

Almanac

Tuesday, January 16, 1990

Published by the University of Pennsylvania

Volume 36 Number 19

INSIDE

- SENATE: SEC Actions 1/10/90, p. 2
- Speaking Out: Combined Charities, p. 2
- Associate VPUL: Resources for Distress, p. 3
- Discussion: Wharton Teaching Standards, pp. 4-5 and 8-11
- Involvement in the 250th, pp. 6-7
- Deaths, p. 11 ● CrimeStats, Update, p. 12
- Pullout: U.S. Supreme Court Syllabus and Opinion, Penn v. EEOC

Annenberg Chairs: Nancy Farris, Drew Faust

Two Walter H. Annenberg Professorships in History funded by a \$10 million gift made by the former British Ambassador last year have been awarded to full professors who have been teaching at Penn since the early seventies:

Dr. Nancy Farriss, an ethnohistorian of Latin America who won the MacArthur Award in 1986, joined the University as associate professor in 1971, and *Dr. Drew Gilpin Faust*, a prize-winning historian of the Old South who arrived as a graduate student in 1970, started as a teaching fellow in 1972.

Dr. Farriss, a summa cum laude alumna of Barnard, took her Ph.D. at the University of London in 1965 and taught Hispanic studies in Jamaica before joining William and Mary's history department as assistant professor in 1968. She was a visiting lecturer at Harvard when Penn's history department recruited her. She is the author of *Maya Society under Colonial Rule: The Collective Purchase of Survival* (1984), which won three national awards in 1985, and *Crown and Clergy in Colonial Mexico, 1759-1821: The Crisis of Ecclesiastical Privi-*

lege, part of the University of London Historical Series.

Dr. Faust, who has held a term chair as the Stanley I. Sheerr professor of history for the past year, enrolled in Penn's American Civilization after taking her B.A. magna cum laude from Bryn Mawr in 1968 and working with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development for two years. She became a teaching fellow in 1972 and was made assistant professor in 1976 after taking her Ph.D. in 1975. She rose to full professor in 1984, twice chairing the American Civilization department before moving to history with the Sheerr chair appointment. Winner of the Lindback Award for distinguished teaching in 1982, she is widely known for her books including *James Henry Hammond and the Old South*, which won three national awards in 1983. Her 1977 *A Sacred Circle: The Dilemma of the Intellectual in the Old South* was reissued in paper in 1986, and her most recent book is *The Creation of Confederate Nationalism: Ideology and Identity in the Civil War South* (1988).



Above, Dr. Faust.
At right, Dr. Farriss

Sidelight: In the course of preparing the story at left, *Almanac* learned that Dr. Faust was inadvertently omitted from the campus phone book, leading to a rumor that she had accepted a position elsewhere. Her office address is 321B College Hall/6303 and her extension is 8-5125. If others have corrections or updates to the phone book now in print, we will be pleased to publish them.—Ed.

On Burglary at the Vet School

The following was issued in response to a break-in over the weekend in which research files, disks and tapes were stolen from the office of Dr. Adrian Morrison, professor of anatomy at the School of Veterinary Medicine. In phone calls reporting the break-in to news media Sunday afternoon, an unidentified woman claimed responsibility on behalf of the Animal Liberation Front and said the group had targeted Dr. Morrison's files specifically because of his advocacy of the use of animals in research.

We want to condemn in the strongest terms the attempt to silence and intimidate Professor Adrian Morrison, whose office was burglarized this past weekend.

Rather than debating and discussing Professor Morrison's views in the open, the persons responsible for this incident have resorted to illegal acts of theft and burglary. Such tactics are abhorrent to all of us who cherish a free society and our right to express our opinions.

We are relieved that this cowardly act resulted in no harm to animals at the Veterinary School.

The individuals who committed this crime can be assured that the University will press for a full investigation and prosecution of the persons responsible.

Michael Aiken
Provost

Sheldon Hackney
President

Supreme Court: EEOC Has Access to Peer Reviews

In a landmark decision for academia, the U.S. Supreme Court on January 9:

"Held: A university does not enjoy a special privilege requiring a judicial finding of particularized necessity of access, beyond a showing of mere relevance, before peer review materials pertinent to charges of discrimination in tenure decisions are disclosed to the EEOC."

The syllabus and full opinion written by Justice Blackmun for the unanimous Court appear in a four-page insert at the center of this issue.

On receipt of the opinion, which upholds an earlier finding of the Third Circuit Court of

Appeals, President Sheldon Hackney issued the statement below. At presstime, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) and University General Counsel's Office were in conversation about redaction of documents, which the Court specifically did not rule upon (see footnotes xx and xx, pages X and X). The EEOC, investigating the complaint of Dr. Rosalie Tung (now professor of business administration and director of the International Business Center at the University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee), has asked for the documents intact; the University has proposed removal of the names of writers and persons mentioned in peer reviews.

University Response to Supreme Court Ruling

Many members of the academic community have been following this case closely and with great interest.

The Supreme Court has now decided that the EEOC is entitled to access to confidential peer review materials in tenure decisions without having to show specific need. The Court expressed its reluctance to create a privilege in this area since Congress had not done so. The Court acknowledged the importance of a university's right to determine "who may teach" free from governmental interference. However, the Court found that the injury to this right resulting from the EEOC's access to the documents was too remote and speculative to warrant special protection. The case before the court did not involve the merits of Professor Tung's allegations of discrimination.

The Administration of the University feels that the confidentiality of tenure review materials is a very important part of the hiring and promotion process in higher education. Many institutions agree with this position and filed briefs on the University's behalf. We hope that the Supreme Court's decision will not discourage faculty members' candid participation in the peer review process.

We are nevertheless pleased that the Court has established a national standard in an area where appellate courts had previously reached conflicting conclusions.

—Sheldon Hackney, President

SENATE

From the Senate Office

The following statement is published in accordance with the Senate Rules. Among other purposes, the publication of SEC actions is intended to stimulate discussion between the constituencies and their representatives. We would be pleased to hear suggestions from members of the Faculty Senate. Please communicate your comments to Senate Chair Robert E. Davies or Faculty Senate Staff Assistant Carolyn Burdon, 15 College Hall/6303, Ext. 8-6943.

Actions Taken by the Senate Executive Committee Wednesday, January 10, 1990

- 1. Senate Committee on Committees.** Nominations were made for the 7 vacancies on the 9-member committee that suggests membership for the appointed (not the elected) Senate Committees. The nominations will be circulated by mail ballot to SEC members and appointments made thereafter.
- 2. Provost's Ten Working Group Reports.** Some issues discussed were the unaddressed problems of extensive TA involvement in teaching and the need for improvement of intellectual offerings in the undergraduate experience; the suggested increase of faculty involvement in many areas while the faculty size is to remain constant; the increasing budget and scope of the VPUL area without faculty oversight; a change in the vision from faculty as the central power of the University to faculty as the instructional staff; the strong need to increase library funds for maintenance and staffing and to insure that books are easily accessible; there are similarities and also differences that should be celebrated across the University; standards for tenure appointments should be upheld; and if marginal students are to be admitted then remedial programs should be provided for them. SEC members felt the importance of these reports required further discussion at future SEC meetings.
- 3. Charity Drive/United Way.** After discussion with Professor David Rudovsky, the following resolution was adopted: "The Senate Executive Committee requests that the President open the United Way program to include other federated charities who wish to participate in the coming year."
- 4. February Agenda.** The following items were placed on the agenda of the February meeting: discussion of University involvement and costs in the United Way campaign; the impact of the University's fringe benefits policy on research programs; and continued discussion of the Provost's reports.



F/SAP: Carol Bennett-Speight

Carol Bennett-Speight (above), assistant director of the Faculty/Staff Assistance Program and acting director of F/SAP for the past year, has been chosen from 65 applicants in a four-month national search.

Ms. Speight, a 1977 Rutgers MSW whose early practice in social work included programs in mental health, substance abuse, family warfare and minority and women's issues, came to F/SAP in 1987 from Inegra, Inc., a national firm that provides counseling and management of employee assistance programs to corporations. She is currently working on her D.S.W. in Administration with a focus on Organizational Behavior and Management.

The Faculty/Staff Assistance Program, now in its sixth year as a counseling and referral resource for members of the University faculty and staff, is under the aegis of the School of Social Work. The Human Resources Office contracts for its services to Penn offices referring staff there and for individual members of the faculty and staff seeking assistance.

Speaking Out

For Combined Charities

The Committee for a Combined Charitable Campaign at Penn is pleased that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee has passed a resolution [reference to resolution] in support of our initiative to broaden the University's annual workplace charitable fundraising drive. Over the past year, we have sought to change the University's Fall campaign from an exclusive United Way drive to a combined program similar to the those run by the City of Philadelphia, the School District of Philadelphia and numerous colleges and universities around the country.

In a combined workplace charitable campaign, the employer invites fundraising organizations in addition to the United Way to solicit funds and to receive employee donations directly through its payroll deduction process in a single drive. Eligibility for participation is typically limited to those organizations which disburse funds to, or consist of, a group of constituent agencies providing health or human services in a specified geographical area and which are not also members of another fundraising umbrella.

In the Delaware Valley, such eligible organizations are the Black United Fund of Pennsylvania, the Bread and Roses Community Fund, the United Negro College Fund, Womens Way and the National Health Agencies. Each of these organizations raises

money for agencies which are not members of United Way but which provide essential services to our region's sick, homeless, abused, and disadvantaged citizens and to communities struggling to survive crime, pollution and economic hardship.

The United Way's donor option program does not meet the needs of Penn faculty and staff who wish to support these important local organizations. Information about these organizations is not included in the United Way's materials and every contribution made through donor option is charged a fee of 18% or more to cover the United Way's overhead and the possible withdrawal of pledges.

In response to our Committee's initial request to the President for a combined campaign during this past Fall's drive, President Hackney allowed some greater visibility to these organizations without displacing the United Way as the primary federation in Penn's workplace drive. Four other federations which applied were permitted to distribute a piece of literature about their groups to Penn donors and to participate during the Penn solicitor training sessions. While this was a significant first step, it did not provide organizations formed for the same purposes as the United Way with access as equal partners in Penn's campaign and it did not permit Penn faculty and staff to directly contribute to these organizations without incurring an extra administrative charge.

Our Committee has heard from a number of staff and faculty who are discouraged by the United Way's control of Penn's workplace campaign and thus contribute to these other fundraising organizations individually. As the result, Penn's campaign suffers from lower participation than that enjoyed at other large workplaces in this area and around the country.

Penn groups and people in addition to those in the Senate Executive Committee which have endorsed a combined charitable fundraising drive at Penn include the A-1 Assembly, the Association of Women Faculty and Administrators, the Librarians Assembly, and leaders of the African-American Association, the A-3 Assembly and the unions of Library and Dining Services workers. The Penn community clearly prefers a combined drive which will provide the freedom of choice that is essential to any University sponsored campaign.

Our Committee shortly will contact the President to renew the request on behalf of these supporters for a program in which other fundraising groups can participate as partners during the University's workplace charitable drive in 1990. Please contact one of the co-chairs, Jane Combrinck-Graham at 8-6235 or David Rudovsky at 8-3087, if you would like to add your support for this initiative.

—The Committee for a
Combined Charitable Campaign at Penn

Resources for Students in Distress

The Office of the Associate Vice Provost for Student Affairs joins with others in the campus community in lamenting the recent loss of members of the Penn community. We share the sense of sorrow and want to take this opportunity to identify our services for students who seek help in times of distress, and to advise students of procedures that are in place in response to crisis. The Penn resources for assistance to students in times of need are noted below.

—Patricia Kaurouma, Associate Vice Provost

The Student Health Psychiatry Service

This service provides free psychiatric counseling, consultation, and brief therapy for students who wish to discuss any emotional concern. The staff are experienced in working with college students on problems ranging from mild to severe to incapacitating emotions. Students may choose to work with either a psychiatrist, psychologist, or a social worker, male or female. Both individual and group therapy are available and all contacts are treated with strict confidentiality.

The kinds of problems about which students seek assistance include: anxiety, depression, loneliness, difficulties with relationships, concerns about alcohol and drugs, lack of self-confidence, family problems, sexual concerns, trouble with school, persistent feelings of being in poor health, suicidal feelings, troublesome or fearful thoughts, feelings of weakness, unworthiness, or dependence, and trouble dealing with painful personal experiences.

Students can make an appointment by phone or in person between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. In an emergency students can always be seen the same day; one just needs ask. In case of an emergency after hours and on weekends, call 662-2850.

Students may come in for just one visit, or for as many as eight. While we are unable to offer long term or intensive psychotherapy, if a student's concern cannot be resolved, we make every effort to arrange a smooth and successful referral to a local clinic or private facility which meets the student's needs.

Location: Student Health Service in Penn Tower Hotel

Telephone: 662-2860, if not answer, 662-2850

Victim Support

If a student needs medical care as the result of an accident, fight, robbery, or sexual assault, medical treatment is provided in Student Health Service or the student is referred immediately to an appropriate resource as needed. We also put students in touch with Public Safety's Victim Support Services as necessary or direct the student to counseling resources to assist in recovery. Help is available by calling Student Health at 662-2850.

Alcohol/Drug Education and Counseling

If a student is concerned about a friend or loved one's use of drugs or alcohol, or if a student just wants to talk with someone about the use of alcohol or other drugs; needs to check the facts about the effects of a particular drug, or would like to have a workshop on the issue for a student residence or organization, the Campus Alcohol/Drug Resource Center is available in Room 115 at Houston Hall. Students may stop by or phone 898-2219 for more information. Health Education at 662-2869 assists in this area as well.

Our C.A.R.E. (Campus Alcohol Resources and Education) staff cares about students and is ready to provide discrete and entirely confidential consultation, education, and counseling services. We also provide follow-up care if a student is seen in Student Health for other alcohol-related problems. Our program staff includes social workers, psychologists, psychiatrists and physicians. To make an appointment with a C.A.R.E. coordinator, call 662-2860.

University Counseling Service

The University Counseling Service is the primary source of professional psychological counseling for students with concerns across a broad spectrum of development such as academic performance, career choice, and a broad spectrum of personal, social and emotional issues. The service also attempts to help students anticipate and prevent the development of such problems as well as help find ways of resolving these problems when they do occur. The focus of the Counseling Service's interventions may be at the individual, group, organizational or institutional levels and includes collaboration with faculty and staff.

The services and activities of the counseling service include individual counseling and therapy, group counseling and workshops, outreach, consultation and education, training and teaching, assessment and referral, self-help library, research and evaluation. Service to graduate students include an information table at the graduate student reception, a satellite office in the Graduate Towers, a liaison staff person assigned to the Graduate Towers, group workshops for graduate students only (survival skills in graduate school, dissertation support group, assertiveness group), a counseling liaison to the GAPSA, and relationships with the graduate and professional school administrators to assess graduate student counseling needs. Brochures outlining services are delivered to each graduate school at the start of the academic year, and emergency time is available every day to graduate students.

Location: University Counseling Service, 3611 Locust Walk, 2nd Fl.
Telephone: 898-7021

The offices noted above work in concert with other office of the university throughout the year. In addition, the Vice Provost for University Life has established a protocol of emergency procedures to handle student life emergencies. Although it is impossible to anticipate every potential problem, the protocols provide guidance for those University administrators, faculty, and staff who may encounter major emergencies involving students. Protocols have been established for accidents or serious illness, death of a student, psychiatric emergencies, public health problems, rape or sexual assault, residential emergency, and violence or extremism. Any University administrator, faculty or staff may contact the Vice Provost for University Life office for details of these campus emergency protocols, and for assistance in individual circumstances involving students.

Location: Office of the VPUL, 200 Houston Hall
Telephone: 898-6081

In instances where a death of a student in the community has occurred, a member of the Vice Provost for University Life offers support through contact with key campus offices such as the residential staff, counseling, student health, and individual schools. These contacts are made to insure that both individual and group outreach efforts are put into place. This staff member also works with the student's family to take care of matters that a family cannot handle at times of stress and bereavement. A liaison is also established with key persons and agencies outside the campus community.

If students or other members of the University community encounter problems, we can offer assistance and we hope you will not hesitate to be in touch with any of our services.

On the Adoption of Teaching Standards in The Wharton School

Ed. Note: For clarity, the following contributions are published in the reverse order of receipt. This exchange began with the offer of Dr. J. Scott Armstrong's comments on teaching standards, (pages 9-10, after the centerspread and insert), which had been prepared in advance of a Wharton Faculty Meeting vote but were submitted after the committee report had been adopted. To give readers a context for his comments, *Almanac* sought the full text of the adopted report (below), and the chair of its proposing committee volunteered the paragraphs at right.

About the Report and Teaching Standards

The Faculty Committee on Teaching Quality in the development of the report sought and received extensive consultation from Wharton faculty, administration and students. Prior to the faculty vote, the report was discussed at a Wharton faculty meeting, among faculty within the departments, at the Chairperson's meeting and the Dean's Advisory Council. Further debate occurred at the next Wharton faculty meeting at which the vote was taken. The faculty voted and passed a motion to accept the spirit of the report.

It should be noted that the minimum standard for teaching should affect a very small percentage of the faculty. For example, during the last five years when no minimum standard was in effect, only 5% of the standing faculty averaged less than 3.0.

—Marshall Fisher
Chair, Committee on Teaching Quality

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Quality

1.0. Introduction

Toward the end of the Fall 1988 semester, Dean Palmer formed the Committee on Teaching Quality to consider ways in which the quality of teaching at Wharton could be improved. The original committee included six faculty members (Marshall Fisher, Chairman, Janice Bellace, Edward Bowman, Thomas Robertson, Anthony Santomero and Robert Verrecchia) and three MBA students (Dorothy Adams, Reynolds Faulkner and Jon Kopaas). When Ned Bowman became Deputy Dean in January of 1989, he was replaced on the committee by Ian MacMillan.

The committee began its work in earnest after the Fall semester ended, meeting a total of eight times from December 1988 to May 1989. In addition to discussing teaching quality as a group, the committee solicited advice from department chairmen and from Professors Kleindorfer, Reibstein and Oliver in their capacities as heads of the Ph.D., MBA and Undergraduate programs. We received substantial written input from this group, as well as some correspondence from a number of other Wharton faculty members. We also met with Larry Robbins, Dave Reibstein, Marion Oliver, Cam Enarson (on behalf of the WGA Excellence in Teaching Committee) and two first-year cohort representatives, Cathy Chuday and Imad Labban. The committee also received useful advice from Paul Browne on ideas for restructuring room and course scheduling in the first semester of the MBA program.

We made extensive use of a computerized database containing student evaluations for all courses taught from Fall 1984 to the present. We are indebted to Deidre Woods, who maintains this database, and who did an excellent job of providing numerous reports on various tabulations of the data requested by the committee.

In March, we presented a preliminary report of our work in a number of forums, including a department chairmen's meeting, a Wharton faculty meeting, an open forum of MBAs, and meetings of the Decision Sciences, Finance, Management and Marketing Departments. During these sessions, we received a great deal of valuable feedback, much of which is incorporated in this final report.

Teaching quality is a multifaceted and complex subject and we were forced early on to narrow our sights to have any hope of making significant progress within a reasonable time frame. Our principal emphasis has been effectiveness of the individual instructor within the current curricular structure. Thus, for example, we did not look at educational philosophy or curriculum design. In part, this was because we felt these issues are being looked after by existing Wharton committees. For example, there will be a wholesale review of the MBA curriculum next year.

We also gave greatest emphasis to the MBA program. This was not so much an explicit prior choice as it was a result of focusing on where the largest number of difficulties seemed to be. We were also careful to coordinate with, but not duplicate, ongoing efforts to redesign course evaluation forms and to improve communications between faculty and cohort leaders. Obviously, our choice of emphasis is not intended to suggest that the things we did not look at are less important. Rather, we tried to pick an area where we thought we could make a contribution.

2.0. Teaching Quality Issues at Wharton

Our committee's first step was to understand better the current level of teaching quality at Wharton. These efforts included a report on student perceptions of teaching quality that was given to the faculty members of the committee by student members, an extensive review of the database on student evaluations, and discussion with Deans Oliver and Reibstein. We also received some useful insights in the preliminary presentation of our results in March to the open MBA forum and various faculty groups.

An early meeting of our committee was fully devoted to a presentation by the three student members of the committee on student perceptions of teaching quality in the MBA program. They highlighted the following seven issues:

1. Variability of Teaching Talent
2. Teacher Evaluation Forms
3. Core Courses
4. Size of the MBA Program
5. Faculty Commitment to the Teaching Function
6. Depth of Topic Treatment
7. Inexperienced Professors

Many of these issues would also apply to the undergraduate program. In addition, the undergraduate program must cope with the fact that many courses are taught by non-standing faculty.

The first item on the list of seven issues (variability of teaching talent and the need to focus on the bottom end of the quality distribution) struck a responsive chord with the faculty members of the committee. The issue is clearly not with the average quality of teaching at Wharton, which is quite good (2.0 and steady over the last decade), but with the lower end of the distribution.

Although it is easy to debate how well student evaluations measure teaching quality and what is an acceptable level of quality, it seems hard to dispute the fact that there are difficulties with a course which receives an average instructor evaluation of 3.0 or worse. We therefore used an instructor evaluation of 3.0 or worse as our definition of the lower end of the teaching distribution.

When we looked at the percentage of courses in this lower end of the teaching distribution, we found both good news and bad news. This percentage was very small in the Ph.D. and undergraduate programs, and actually decreasing in the last three years in the undergraduate program. On the other hand, the percentage of courses in the MBA program has been increasing in the last few years to a level where it is unacceptably high for a school with Wharton's standards.

We also looked at which instructors were receiving poor evaluations and discovered more good news. Of those who had an average instructor evaluation of 3.0 or worse during the period 1984-1989, fully 72 percent were adjuncts, lecturers or Ph.D. candidates.

It would seem that poor instructors who are non-standing faculty should be much easier to deal with than teachers on the standing faculty. This is not to say that non-standing faculty are poorer teachers than regular faculty. They include some of our finest instructors. But they apparently have a higher variability in teaching quality.

A final point on teaching quality that was made during the discussions with departments is that some large departments which have extremely high student/faculty ratios find that this factor makes it harder to deliver quality teaching.

3.0. Recommendations

While we believe that Wharton should continue its strong commitment to research, there is much that can be done to improve teaching quality without compromising research excellence. The committee considered and selected from an enormous number of suggestions in arriving at the recommendations set forth here. We do not believe that these recommendations are the "final answer" to teaching quality, but are first steps that can be taken right away. Teaching quality is something that must receive continual attention. Part of that effort should be to monitor the impact that these recommendations have and make adjustments or consider other actions as necessary.

There are interdependencies among our recommendations that would make them difficult to implement in a piecemeal fashion. For example, successful implementation of minimum standards for acceptable teaching also requires implementation of our recommendations for revising instructor evaluations and reducing the initial teaching load for junior faculty.

3.1. Establish Minimum Standards for Acceptable Teaching

There should be minimum standards for acceptable teaching at Wharton that would be applied in tenure and promotion decisions. Furthermore, tenured faculty falling below the minimum standard should receive little or no salary raises, and adjuncts, lecturers or Ph.D. candidates below the minimum standard should not be allowed to continue teaching. Addressing substandard instructors within the adjuncts, lecturers and Ph.D. candidate ranks can have an enormous impact on the lower end of the teaching distribution, since they account for 72 percent of the instructor evaluations of 3.0 or worse.

We suggest that the minimum standard for standing faculty should be a 3.0 in instructor evaluation and for adjuncts, lecturers and Ph.D. candidates a 2.7 in instructor evaluations. Higher standards are set for adjuncts and lecturers, since their primary function is teaching. Similarly, we use a higher standard for Ph.D. candidates, since it is not essential that they play an active role in the classroom.

For promotion decisions, we suggest that the standards be applied to an average evaluation, weighted by class size, computed over a number of semesters. For tenure decisions, it would also be reasonable to discount the first two years, since that is a period in which new faculty are adjusting to Wharton and learning to teach. The weighted average of their instructor evaluations from the start of the third year until the point in time at which they come up for tenure would need to be better than 3.0. It would also be sensible to have a "grey area" ranging from about 2.5 to 3.0. For faculty in this region, the burden of proof that they are acceptable instructors would lie within their department and would depend on a careful review of information in addition to teaching evaluations. The additional information could include results of classroom visits, video taping, letters from former students, course materials that they had prepared, or demonstrated effectiveness in Ph.D. advising.

We recognize that student evaluations are an imperfect measure of teaching ability, but we do not think that they are so imperfect that it could be argued that someone who has averaged worse than a 3.0 over a four-year period is an acceptable teacher. We also recommend that we strive to make the student evaluations as valid a measure as possible. Some specific suggestions in this regard are outlined in Section 3.5. We note further that requiring "acceptable" teaching for tenure is consistent with the policy followed by most of our peers, as noted in the report, "Teaching Load Activity: Seven Schools of Business, 1987-1988," prepared by Bill Pierskalla.

Some sort of phase-in of the acceptable teaching requirement for tenure should be used for current assistant professors at Wharton so that there would not be a sharp change in the "rules of the game" for tenure for these people.

3.2. Reduce the Student/Faculty Ratio

Wharton has the highest student/faculty ratio of any of our peers, which translates into big classes, crowded classrooms, students getting closed out of courses they want to take, and faculty who have the highest teaching load of any of our peers.

Over the years, the school has coped admirably with this situation by trimming away those activities that require significant time and provide little value. Examples include reducing enrollment in the evening school and cutting low enrollment courses. These efforts to develop focus

should definitely be continued, but by themselves they will not solve anything. We need either more faculty or fewer students.

We currently have open faculty positions and are doing as much as can be expected to fill them. Thus, further progress would seem to depend on reducing the number of students enrolled in our programs. At the undergraduate level, we suggest it be done by stricter enforcement of the prerequisite requirements for non-Wharton students who want to take Wharton courses. At the MBA level, we recommend cutting the class size by about 10 percent. The impact that this could have on teaching quality in the critical first year of the MBA program is discussed in the next section. Finally, we note that there is already a plan that is being executed to reduce the size of the Ph.D. program.

Obviously, these recommendations will have a cost, but, considering the portion of tuition that goes to the University and to student aid, this cost does not seem onerous relative to other things on which we spend money at Wharton, and, if teaching quality is of high importance to us, we should make this investment. We recommend that Eric Van Merkensteijn, as Chief Financial Officer of Wharton, be charged with studying the financial implications of this proposal.

It would also be good if this reduction in the student/faculty ratio could be used in part to reduce teaching loads for junior faculty. Several departments now have a three-course teaching load for junior faculty, at least during the first few years. We would like to see this policy extended to all junior faculty at Wharton.

3.3. Focus on the First Semester of the MBA Program

The teaching evaluation data and comments from students consistently underscore the fact that the major teaching concern at Wharton is in the MBA program, and that within the MBA program the first semester cohort courses are the biggest concern. Another reason to focus on the first semester is that first impressions count. A poor first semester is likely to color a student's feelings about the remaining three semesters, even if the courses after the cohort are well taught.

For Fall semester 1989, options to improve the situation may be limited, but the Dean's Office should work with department chairmen to have good instructors assigned to the cohort courses where there is still flexibility and to emphasize the importance of having the first semester go well. It would also not be a good idea to have some cohorts with all of the best instructors and other cohorts with all of the worst instructors. To the extent possible, assignment of instructors to cohorts should equalize teaching talent across cohorts.

For the long term, the committee has discussed with Paul Browne some simple ideas for restructuring the cohort system that should make it much easier to deliver an excellent first semester. We recommend that the size of the MBA program be cut to 675 and the cohort size increased to 75, so that there would be nine cohorts. With waivers, a cohort of 75 would fit within the tiered rooms in Vance Hall and several rooms in Steinberg Hall-Dietrich Hall. The first semester should be staffed with 15 first-rate instructors, each of whom would teach three sections of one of the five cohort core courses. Teaching these three large core sections would count as a four-course load for these instructors.

We believe that faculty would find this an attractive teaching assignment because it is easier to teach three sections of the same course than four sections with multiple preparations. Also, concentrating all of one's teaching in a single semester has advantages. It should thus be feasible to find 15 excellent instructors who would be eager to participate in teaching the first semester program.

The first semester MBA program should get preference in scheduling the tiered rooms in Vance Hall and other high quality rooms. The 15 faculty should be organized into three teaching teams of 5, with each team teaching the same set of cohorts. Some of the things which are now done in the WEMBA program that improve esprit de corps could also be considered, such as providing lunch for faculty and students.

Currently, there is some variability in section size in the cohort courses because some departments teach double cohort sections and others teach some small sections. The incentive for teaching double cohort sections will be greatly diminished once the number of cohorts is cut to nine. We believe this practice should not be continued under the system we are proposing.

A reasonably good assessment of the impact that this proposal will have on teaching quality can be obtained by examining the instructor evaluation data for the cohort courses during the most recent academic year. These data are depicted in Table 1 [not published; request

continued on page 8, past centerspread and insert

Open Letter to The Penn Community

1990 will be a special time for the University of Pennsylvania. Our Founder's Day celebration will take place on Wednesday, January 17, inaugurating a year of special intellectual and cultural programs. Join us as we celebrate 250 years of educational leadership and usher in the next era of Penn's service to the nation and the world.

During the week of May 13, 1990, the University will be welcoming thousands of Penn alumni and friends who will come to join us in celebrating our birthday. This week will begin with Baccalaureate and Commencement ceremonies, continue with a variety of 250th activities, and finish with Alumni Weekend events.

Because this is primarily a "family party", we hope that you, our faculty, staff and students, will participate in our celebration in a variety of ways. Although the University will be "open for business" that week, we recognize the uniqueness and importance of this time and encourage your involvement.

You may wonder how you can become a part of this celebration. One way is to attend an event. As you may have read, there will be a plethora of intellectual programs and special entertainment from which to choose. There will be a registration process for tickets, but the registration fee will be waived for faculty, staff and students. Information on registration and ticket purchase for special activities will be in the program materials to be mailed to you in early spring.

Another important way for you to be involved is by volunteering to help during the celebration. While you are participating as a volunteer, you will have the opportunity to take an active part in events of intellectual and cultural distinction.

We will need many of you to fill a variety of roles to ensure the success of this campus-wide effort. We have contacted deans, vice presidents, department chairs and administrators to advise them of our need for your assistance.

Accompanying this letter are Penn's 250th Celebration Operational Guidelines and Procedures and a Volunteer Activity Preference Form. We ask you to review this material carefully. We encourage you to sign up to be a volunteer by completing the form on the next page.

In 1990, Penn will be celebrating "Ben's Best Idea": Our University. Together, let's make the celebration a most enjoyable success.

*Sheldon Hackney Michael Aiken
Marna C. Whittington*

PENN



250th
Celebration

Operational Guidelines and Procedures

The week of May 13, 1990 will be a special and busy time for Penn. In addition to Baccalaureate, Commencement and Alumni Weekend events, many intellectual and cultural activities are being planned to celebrate our 250th anniversary. The University of Pennsylvania will be open for business Monday through Friday of that week. In addition, there will be staffing needs for Alumni Weekend and 250th events on Saturday and Sunday.

In order for the University to have a successful celebration, the pace of regular business will slow to allow for staff involvement as volunteers and participants. However, all University employees are expected to report to work as scheduled.

Office Coverage: All offices should be open with necessary staff to handle phone calls, critical services and emergencies. There should be a minimum of special or new assignments made or due on those days.

Supervisors are responsible for ensuring coverage so that all staff who wish to participate in some 250th events, either by attending programs or volunteering their time, may do so provided scheduling and operational considerations allow.

Attendance at Events: We believe that the Penn community should be encouraged to participate in 250th events, as participants and as volunteers. Faculty and staff will be required to register, but the registration fee will be waived. Tickets for events will be available on a first-come, first-served basis, through the general registration process. Information concerning registration and purchase of tickets for special activities will be in the program to be mailed in early spring.

Any employee who attends 250th events will not have vacation or personal time charged for such participation.

Volunteers: The University will be relying upon its faculty and staff to volunteer their time during the celebration. Supervisors are asked to encourage staff participation and to accommodate requests for volunteering provided

scheduling and operational considerations allow. Refer to the statement on Office Coverage for more information.

Volunteer categories will include, among others, guest relations, information services, session and program operations, and office assistance.

In some cases, however, individuals will not be able to volunteer or attend events because they are performing services that must remain in operation at all times, regardless of other University activities. In all cases, staff must obtain supervisory approval to attend events or serve as volunteers.

In order to prepare the volunteers, the 250th Office and Alumni Relations will be holding training sessions in the spring of 1990. We will request that all volunteers attend these sessions.

Work Hours: The regular schedule of daily hours at the University is 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, with a one-hour lunch period. There are times, however, when schedules need to be changed to accommodate the work that needs to be performed. During the 250th celebration, there will be nighttime activities and a weekend schedule of events which will depend upon volunteer assistance in a variety of ways.

To support the celebration, use of flexible time is encouraged.

Supervisors may reassign weekly-paid employees to assist in the evenings or on the weekend without the need for compensatory time or additional pay, provided that the total number of hours worked that week is equivalent to the number of hours worked during a regular work week (35, 37 1/2 or 40 hours).

For example, on Thursday, May 17, an employee would report to his/her office at 1 p.m.; work there until 5 p.m.; have dinner between 5 and 6 p.m.; do volunteer duties between 6 and 9 p.m. and have this considered a seven-hour work day. Or if scheduling were to permit, an employee could substitute seven

continued past insert

hours on the weekend in lieu of a weekday.

Overtime Compensation and/or Compensatory Time: Where it is necessary for weekly-paid staff (A-3) to work in excess of their regular work week (35, 37 1/2 or 40 hours), the following University policy applies:

All University employees on the weekly payroll who are not covered by collective bargaining agreements are to be compensated for working in excess of their normal schedules for one pay period (35, 37 1/2 or 40 hours) as follows:

Hours Worked	Compensation	CompTime
35-40 hours	regular hourly rate of pay	or one hour compensatory time off for each hour worked
Over 40 hours	one and one-half times the regular hourly rate of pay	no compensatory time permitted

Any overtime pay must be charged to the staff member's home department. Departments are expected to keep the appropriate records for overtime and compensatory time owed.

University procedures do not permit overtime pay for monthly-paid (A-1) staff.

Overtime work may be undertaken only at the direction of and with the advance approval of the employee's supervisor. If compensatory time is appropriate, the substitution of compensatory time off, in lieu of monetary compensation, must be agreed upon in advance by both the supervisor and the employee.

Overtime compensation provisions for employees in collective bargaining units are governed by the terms of their respective collective bargaining agreements.

Questions may be addressed to the following units in the Office of Human Resources: Staff Relations at Ext. 8-6093; Labor Relations at Ext. 8-6019; Compensation at Ext. 8-3503; and to Penn's 250th Office at Ext. 8-1990.

—Office of the Senior Vice President

Volunteer Activity Preference Form: General Information

Below are listed brief descriptions of the various kinds of tasks to be done by volunteers during Penn's 250th Celebration the week of May 13, 1990. Alumni Relations is also seeking individuals who can volunteer to help with Alumni Weekend events, May 18 and 19, 1990.

Please review the descriptions to determine which categories appeal to you most. The 250th Office is encouraging individuals to volunteer as much time as their schedules permit. Half-day slots (3.5 hours) are the minimum; full days (7 hours) are preferable, if possible. There will also be evening and weekend events that will need to be staffed.

Before returning the signed form, staff members should speak with their supervisors. He or she will have to make arrangements for overall office coverage. Please read "Penn's 250th Operational Guidelines and Procedures" in its entirety. It addresses a number of important operational issues including the use of flexible scheduling during this celebration week.

At this time, we are not asking you to select the specific dates you wish to volunteer. However, we are asking you to estimate the number of full or half days you can give to this effort. Please note that we will need volunteers in the evenings and on the weekend.

Once all forms are received, staff of the 250th Office and Alumni Relations will contact you about attending volunteer training sessions and scheduling your specific volunteer dates and times.

Thank you for becoming a part of this grand "family party." If you have any questions, please call extension 8-2862.

Volunteer Categories

Most of the following tasks will be performed during the week of May 13-20, 1990. Two categories, Office Assistance and Coordination of Volunteers, will need volunteer assistance from the end of April through May 20.

Volunteers will also be scheduled to attend one or two training sessions in the spring.

Guest Relations - serve as Penn's on-site ambassadors to alumni and distinguished guests. Greet and assist guests at various locations and events.

Information Services - provide assistance and information to guests either from campus-wide information booths, via telephone, or by computer. Act as liaisons to emergency services, if needed.

Session and Program Operations - oversee a successful event from beginning to end including room monitoring, ticket collection, and general events facilitation.

Office Assistance - provide much-needed clerical and office support including word processing, assembling of materials, telephone coverage, procurement of supplies and other similar tasks.

Coordination of Volunteers - work with the 250th Office, Alumni Relations and School Liaisons to oversee the volunteer effort.

Alumni Weekend Staffing of Events (Alumni Weekend events will be on Friday, May 18 and Saturday, May 19) - Duties include facilitating reunion and class events and serving as marshall for the Alumni Run and the Penn Parade of Classes.

—S.H., M.A., and M.C.W.

Penn's 250th Celebration Volunteer Activity Preference Form

Please give us an indication of the number of full and half days you can provide:

full days _____

half days _____

Are you available evenings? _____ weekends? _____

Staff member's signature _____

Supervisor's signature _____

Date _____

Please return this form to Joan Williamson at 739 Franklin Building/ 6296 by February 9, 1990.

Name _____

Title _____

School/Department _____

Address _____

Phone _____

Please list, in priority order, the three categories of volunteer activities that most interest you. We will try to accommodate your first preference if possible.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Wharton Teaching Quality continued from page 5

them from the committee chair]. Data for 805 are not available, since this course was not taught as a Wharton course during 1988-89. Let's consider what happens if we cut the number of sections to nine in each of these courses and assume that we eliminate the instructors with the worst teaching performance. It is hard to predict what will happen in 800, since this course currently has only seven sections, but for the other three courses, under this change, the percentage of sections with an instructor evaluation of 3.0 or worse drops from 20.5 percent to 0 percent, the worst evaluation drops from 3.9 to 2.5, and the average evaluation across all sections drops from 2.24 to 1.8. This estimate of impact is optimistic in that it assumes we can identify and remove the worst instructors, but it is pessimistic in that it ignores the impact of the incentive of teaching three instead of four courses on an instructor's teaching performance and on the number of additional good instructors that would be motivated to volunteer to teach cohort courses. On balance, we think that this is a reasonable estimate of the impact this proposal would have.

3.4. The Departments' Role

Many, if not most, of the things that can be done to improve teaching quality will logically be managed at the departmental level. Clearly, the departments will play an important role in many of the recommendations made in other sections of this report, including enforcement of minimum acceptable teaching standards, assigning good instructors to the MBA core courses, and enforcing prerequisites for non-Wharton undergraduates taking Wharton courses. Beyond this, there are many activities that lie completely within the domain of individual departments. Listed below are some possible departmental activities for improving teaching quality. This list is based in large part on suggestions that we received from department chairpersons and others, and includes a number of items that some departments are already doing.

Departmental Activities for Improving Teaching Quality

1. *Heighten awareness.* Openly discuss teaching quality at department meetings and stress its importance. In and of itself, this heightened awareness will have positive impact.

2. *Individual faculty conferences.* The department chairperson can meet individually with all faculty with less than acceptable teaching ratings to discuss methods for improvement.

3. *Rewards* Take more account of contributions to teaching quality in determining raises.

Reward the best teachers with a reduced load of a smaller number of relatively high enrollment sections, as we have recommended for cohorted courses. This is also done by some departments (e.g., Accounting) for other high enrollment courses.

4. *Faculty Development.* Hold workshops to share ideas on teaching.

Senior faculty with outstanding teaching performance can sit in on junior faculty classes when invited and provide ongoing mentoring. Junior faculty can also visit classes taught by senior faculty.

Many junior faculty are on a steep learning curve in their teaching ability during their early years at Wharton. This should be considered in course scheduling by starting them on courses that are relatively easy to teach or on multi-section courses where they will be part of a team that includes more seasoned instructors.

5. *Course Assignments.* Take faculty with a history of poor teaching out of required and high enrollment courses.

6. *Course Heads.* Appoint strong course heads (especially in the core courses) to provide inspiration, integration and experience.

7. *TAs.* Assign TAs based on their teaching skills as well as the support needs of the Doctoral Program. This is especially important for required or high enrollment courses.

8. *Support.* Provide adequate support for TAs, course head counseling, teaching supplies, audio visual preparation, etc.

It is unlikely that any one department would do all of these things, but each department should fashion a program of activities that makes sense for it.

The Wharton School is remarkably decentralized in the freedom that departments have to manage their affairs. This is appropriate, given Wharton's size and the nature of an academic institution. However, we have a concern that under such a decentralized structure, issues that are important to the school, such as teaching quality, may not receive the attention they deserve at the departmental level, and that therefore a bit more coordination from the Dean's Office would be useful. This coordination should not be limited to teaching, but should also include

research and other activities of departments.

We suggest the following be tried as a first step. Schedule two additional meetings a year with each department chairperson, the Dean and the Deputy Dean. The first meeting would be in late Summer or early Fall and focus on plans for the year. The second meeting would be in late Spring or early Summer and would review what was accomplished during the year relative to those plans. These meetings should address all aspects of the department's activities that the department chairperson or Deans feel are important, and would logically include an assessment of strengths and weaknesses in teaching and steps that would be taken to correct weaknesses. These meetings would also provide an opportunity for department chairpersons to secure any help that is needed from the Dean's Office and to match resources, such as the department's budgets and teaching slots, more closely with the need and mission of the department.

3.5. Student Evaluations

The committee felt that the student evaluation forms currently being used could be improved, both to make them a more valid measure of teaching performance and to make them more useful to instructors in diagnosing difficulties with a course. It is clearly important that the student evaluations be as good a measure of teaching quality as we can make them if more weight is to be placed on this information in promotions and salaries.

For these reasons, we were delighted to learn that the WGA Excellence in Teaching Committee is working on improving student evaluations and on achieving wider distribution of this information to students. Cam Enarson attended a meeting of the Teaching Quality Committee and gave a presentation of the project to improve student evaluations. We had a chance to see a draft of a revised evaluation and offer our comments. This effort will continue next year under the chairmanship of Stephanie Dulitz and with active participation by Greg Walton as Vice President of the WGA. We support the work of this group and look forward to their results.

Beyond this, we had three specific recommendations concerning student evaluations. First, it might be a good idea in computing averages to discard outliers. For example, the best and worst 5 percent of all evaluations could be discarded before computing the average. As things stand now, with an average student evaluation of about 2.0, two or three students who give an instructor a 5.0 can have an inordinately high weight on the average.

We think the student evaluations should be published each semester in *The Wharton Journal* and distributed to faculty. Detailed results for individual faculty could be distributed within the departments, together with average results for other departments.

It would be good to have as many students as possible complete the evaluations. One possibility to consider is for students to enter their evaluation information via computer terminals and to withhold grades until all evaluations are completed.

3.6. Faculty Development

The committee reviewed some materials provided by Larry Robbins on his faculty development program and had the opportunity to meet with Larry. Most members of the committee felt that this program is fulfilling a need and should be continued on a voluntary basis, although some expressed reservations. Many faculty who have participated in the program felt that videotaping was a particularly worthwhile experience.

Beyond this, the committee did not have a clear viewpoint on whether more should be done in the area of faculty development. Some members of the committee felt that there was definitely a learning process involved in becoming a good teacher and that Wharton's many excellent award-winning instructors could be helpful in this learning process. Others agreed with this viewpoint but felt that this effort was best administered at the department level. Still others felt that faculty development was relatively less important, and that if the proper incentives were provided, faculty would figure out how to teach well.

On balance, we felt that it would be a good idea to have one or two one-and-one-half-hour sessions on teaching in the Fall organized by faculty as part of orientation for new faculty. These sessions would underscore the importance of good teaching, make faculty aware of resources that are available to them for learning to teach, and could include presentations by some of Wharton's best faculty on their philosophy and techniques for good teaching.

We also received a suggestion from Bruce Allen that should be straightforward to implement and could have considerable value. He

suggested that Larry Robbins's group videotape the performance of the award-winning professors at Wharton so that others could observe their teaching techniques. These videotapes of good teaching could be distributed to all faculty. While it is clearly impossible for one person totally to emulate another's style, seeing examples of good teaching should be useful in refining one's own approach to teaching.

3.7. Facilities

A number of faculty have complained of difficulties with certain rooms or audio visual facilities. For example, in some rooms it is not possible to darken the front of the room while keeping the main room lights on. This creates a dilemma with transparencies because the front of the room is either too light for the transparencies to be seen clearly or the back of the room is too dark for the instructor to be able to see the students.

While any one of these may appear relatively minor, the solution in most cases seems equally straightforward. More importantly, when faculty bring up problems and they do not get resolved, it tends to dampen enthusiasm to work hard to achieve quality teaching.

There should be a single individual in the Wharton administration to whom faculty can report problems such as these. This individual should be responsible for addressing these issues and promptly reporting back to faculty. Hopefully, most problems will be settled, or there will be a very good reason why they cannot be settled. It should be clearly visible to all who the accountable individual is. For example, he could make a brief appearance at the first faculty meeting of each year. If there already is such an individual, he needs to be more visible, based on the complaints we heard from faculty.

3.8. Policy on Missing Classes

Some students have complained of instances in which a faculty member would miss an inordinate number of classes during the semester and/or would not give adequate notice and make provisions for covering the material that was missed. This kind of behavior is clearly unacceptable and seems the most extreme example of unacceptably poor teaching. We recommend that the school have a clear policy on missing classes which is publicized to all faculty and students. The policy should stipulate that faculty should make every effort not to miss a class during a semester. Occasionally it may be necessary to miss a class for a valid reason, such as illness or the need to attend an important professional

meeting. Faculty should give advance warning when they must miss a class and take steps to make sure that there is no educational loss through their absence. A small class can be rescheduled and a larger class can be taught by another instructor who is either teaching or has taught another section of the same course.

3.9. Communications: Faculty, Students and Administration

In the open forum of MBAs that the committee sponsored, there were a number of comments on the role that communications play in creating the right educational environment. We do not have any major recommendations in this area, but there are some small suggestions that might make some improvement. Some of these things are already being done to some extent.

Some of the difficulties with large classes could be overcome if faculty could call on students by name. To facilitate this, brief biographies and photo cards should be distributed to faculty a couple of weeks in advance of the start of the semester for the students they will be having in class. Students should also be given namecards each semester that they can carry with them to class to display in front of them to make it easier for faculty to learn their names.

Programs that build a rapport between faculty and students are obviously a good thing. Dave Reibstein has started a very nice program called "Food for Thought" in which faculty discuss their research over lunch with a small group of students. There are other programs where students take faculty to lunch. These should be continued and, if possible, expanded. Cohort leaders also provide a mechanism for faculty to access student opinion. Finally, some faculty distribute diagnostic course evaluations in the middle of the semester. This seems to be a very much appreciated way for students to provide input on a course in time for it to be immediately useful.

The communications that MBAs receive from the administration at orientation should emphasize the nature and advantages of a research understanding that the administration is already doing this, so our recommendation is to emphasize the importance of continuing it.

Teaching quality is not only a faculty issue. It depends on appropriate student expectations. It is very much a function of the intellectual climate created by all stakeholders — faculty, administration, staff and students. Improving teaching quality must be a shared objective that receives the strong commitment of all members of the Wharton School.

The Case for Minimum Teaching Standards by J. Scott Armstrong

Author's Note: The following was sent to the Wharton faculty in November, 1989, challenging a set of proposals by the Wharton Teaching Committee.¹ The committee's proposal was presented as an "all or nothing" choice. Despite a substantial amount of support for the position stated below, the Wharton Committee recommendations were passed as originally proposed; this includes punitive measures for faculty who get low ratings (referred to below as the committee's Proposal #1). The proposals said that for tenure or promotion, a faculty member must get better than an "average" rating (3.0 on a five point scale). The vote was close. It seems likely that Proposal #1 would have been defeated had a secret ballot been conducted on this item alone. Action was not taken on any of the nine proposals in my paper, and neither of the proposals on process were accepted. Since that time, faculty from other schools have read the memo and suggested that it be reprinted in *Almanac* in order to gain further faculty comment. They are concerned that similar events in their schools may affect the quality of the educational environment.—J.S.A.

We all share the desire to improve the learning environment at Wharton and to have students who will be satisfied with this environment. While most of the Wharton Teaching Committee's recommendations are consistent with these aims, I believe that recommendation #1, to "Establish Minimum Standards for Acceptable Teaching," will be

detrimental to learning. I therefore recommend that we reject proposal #1. This letter describes how I reached this conclusion, suggests alternatives, and recommends a process for resolving the issues.²

Factors Favoring Proposal #1

1. It communicates that something is being done.³
2. It may raise the short-term satisfaction level among students.
3. It may help to increase the efforts of those faculty who currently invest little effort.

Factors Against Proposal #1

1. Teacher ratings do not provide a useful measure of learning. Unfortunately, I had not bothered to read the extensive literature on this subject when I was involved in the implementation of Wharton's Teacher Evaluation system. The literature contradicted my basic assumptions on this topic. Numerous empirical studies have been published on the relationship between teacher ratings and learning. Some studies show positive relationships and some show negative ones. Typically the effects are small. (See Dubin and Taveggia, 1968, for a review of this literature.) One such study compared the performance of students in 11 sections of a calculus course at Stanford; participants in the lower rated courses performed significantly better on a common examination at the end of the course (Rodin and Rodin, 1972.) Another study, the "Dr. Fox study," showed that an actor with a completely meaningless script was able to deliver a one-hour lecture followed by a 30-

MBA students that there should be a course evaluation and I worked with them to introduce the first evaluation system.

- 3 Some people refer to this as the politician's syllogism: "Something must be done. This is something. Therefore, this must be done."

¹ A faculty committee appointed by the Dean. [See starting page 4.—Ed.]
² Some historical background may be of interest. I have been teaching at Wharton since 1968 and have taught at eight other schools in seven different countries. Shortly after arriving at Wharton, I convinced some

minute discussion and to achieve high ratings (Naftulin, et al. 1973). Finally, in a massive study using before and after measures of knowledge of economics, participant ratings of basic economic courses had no relationship to learning (Attieyeh and Lumsden, 1972).

2. On theoretical grounds, one might expect teacher ratings to harm learning. One principle of learning is that the learner should feel responsible for the learning (Armstrong, 1980; Armstrong, 1983; Condry, 1977; Tough, 1982). Teacher ratings communicate that the teacher is responsible for changing the student. Students are implicitly expected to play a passive role and then to evaluate the teacher's performance instead of their own performance.

3. Another theoretical argument is that evaluation tends to interfere with open communication. This would be expected to be detrimental to the learning process in that teachers may not provide as accurate feedback.

4. Teacher evaluations can be misused. Students who are doing poorly in a course can claim that the teacher is not competent in order to imply that the student was not at fault. (This applies not only to ratings, but also to other aspects of an environment that puts student satisfaction rather than learning as the primary goal.) This misuse of evaluations has been gaining in popularity. I understand (hearsay) that it is a popular strategy at state universities that stress teacher evaluations.

5. Unfavorable changes in course content may be expected. Learning involves frustration. It means that some prior behaviors are not optimal. (For example, tell a smoker to stop smoking and you will get a negative reaction.) To obtain good ratings, it is preferable to avoid disconfirming evidence and to reinforce what people already believe (Zelby, 1974). In my studies, I have found that experiential learning produces some "hostile alienated objectors" (Armstrong, 1980). Techniques for getting high ratings are often at odds with learning (e.g., it is a good idea to reinforce what students already believe rather than to imply that their current approach to problems is deficient; it is good to avoid topics where the research findings are not clearcut; it is desirable to meet expectations of students, such as that the teacher is responsible for their learning.) Content also tends to "pop management" and current events. As an analogy to this focus on short-term satisfaction, consider the doctor-patient relationship: A focus on current satisfaction is like giving the client an aspirin to make him feel good today, whereas there may be a more fundamental treatment needed to solve the causes of the headache.

6. Experimentation might be reduced. Teachers may be less willing to try something new once they have gained tolerable ratings.

7. The contract is changed for faculty members. They were hired under one set of rules and the rules are now being changed.

8. It might be more difficult to attract new faculty.

9. Some faculty may perceive that the solution has been made on unfounded grounds. No empirical evidence was provided to demonstrate that this policy change on ratings would be beneficial in a situation such as ours. I would be surprised if such research exists.

10. Are legal issues involved? Given that the prime mission is learning, not entertainment, there may be legal issues involved in using the present type of teacher evaluation (Miller, 1978). Miller suggests that faculty members might sue on the basis that they are being judged on a criterion that has been shown to lack validity. (His article was directed at administrators to alert them of this danger.)

11. Might extrinsic rewards, such as paying for teachers for high ratings by students) reduce the motivation for a task that many faculty find to be intrinsically rewarding? (The research on attribution theory suggests this as a possibility.)

12. Might proposal #1 cause alienation of faculty from students? In environments that stress teacher evaluations, I have heard teachers make negative statements about students and refer to them as "the enemy". (This statement is based purely on unaided observation.)

13. Might some of the faculty react negatively to the assumptions implied by Proposal #1? The proposal implies that teaching is a distasteful activity and it is difficult to get someone to do it. It also implies that faculty are irresponsible people who respond primarily to punishments. These assumptions are common in the management of public universities; they have produced abysmal results.

14. Would proposal #1 have an adverse effect on Wharton as a research institution? Based on the recent study of publications, citations, and peer ratings, Wharton is ranked third among business schools. This represents our comparative advantage and we should not put it at

risk. (It is difficult to see how the proposed changes in teacher evaluation could *improve* the research environment.)

Some Alternatives

The following suggestions are listed in order of importance as I see them.

A. Restate the first proposal as "Establish standards for effective learning." A basic problem is that we have no measures of learning, which is presumably a primary objective. The committee's recommendation #5 could be restated to aim at "learning evaluations", (a point that was raised in the last faculty meeting). It really is not that difficult to assess learning. I have used end-of-course evaluations that ask students to report their success at improving skills; the responses to this survey have often differed greatly from their ratings of me as a teacher. When learning is most effective, the learners believe that they have done it themselves. This attitude also bodes well for that individual's learning after graduation. I have also used critical incidents surveys administered six months after the completion of the course to determine what techniques or concepts students have been able to use. Other measures include looking at the grades of students in follow-on courses and looking at the number of students who took follow-on courses. Finally, we should examine what happens to our students after they leave. Are they more effective on the job? Are they recognized as being effective? Are they able to use techniques and concepts from their Wharton education? Are they satisfied in retrospect that their learning was useful?

B. Use alternative measures of teacher effectiveness. Allow teachers to obtain evidence of their effectiveness in aiding the learning process. This would be particularly relevant for those faculty who rely on experiential learning.

C. Eliminate the cohort system. I was a strong opponent of the cohort system when it was proposed because it would harm the learning environment (at the same time, I thought it would be popular among students.) The evidence presented by the committee indicated that the cohort system has created a "teaching problem." It would be interesting to determine whether the faculty believes that the benefits of the cohort system are so large that they justify the bad effects. I do not.⁴ As an alternative, it may be possible to modify the cohort system to allow students more freedom of choice.

D. Examine the student complaint system to determine whether there have been changes in the measurement system. A possible hypothesis would be that the Dean's office may encourage students to complain and that students go to the Dean with complaints rather than to the faculty member. If so, it may be useful to ask whether a more fruitful approach would be to require that students first try to work out problems with the professor. (There have been a number of cases where the students have gone directly to the Dean's office when the faculty member was under the impression that things were going well.)

E. Design the system to promote learning rather than to avoid complaints. The latter approach may lead to a system designed to cater to the poorest and least interested learners.

F. Increase freedom in the environment. Rather than restrictive rules, we should seek ways to increase freedom of choice for the faculty and students.

G. Base recommendations on the empirical research on how people learn. An extensive literature exists on this topic.

H. Define the problem from a systems viewpoint. Can we improve the environment for research and learning? In particular, could the learning environment in the second year of the MBA program be improved?

I. When extrinsic incentive are necessary, focus on rewards rather than punishments. How many of us believe that we respond better to punishment?

Suggestions on Process

I. Survey faculty anonymously on these issues. They are highly sensitive and some faculty have told me that they do not feel free to speak out about it. This is especially important for those who do not have tenure, but I have also heard it from those who do have tenure.

II. Seek consensus on this issue. Rather than rushing to a solution, I urge that we seek solutions that would be acceptable to most of us. If

⁴ Faculty at other schools have also reported detrimental effects on learning from the imposition of cohort systems. (This is hearsay.)

it does become necessary to vote, I request that the voting be done anonymously.

Conclusions

My opposition against proposal #1 is balanced by my support for all other recommendations by the Wharton Teaching Committee with one exception. That exception is for #2d which relates to reduced teaching loads for junior faculty. This recommendation has no clear relationship to the teaching issue. It should be handled as a separate issue.⁵

I recommend passage of the Teaching Committee recommendations except for Proposal #1 and #2d. A vote for #1 is a vote against the research in this area. My prediction, if #1 is instituted, is that our learning environment will become more like that in most public schools; those environments are less conducive to research and learning.

Hopefully, the proposals will be handled separately. If not, I recommend a vote against the package.

⁵ An alternative argument is that it may be more equitable to provide reduced teaching loads for a specific purpose (e.g., to work on teaching skills or to pursue a particularly fruitful line of research) rather than to base it on length of service. Under the committees's proposal, those with less previous contributions to the school benefit more. Is this the message that we want to send?

References

- Armstrong, J. S. 1980, "Teacher versus Learner Responsibility in Management Education," Wharton Marketing Department Working Paper.
- Armstrong, J. S. 1983, "Learner Responsibility in Management Education or Ventures into Forbidden Research (with commentary)," *Interfaces*, 2 (April), 26-38.
- Attiyeh, R. and K. G. Lumsden, 1972, "Some Modern Myths in Teaching Economics: The U.K. Experience," *American Economic Review*, 42, 429-433.
- Condry, J., 1977, "Enemies of Exploration: Self-initiated versus Other-initiated Learning," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 459-477.
- Dubin, R. and T. C. Taveggia, 1968, *The Teaching-Learning Paradox*. Center for Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon.
- Miller, D. W., 1978, "Dangers of Using Student Evaluations for Administrative Purposes," *Collegiate News and Views*, 2-3.
- Naftulin, Donald H.; J. E. Ware, Jr. and F. A. Donnelly, 1973, "The Doctor Fox Lecture: A Paradigm of Educational Seduction," *Journal of Medical Education*, 48, 630-635.
- Rodin, M. and B. Rodin, 1972, "Student Evaluations of Teachers," *Science*, 177, 1164-1166.
- Tough, Allen, 1982, *Intentional Changes*. Chicago: Follett.
- Zelby, L. W., 1974, "Student-faculty Evaluation," *Science*, 183, 1267-1270.

DEATHS

Paul D. Arias, a Ph.D. candidate in chemistry, died December 18 at the age of 31. He earned his B.A. in 1984 and his M.S. in 1987, both in chemistry at Penn, serving as a teaching assistant in 1984 and as a research fellow since 1985. Surviving are his parents, Dr. and Mrs. John Arias, and a brother.

Samuel D. Bedrosian, professor of electrical engineering, died January 12 at the age of 68. A 1942 graduate of SUNY Albany, he was an officer with the U.S. Army Signal Corps in World War II and a communications designer and section chief afterward, taking his master's from the Polytechnic Institute of New York in 1951. After experience with Burroughs Corporation as a systems engineer he took his Ph.D. at Penn in 1961 and joined the faculty as assistant professor in 1964. He became full professor in 1973, and in 1977 took the directorship of the SEAS-Wharton dual degree program. Among his honors was the 1976 Kabakjian Award of the A.S.A.

Dr. Bedrosian is survived by his wife Agnes, daughter Camille, son Gregory and a sister, Mary Bedrosian. Memorial contributions may be made to the Moore School of Electrical Engineering.

Margaret Minear Bissey, a retired managing editor of *Cancer*, the American Cancer Society journal edited at HUP, died December 24 at the age of 71. Editor Jonathan Rhoads called Mrs. Bissey the "bulwark of the editorial staff" during the 21-year-period of her service when it tripled in circulation and became influential in 50 countries worldwide. She is survived by her husband, Raymond, two daughters, Sherry Koch and Leslie Becker, and five grandchildren.

Cornell M. Dowlin, an emeritus professor of English who was on the faculty for 40 years before retiring in 1967, died December 28 at the age of 91. A native of Philadelphia, he graduated in 1921 from Penn, where he was a member of Phi Beta Kappa, and later received his master's and Ph.D. in English from the University. In addition to his scholarly work Dr. Dowlin edited for Penn's bicentennial in 1940 a guidebook, *The University of Pennsylvania today, its buildings, departments and work*. Surviving are his sons, Cornell M., Jr.,

and John S.; three grandchildren, three great-grandchildren and a sister.

Bernice Holden, 75, a retired Physical Plant custodian, died November 25. She is survived by a niece Gloria Helmsley.

Margaret Majer Kelly, 91, the first director of women's athletics at Penn, died January 6, after many years of ill health, at a convalescent home near Somers Point, New Jersey.

A beauty queen who graced the covers of several magazines in 1919 and the early 1920's, Margaret Majer was an accomplished swimmer and athlete who married Olympic rowing champion and construction magnate John B. Kelly, Sr., and went on to become a powerful force behind the prominent Philadelphia family. Mrs. Kelly was the mother of the late Princess Grace of Monaco and the late John B. Kelly, Jr., a Penn alumnus who became an Olympic rowing champion and president of the U.S. Olympic Committee.

She is survived by two daughters, Margaret K. Conlan and Elizabeth K. LeVine; 13 grandchildren, and 17 great-grandchildren.

James P. (Jamie) Ricciardelli, 39, production manager at the Annenberg Center, died December 17, 1989.

An alumnus of St. Joseph's College with a masters in theater from Villanova, Mr. Ricciardelli joined the Annenberg Center staff in 1974 as a production assistant, and served as building administrator and scheduling coordinator while rising to head the production department. He also gave theater workshops and directed productions for Penn Players.

He is survived by his mother, Mary; two sisters, Josephine Trimmer and Carol Glennon; a brother, Richard; and by his companion of 19 years, Kevin Harty, who contributed the following for publication, in fulfillment of Mr. Ricciardelli's request before he died:

"Diagnosed with AIDS in February, 1987, Jamie Ricciardelli continued to work and to travel extensively both here and abroad. He was also a founding member of We The People, the Philadelphia AIDS/ARC Coalition. He continued to work as an active board member of We The People until the onset of his final illness in September. He firmly believed that it was important for people with AIDS to get on

with their lives as soon after their diagnosis as possible.

"His last words were 'I don't bitch much. I don't complain,'" Mr. Karty added. Contributions in his memory may be made to the Philadelphia Zoo.

Tyrone (Bear) Robertson, a freshman majoring in mechanical engineering, died December 30 at the age of 18, of a gunshot wound he received as a bystander in at a fast-food restaurant in his hometown of Chester, Pa. A graduate of Chester High School, he was a star scholar-athlete who ranked fifth in his graduating class and was a member of his school's Hi-Q academic team as well as a heavyweight wrestler and Most Valuable Player of his football team. He was slated to play football for the Quakers.

A campus memorial service was held for Mr. Robertson January 11. He is survived by his parents, Ada and Paul Robert Sr., and his two brothers, Paul Jr. and Craig.

Joseph R. Roth, a senior majoring in economics in the College, died January 11 at the age of 21, at a rifle range in Philadelphia after a gunshot wound ruled to be self-inflicted.

A memorial service for Mr. Roth was held Sunday January 14 in Maplewood, N.J. He is survived by his parents Dr. Allan Roth and Mrs. Amy Roth and a brother Alex.

Dr. Charles Michael Weber, a Lindback-award winning emeritus professor of legal studies, died December 29 at the age of 78. Dr. Weber, a 1936 alumnus of Colgate, where he was Phi Beta Kappa, took his law degree at Cornell University. After wartime service in the U.S. Navy, he practiced law, taught at Hofstra, and was the first dean of the New England College in New Hampshire until 1947, when he joined Penn as assistant professor. He received the Lindback Award in 1960 and became emeritus professor in 1975. He co-authored the *Introduction to Law and the Legal Process* published in 1965 with a second edition issued in 1973.

He is survived by his wife, the former Ida Elizabeth Reinhold, daughters Gwendolyn Beth and Beatrice Anne, sons Michael Packard and Stephen Albert, five grandchildren and a brother, Frank.

Department of Public Safety

This report contains tallies of part 1 crimes, a listing of part 1 crimes against persons, and summaries of part 1 crimes in the five busiest sectors on campus where two or more incidents were reported between January 8, 1990 and January 14, 1990.

Total: Crimes Against Persons-0, Thefts-21, Burglaries-4, Attempted thefts of Auto-0, Thefts of Auto-1.

Date Time Reported Location Incident

38th to 39th; Spruce to Locust

01/08/90	1:06 AM	3800 Blk Locust	Auto taken
01/09/90	11:58 AM	Lot #14	Window broken/money taken
01/10/90	9:53 PM	Dining Commons	Knapsack and contents taken

37th to 38th; Locust to Walnut

01/10/90	4:29 PM	Bookstore	Books taken
01/11/90	7:16 AM	Bookstore	Knapsack, contents from unsecured locker
01/11/90	4:56 PM	Grad Sch of Ed	Jacket taken

32nd to 33rd; South to Walnut

01/08/90	9:55 AM	Franklin Field	Copper tubing taken
01/08/90	2:00 PM	Rittenhouse Lab	Walkman taken from unsecured room
01/12/90	6:22 PM	Hutchinson Gym	Watch taken/arrest

34th to 38th; Civic Center to Hamilton

01/08/90	10:13 AM	Medical School	Transcribing machine and files taken
01/08/90	4:23 PM	Richards Bldg	Radio taken from secured office
01/12/90	4:51 PM	Clinical Res bldg	Unattended purse and contents taken

38th to 40th; Baltimore to Spruce

01/08/90	3:30 PM	Pi Kappa Alpha	Personal items taken
01/08/90	4:23 PM	Pi Kappa Alpha	Personal items taken
01/10/90	4:18 PM	Alpha Epsilon Pi	Stereo equipment taken

Safety tip: If you are careless you may become car-less—take precautions. Many of the stolen cars are left unlocked, have windows open, or have the key left in the ignition. Don't help thieves to help themselves with your car—lock your vehicles.

18th District Crimes Against Persons

Schuylkill River to 49th Street, Market Street to Woodland Avenue
Reported crimes against persons from 12:01 AM December 18, 1989
to 11:59 December 31, 1990

Total: 18 incidents, 2 arrests

Date	Time Reported	Location	Offense/Weapon	Arrest
12/18/89	10:00 PM	4800 Hazel	Robbery/gun	No
12/19/89	9:00 AM	3000 Market	Agg Assault/bottle	No
12/19/89	11:04 AM	3400 Civic	Agg Assault/fists	Yes
12/20/89	4:39 AM	3400 Market	Robbery/strongarm	No
12/20/89	5:15 PM	4738 Kingsessing	Robbery/strongarm	No
12/20/89	9:42 PM	4000 Ludlow	Robbery/strongarm	Yes
12/21/89	2:19 AM	4600 Market	Robbery/gun	No
12/21/89	1:50 PM	4618 Baltimore	Robbery/strongarm	No
12/21/89	1:50 PM	4826 Baltimore	Robbery/bomb	No
12/22/89	4:39 AM	4000 Walnut	Robbery/gun	No
12/26/89	2:02 PM	3900 Chestnut	Robbery/gun	No
12/27/89	8:45 PM	200 S 45	Robbery/strongarm	No
12/27/89	11:30 PM	4100 Walnut	Robbery/gun	No
12/28/89	4:02 PM	4200 Pine	Robbery/strongarm	No
12/28/89	10:10 PM	3936 Market	Robbery/gun	No
12/28/89	11:24 PM	3810 Chestnut	Robbery/strongarm	No
12/29/89	4:45 PM	605 S. 47	Robbery/gun	No
12/29/89	7:15 PM	4729 Larchwood	Agg Assault/knife	No

Update

JANUARY AT PENN

EXHIBITS

12 *Made in the Image of*; recent paintings of Jeffrey Hunter Bailey; Gallery 3601, Christian Association; January 19, opening reception, 5:30-7:30 p.m. Through February 23.

ON STAGE

12 *Trivial Comedy for Serious People: The Importance of Being Earnest*; Oscar Wilde's comedy directed by Gavin Cameron-Webb; Zellerbach Theatre, Annenberg Center. Ticket information: Ext. 8-6791. (Philadelphia Drama Guild) Through February 4.

SPECIAL EVENTS

16 *Symposium on Contemporary Soviet Art*, Artist Ilya Kabakov and Jamey Gambrell of *Art in America*; 7-9 p.m., Room B-3, Meyerson Hall (Institute of Contemporary Art).

17 *Celebration of Benjamin Franklin's Birthday*; buffet 5-7:30 p.m., Faculty Club. Reservations: Ext. 8-4618 (Hospitality Services).

TALKS

18 *Relaxation Techniques—Dealing with Anxiety, Stress and Tension*; Frank Guarnaccia, F/SAP Staff Counselor; noon-1 p.m., 2nd floor, Bishop White Room, Houston Hall. Registration: Ext. 8-7910 (Faculty/Staff Assistance Program).

19 *Oxygen-Derived Free Radicals and the Endothelium in Myocardial Ischemia Reperfusion Injury*; Allan M. Lefer, department of physiology, Jefferson Medical College, Philadelphia; 12:15 p.m., Seminar Room, Room 1, ground level, John Morgan Building (Institute for Environmental Medicine).

Sex Determination in Men; Peter Goodfellow, Imperial Cancer Research Fund, London, England; 2 p.m., Wistar Auditorium, Wistar Institute (Wistar Institute).

23 *Choosing a Summer Camp for Your Child*; Karen Pollack, Coordinator, Child Care Resource Network; noon-1 p.m., 2nd floor, Ben Franklin Room, Houston Hall. Registration: Ext. 8-0313 (Child Care Resource Network).

Deadline: For Update: Mondays a week before each issue goes to press. Copy must be in writing (by mail, fax or e-mail, address below).

Almanac

3601 Locust Walk Philadelphia PA 19104-6224
(215) 898-5274 or 5275 FAX 898-9137
E-mail ALMANAC@A1.QUAKER

EDITOR
ASSOCIATE EDITOR
EDITORIAL ASSISTANT
STUDENT ASSISTANTS

Karen C. Gaines
Marguerite F. Miller
Margaret Ann Morris
Ashley M. Dupuy, Jung Y.
Sarah Kim, Melissa J. Musick,
Phuong Nguyen, William
Shraga, Lynn L. Westwater

ALMANAC ADVISORY BOARD: For the Faculty Senate, June Axinn, R.E. Davies, Charles D. Graham (Chair), Almarin Phillips, Lorraine Tulman and Vukan R. Vuchic; for the Administration, William Epstein; for Staff Assemblies, Deverie Pierce (A1), Irma Feldman (Librarians), Joseph Kane (A-3).