculty Senate Office, 15 College Hall/CO.

Agenda

Fall Meeting of the Faculty Senate

Wednesday, November 28, 1984

3-5:30 p.m. in 200 College Hall

1. Approval of the minutes of April 18, 1984 (mailed to members)
2. Report of the Chair
3. Report of the President
4. Report of the Provost
5. *For Action:* Law School proposal for 2 Practice Professorships (*Almanac* 11/13/84). The Senate Executive Committee recommends adoption of the following motion:
That, the Faculty Senate approves the Law School proposal for the establishment of no more than two Practice Professorships in the Law School.
6. Report of the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (at left)
7. *For Action:* Amendment to the Faculty Grievance Procedures, Sec. VI Findings, par. d, line 6. The Senate Executive Committee recommends adoption of the following amendment: After the words "detailed reasons, and" insert the words: "These reasons and the panel report" to provide that the Senate Chair will receive a copy of the hearing panel's report.
8. Discussion of the Task Force Report on Conduct and Misconduct (mailed members)
9. Adjournment by 5:30 p.m.

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

In accordance with the Five-Year Plan unanimously adopted by the Faculty Senate at its last meeting on April 18, 1984, the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty calls upon the administration to set faculty salary increases for next year at a level consistent with *all* the Plan's objectives.

First, next year's increase must be greater than the inflation rate, currently estimated at 4.4 percent.

Second, next year's increase must be sufficiently greater than the inflation rate to continue the restoration of faculty salaries to their 1972 purchasing power by 1989. This objective requires that next year's increase be at least the sum of the inflation rate (estimated at 4.4 percent), the real increase stipulated in the Five-Year Plan as necessary in each year (1.8 percent), and any shortfall by which last year's salary increases failed to meet this objective.

Third, next year's increase must be at a level which is sufficient to guarantee that the salaries of continuing faculty do not decline relative to the salaries of continuing faculty at peer institutions. Salary raises for continuing faculty at Penn in the last three years have fallen 4.4 percentage points behind the median for their peer institutions.* In fact, Penn fared worse than every "peer" except one. This rate of decline relative to our peers is an acceleration of the longer term decline reported in the Five-Year Plan. Next year's salary increase must be 4.4 percentage points above the median increase at our peer institutions. If this is the case, Penn will be restored to its 1981-82 competitive standing. The decline in standing between 1972 and 1981 would still not be corrected and the salary actually lost by faculty between 1981 and 1984 would still not be recovered.

Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty

Jean Alter, professor of Romance languages

Claudia Goldin, associate professor of economics

Antoine Joseph, assistant professor of American civilization

Ezra Krendel, professor of statistics

Paul A. Lieberman, professor of anatomy & ophthalmology/ Med.

Janice F. Madden, associate professor of regional science, chair ex officio:

Jacob M. Abel (mechanical engineering), Senate Chair

Jane Axinn (social work), Past Senate Chair

Anthony R. Tomazinis (city planning), Senate chair-elect

*Brown, Columbia, Dartmouth, Princeton, Yale, Johns Hopkins and Stanford. Cornell, Harvard, Chicago and Northwestern could not be included in the analysis because comparison data were unavailable. Investigation of other data indicate that the inclusion of these universities would not alter the results.

SENATE From the Chair

On Being of Account

On Wednesday, November 28, your Senate will hold its fall plenary meeting. The agenda includes a report of the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, the text of which appears below. The report makes strong arguments based on reliable data and sound principles of equity. The success of this committee in advancing the faculty's economic interests depends on your participation in the discussions and your support of the recommendations. You cannot do either of these if you are not present. Last Spring a minuscule fraction of the faculty after long and acrimonious debate divided evenly on a part of the report. The president and the provost to whom the recommendations were addressed sat in what had to be bemused silence. It was like watching someone shoot himself in the foot in slow motion. Your opportunity to meet your responsibility to yourself and your colleagues and to be counted awaits you in Room 200, College Hall, at 3 p.m. on November 28.

The Senate Executive Committee has decided to create an Ad Hoc Senate Committee on Behavioral Standards charged with studying the problems dealt with in the report of the Task Force on Conduct and Misconduct as well as with the report of the task force and its history. At the University Council on November 14 the recommendation in that report to conduct a survey on sexual harassment was debated and a resolution to conduct such a survey under the aegis of the vice provost for research was adopted. Your advice as to persons to serve on the Senate's Ad Hoc Committee will be welcome and your views on the conduct of the survey may be communicated to the Vice Provost, Barry Cooperman.



Senate continues past inserts

Provost's Response to the Committee on Economic Status

In response to your Report, the administration is committed to providing real growth in faculty salaries next year. This priority objective has been achieved during each year of Sheldon Hackney's presidency, and we have every intention of continuing to do so in the future.

For the current year, we believe we also met the basic goal of the Committee, though we disagree about methodology. As you know, we do not accept the Committee's retroactive approach and mode of analysis focusing on the past decade to a time when only about half the current standing faculty members were here. Real wages declined in this country during the 1970's generally and throughout higher education particularly. We also do not concur with the proposed comparisons of percentage raises among various institutions, since these comparisons would be determinative only if each institution were starting from the same base, which is not the case. The important comparison, in our view, is of average salaries at peer institutions. As you know, we believe that the best data for comparative purposes are found in the MIT Survey, and those data show that Penn has fared well. In all events, we certainly agree that trying to enhance our competitive position in relation to peer institutions is extremely important, and we will continue to make every effort to do just that. In our judgment, we have succeeded reasonably well in recent years, but that certainly does not lessen our resolve for the future.

Differences about methodology are obviously less important than agreements about results, and we will do our best to achieve the maximum possible real growth in faculty income. As you know, we are still some time away from having a firm picture of any parameters for the Fiscal Year 1986 budget, though we will be pleased to meet again with the Committee at any time that would be helpful.

—Thomas Ehrlich, Provost

December on Campus

December on Campus

December on Campus

December on Campus

A Word on the Presidency

by Peter Gaeffke

In *Almanac* October 5, Anthony Tomazinis drew attention to a proposal which concerns a change of rules for the election of the members of the Senate Executive Committee. It aims at a full electoral process for the whole of SEC in order to strengthen the representativeness of this body. When this proposal was discussed in the meeting of SEC September 12, I supported it and added the following suggestion: A yearly election with two candidates for every position on the ballot would be a cumbersome process, time-consuming, and ultimately harm the interest in the democratic institutions of faculty representation. Therefore, the Chair of the Faculty Senate and all the elected officers should serve for *two years*. In the following I shall argue the deeper reasons for this change and end with a strong plea for a *definite time limit* on the tenure of the President and the Provost at our university.

First some historical considerations:

The university is the only secular institution of the Middle Ages which survived from its beginnings in the 12th and 13th centuries until today. In our times this institution is more vigorous than ever before although it has not changed basically. Its three constituents are the scholars/teachers, the students, and the authority or individuals who established or support the university. The scholars/teachers hold the highest academic degrees in their fields and form a corporate unit endowed with and protected by privileges. The students were and are still organized in fraternities or/and union-like structures. In their composition and organizational setup these two groups have remained more or less the same. However, the third constituent in every university has changed significantly and can be different from institution to institution. First the Pope and the bishops of the Catholic Church gave charters and support. Later, territorial sovereigns and free cities founded and administered their universities. And finally modern governments and powerful private or institutional groups supervise, finance and regulate universities.

In this setup the first two groups had to find various ways to accommodate themselves to each other and to the founding or ruling forces. So under the benign rule of the medieval Popes the University of Paris was in the beginning a "teachers' university," and the University of Bologna started as a "students' university". But most of the later universities were ruled authoritatively, either by the territorial princes who had established them or by local governments which set the rules for academic institutions they supervised.

Under these circumstances it is a real miracle—and it attests to the democratic spirit of the American society—that here great private universities exist free and independent of the State, of religious institutions, and of overt economic interest groups. Interestingly enough, from their very beginnings the private universities were ruled by strong presidents who were installed by nonacademic authorities and recalled by them if necessary. The presidents remained in office for life and some of them served their institutions for several decennia. The faculty, divided into schools, departments, etc., never enjoyed the independence and influence its medieval predecessors had gained.

A glance at the *Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators* (1983) of the University of Pennsylvania is sufficient to show this dominating role of the president even today and the insignificance of the elected head of the faculty, the "rector magnificus" of West European terminology. In literature on this subject one finds various explanations for this situation.¹ There is the argument that the American universities were modelled after the independent colleges of Oxford and Cambridge which had strong "masters" (who, however, were chosen by the faculty). Another suggested explanation is that American universities are still backward compared with their European, especially German, counterparts, and therefore need a strong autocratic leadership during this period of development. (The same argument is used to defend autocratic regimes in developing countries and should not be taken seriously.) At least in his appearance, a modern university president tries to suggest that he is the representative of all the groups in a university, i.e. the students, the administrators, the support staff, and the tenured and non-tenured faculty. However, the elevation of a new president and the equalization of the professors and students together with the administrative support staff in the University Council symbolizes strongly a mistrust in the ability of the faculty to select its own *primus inter pares* and invest him with the power to rule the university for a limited period of time.

The president is now chosen by an elaborate procedure in which some groups of the university have some share but no assurance of their bearing on the outcome of the process. So each selection of a new president is clouded in speculation and gossip, and after the name of a new president has been made public the university community starts guessing whose choice the new president is. Historically, the chancellor (and only he can be called a predecessor of a modern university president) was the Pope's or the King's man. But in practice he stood between the university and the sovereign and often successfully protected the liberties and privileges of the university corporation. Most of the chancellors of the medieval universities came from the nobility or the church hierarchy of the region in which the university was situated. This makes eminent sense because only somebody intimately aware of the special problems and the very individual structure of a particular university can successfully protect the special rights and privileges which are necessary for its function.

When the support of a university comes from the community of businessmen and financial institutions, it may appear to some of them that an establishment of the size of a modern university in a metropolitan city should be run according to management principles and by persons of managerial qualities. Luckily, this has not yet happened; but since the remuneration of the presidents has moved them from the level of a *primus inter pares* into the sphere of corporate management, a pool of university administrators eligible for presidential appointments has developed from which scholars with no academic weight or outright scholarly failures are propelled to the top of internationally famous research institutions.

The elected head of the faculty, however, serves gratis and for only a short time. It may be worthwhile to remember that the medieval student-rectors were also in office only for a short time, often only for a month or two. Yet their attire was that of a king along with whom they were seated in official functions. Their rapid turnover served the principle of participation of the student community in universities' affairs and effectively prevented an accrual of political influence through long tenure.

Exactly this is achieved by the present-day spread of democratization over all groups in the university—except its top administration. Those who defended this system as necessary for undeveloped universities have in mind the ideal of a *res publica doctorum* of the German universities of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century in which faculty elected the rector and deans from among its members just as the Roman senate elected its consuls and high officers of the state. Unfortunately, this German system deteriorated during the political trench war in the sixties after its earlier corruption under a barbaric dictatorship. Among scholars, whoever escaped the various convulsions of the European universities during the 20th century has enthusiastically praised the freedom and noninterference he could enjoy as faculty member under "undemocratically" installed and ruling presidents of American universities. And most would agree that it was just this system which prevented radical reformers and revolutionaries among students and faculty from takeovers of the American universities such as those in famous European academic institutions.

For universities are not experimenting with or creating utopian political conditions as one of the speakers of the last Commencement Exercise saw it. The history of the universities tells us a very different story: The astonishingly "democratic" medieval universities while under the protection of the Catholic Church became dangerous obstacles for the development of centralized national states and were put under heavy political pressure which they were unable to withstand. The most conspicuous example of a *volte-face* of a university occurred when the University of Paris changed her position from supporting the English-Burgundian interests in the trial against Joan of Arc to an unqualified glorification of Charles VII after his capture of Paris in 1436.² In a more recent period German universities were unable to reject influences of the imperial politics of the last German emperor nor did they resist Hitler's nazification. There was also no sign of resistance when the Communists turned Eastern Europe's universities into forges for a communist leadership. Many more examples of more subtle impact of changing policies of the State or of a changing mood of the society on universities could be given. They all show that universities are reflecting the society and the conditions under which they were established and in which they develop.

But if the private American universities under appointed presidents and provosts are the fulfillment of the early beginnings of corporate academic institutions in the Middle Ages and, moreover, a bulwark against modern

¹ Collected in W. H. Cowley, *Presidents, Professors, and Trustees*, San Francisco, etc., 1980.

² See Jacques Verger, "The University of Paris at the End of the Hundred Year's War", *Universities and Politics*, ed. J. W. Baldwin and R. A. Goldwaite, Baltimore and London 1972, pp. 55ff.

radicalism from the left and the right, it still remains a question whether this can happen only at the cost of the dignity of the faculty and by sacrificing the dream of the university as a Republic of Scholars.

As a way out of this dilemma the following propositions should be considered:

Presidents and provosts will always remain the "King's men" if they do not come from the midst of the faculty. Therefore, the faculty must take special care to present serious and dignified candidates from within our institution for the positions of president and provost. This would make it unnecessary to look for outsiders. As faculty presented their own candidates, the self-confidence of the faculty as a whole would rise and a pride in being able to manage their own affairs would replace the feeling of being put into a sort of receivership.

Moreover, the positions of president and provost should not be filled with open-ended appointments but should, like the political presidency, be limited to four or seven years.

Finally, the office of the "Chair of the Faculty Senate" should be renamed "Rector of the Senate" He who holds it should always be elected and its tenure should be extended to two years. It should be possible to re-elect him for one

additional term. The same rules should apply to the members of the Senate Executive Committee.

All this makes sense only when there is a consensus among the faculty that academic interests are its primary concerns and that it is not the task of a university professor to change society by changing his institution. Moreover, the majority of the faculty still working under the assumption that any involvement in university matters is a waste of time, and ultimately futile, will have to realize that the alternative to self-administration is to live as the object of administrative acts of others, whether insiders we did not propose or outsiders without roots in the university. Only in a university such as the University of Pennsylvania and in a society such as ours are we able to work for the self-determination in a Republic of Scholars without becoming the targets of retaliation. But the future course of our university can only be influenced effectively by the faculty if we all get involved at various levels of our institution.

Dr. Gaefke is professor of modern Indian literature and secretary-elect of the Faculty Senate.

Update

NOVEMBER ON CAMPUS

EXHIBITS

27 Faculty Club Art Show; featuring two artists of the Penn community, Jay Lash, professor of anatomy at the Medical School and a self-taught water colorist, as well as Tass Erulkar, a painter talented in the use of acrylics and oils, at the Faculty Club. Through December 21.

FILMS

29 It Happens to Us; women speak candidly about abortion; sponsored by the Office of Student Life; Art Gallery, Houston Hall; noon and 2 p.m., free.

FITNESS/LEARNING

Career Planning & Placement

Registration: Ext. 7530. Graduate students, faculty, and staff are welcome.

26 Private School Teaching; Graduate Student Career Seminars, with Susan Myers, Germantown Friends, and Donald Myers, director of development, Law School; 4:30-6 p.m., Franklin Room 235, Houston Hall.

Safer Living Seminars

28 Proven Home Security; noon, Room D, Faculty Club (Department of Public Safety).

School of Nursing

28 Plasmapheresis: Use and Nursing Implications; Joan Lombardi, staff nurse at HUP; noon, Grice Orthopedic Conference Room, Dulles, HUP.

MUSIC

28 University Wind Ensemble; Claude White conducts Moussorgsky's *Pictures at an Exhibition*, Williams' *The Symphonies*, Benson's *The Leaves are Falling*, and the local premiere of Danny Dorf's *River Rhapsody*; 8 p.m., Harold Prince Theater, Annenberg Center. Free. (Note: new location).

SPECIAL EVENTS

27 Women's Faculty Club Reception to honor newly-appointed and newly-promoted women faculty; 4-6 p.m., Faculty Club.

29 Faculty Club "Friendly Welcome" to faculty and administrators new to the University and to old friends who currently do not hold memberships to attend a special evening in the Hourglass, with mulled wine and cider; 5-7 p.m., Faculty Club.

30 Wine and Cheese; 4:30-6:30 p.m., University Lutheran Church.

TALKS

26 Structural and Functional Changes in the Aging and Demented Brain; Dr. Abass Alavi, department of radiology and neurology, chief of nuclear medicine at HUP; 3:30-5 p.m., Donner Auditorium, HUP (Center for the Study of Aging).

27 Bioenergetic Studies of Mitochondria Oxidative Phosphorylation Using ³¹P-NMR; Dr. Laszlo Gyulai, department of biochemistry and biophysics, School of Medicine; 12:30 p.m., Physiology Library, 4th floor, Richards Building (Respiratory Physiology Group, Department of Anesthesiology).

28 Current Trends in Philosophical Thought; Dr. Iczhak Miller, professor of philosophy; 7 p.m., West Lounge, 4th floor, Williams Hall (Graduate Students of Romance Languages).

30 Hermes' Dilemma: The Masking of Subversion in Anthropological Description; Vincent Crapanzano, department of comparative literature and anthropology, Queens College; 3 p.m., West Lounge, 4th floor, Williams Hall (Center for the Study of Art and Symbolic Behavior, Department of Anthropology, The Comparative Literature and Literary Theory Program).

Early Deadline

The weekly update deadline for calendar entries is at noon on Tuesday, a week before the date of publication. *The January On Campus deadline is Tuesday, December 4, by noon.* There is no issue November 27 due to the Thanksgiving holiday. The address is 3601 Locust Walk/C8 (second floor of the CA).

IN BRIEF

Williams Lectureship: A bequest of the late Lenore Williams, wife of the former provost Edwin B. Williams, will establish the Women's Faculty Club's Lenore R. Williams lectureship starting this year. An outstanding woman leader or scholar will be chosen annually after nominations from the members (women faculty and administrative staff). Names should be submitted by *December 14* to Dr. Joan P. Shapiro, WFC president, c/o Women's Studies Program, 106 Logan Hall; or to anyone on the board: Vice President Dr. Vivian Seltzer, Secretary Mary Cartier, Treasurer Ruth Smith, members Ann Duffield, Kristin Davidson, Dr. Roselyn Eisenberg, Valorie Jennings, Esq., Judith Malamud, Dr. Catherine Marshall, Dr. Gertrude Reichenbach, and Dr. Dilys Winegrad.

Year 104 Calendar Deadline: The celebration of Black history and culture at Penn commemorates the 104 years of Black presence at the University. Programs and events sponsored during the spring semester to be included in the calendar should be submitted to the Office of Student Life, 110 Houston Hall by *December 1*. Call Mary Spata at Ext. 6533 for further information.

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
Michelle Friedman
Michael S. Markowitz
John J. Neumann
Leonard S. Perlman

ALMANAC ADVISORY BOARD Chair, Jean A. Crockett; Jacob M. Abel, Carol P. Germain, Henry T. Hiz, Alfred J. Rieber, Eliot Stellar, Arnold W. Thackray, Anthony R. Tomazinis, for the Faculty Senate; ... William G. Owen for the Administration; ... Carol Carr for the Librarians Assembly; ... Edwin Ledwell for the Administrative Assembly; ... Joseph Kane for the A-3 Assembly.