I. Introduction

The re-establishment of a Task Force on University Governance to build on the work of its predecessor was suggested by the President for the March 6, 1978 agreement which marked the end of the student sit-in. This suggestion was subsequently discussed by the Senate Advisory Committee and accepted in the name of the faculty. The composition of the Task Force was determined by the Steering Committee of the University Council, acting through a subcommittee consisting of one administrator, one faculty member, and one student. The members of the Task Force were selected by their respective constituencies. The formal charge to the Task Force and the membership of the Task Force are contained in Appendix I.

The 1978 Task Force was given two relatively distinct charges relating to University governance. The more immediate charge was to "review the status of the recommendations of the Task Force on University Governance which reported in 1970 and to consider governance issues posed by the agreements reached by the student and the Administration during the weekend of March 4-5, 1978." The other charge was to "consider the governance problems created by the likelihood that it will be necessary to shrink the size of the University." The Task Force began its work in late April of 1978. The initial discussions centered on the relations between the Trustees and the University. Members of the Task Force were selected by their respective constituencies. The 1978 agreement which marked the end of the student sit-in. This suggestion was almost all of the proposals. It was also clear that an item-by-item account of the year experiment in faculty and student membership on the Trustees was presented to the Trustees at their meeting of June 8, 1978. The fall and spring semesters of 1978-79 were devoted to the review of the remainder of the 1970 Report and to discussion of the governance process. Section II of this report is devoted to an examination of the 1970 Report. Section III contains the results of the discussion of governance processes at the University.

II. Review of the August 21, 1970 Report of the Task Force on University Governance

The 1970 Report recommended that the members of the faculty and students be named as non-voting liaison members on most committees. No liaison members will be selected for the Audit Committee. One undergraduate student and one graduate/professional student will be selected for the Committee on Student Life. Liaison members should be selected each year before the end of the spring semester. They should assume their responsibilities effective June 1.

2. Liaison Membership on Trustee Committees

The 1970 Report recommended that the members of the faculty and students be named as non-voting liaison members for each Committee of the Trustees, to attend at least three meetings per year for informational purposes. Although the meetings of the Trustees and of the Trustee Committees have been more open in the past few years, the recommendation for liaison membership has not been implemented in any effective way.

It appears to us that specific liaison membership on Trustee Committees might provide a very effective conduit for information between the Trustees and the rest of the University community. However, it is obvious that four liaison members may be excessive for some of the smaller Trustee Committees.

We recommend that faculty members and students be named as non-voting liaison members of appropriate Committees for the first two years that Trustees are made. In this regard it is important that faculty members and students recognize that there will inevitably be instances in which a Committee of the Trustees will find it essential to meet without the presence of the liaison members. Correspondingly, it is important that the Committee members make special efforts to include the liaison members as fully in the Committee operation as possible. In view of the fact that this is an untried mechanism it appears useful, at least in the first year, to limit the number of liaison members to no more than one faculty member and one student. No liaison members will be selected for the Audit Committee. One undergraduate student and one graduate/professional student will be selected for the Committee on Student Life.

Liaison members should be selected each year before the end of the spring semester. They should assume their responsibilities effective June 1. The initial set of liaison members should be selected during the spring semester of 1979 to begin service on June 1, 1979.

Liaison members will be selected by a group consisting of the Chairmen of the Trustees, the President, and the Chairmen of the Steering Committee of the University Council. Selection will be made from nominations presented by the appropriate constituencies. Each liaison member will be selected for a term of one year, but may serve continuously for as long as three years. The distribution of undergraduate students and graduate/professional students will be determined by the Trustees before the nominations are made. In the event that the Chairmen of the Steering Committee are uncertain of the priorities among the nominations presented or is unable to honor those priorities, it is expected that he [in this report the term “he” will be understood to mean “he” or “she,” whichever is appropriate] will consult with the appropriate constituency organization.

Liaison members of the Committees of the Trustees will be expected to report to the appropriate constituencies and to the University Council. It shall be the responsibility of each constituency to develop mechanisms for reporting on the activities of the Trustee Committees. A special meeting of the University Council in the spring semester of each year shall be devoted to reports from faculty and student liaison members.

*The liaison members selected for 1979-1980 will be distributed as indicated below:

Committee on:

Academic Policy—1 faculty member, 1 undergraduate student
Student Life—I faculty member, 1 undergraduate student,
1 graduate/professional student
Budget and Finance—I faculty member, 1 undergraduate student
Facilities and Campus Planning—I faculty member, 1 graduate/professional student
Resources—I faculty member, 1 undergraduate student
University Responsibility—I faculty member, 1 graduate/professional student
External Affairs—I faculty member, 1 graduate/professional student

3. Informal Meetings Among Trustees, Faculty, and Students

The 1970 Report recommended that the Trustees actively develop additional opportunities for informal meetings between its membership and the faculty, student body, and others. This recommendation does not appear to have been adequately implemented.

Although social interchange between individual Trustees and other members of the University faculty would be beneficial in stimulating understanding and developing, under comfortable cir-
The paragraphs above represent the views of the majority of the members of the Task Force on the selection and student representation on the Trustees. However, a minority of the members are convinced that the advantages of a one-year experiment with student representation on the Trustees outweigh the disadvantages. A summary of their views appears as Appendix III.

B. The Administrative Function

In the interval since the 1970 Report many changes have been made in the organization of the Administration. While some of these changes followed or were consistent with the recommendations made in the 1970 Report, other changes were in directions not envisioned by the 1970 Report. As a result, the existing administrative structure is not a linear combination of the structure which the 1970 Task Force studied and the structure it recommended. Accordingly, it has not always been possible to make simple recommendations on implementing proposals in the 1970 Report.

1. Organization of the Office of the Provost

The 1970 Task Force recommended that a Senior Associate Provost and an Associate Provost for Medical Affairs be established. It also recommended that the then current posts of Vice Provost for Student Affairs, for Research, and for Planning be continued. In the past few years the Provost's Office has consisted of the Provost, the Associate Provost for Academic Planning, the Vice President for Health Affairs (a Dean), the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs and University Life, and the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research. Currently Vice Provosts for University Life and for Research are being named to replace the two Vice Provosts mentioned above.

The Task Force discussed the organization of undergraduate studies and University Life and consulted with the Provost-elect on the organization of his office. Although we did not reach a clear consensus on either subject, it is not obvious that the new organization is inferior to any other which has been discussed. The Vice President for Health Affairs continues to be an Associate Provost for Health Affairs, and the other posts are not greatly different from the recommendations made in the 1970 Task Force Report. It appears that the precise details of staff assignment should be left to the judgement of the Provost who will, after all, be properly held responsible for the success or failure of his Office.

2. Associate Deans

The 1970 Task Force recommended that Associate Deans with divisional responsibilities be appointed in large schools. This recommendation appears to be the most pertinent now for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, which was originally constituted from a wide spectrum of disciplines and has since been broadened even further by the partial incorporation of the Graduate Biomedical Groups. Although concern has been expressed (in, for example, the dissent which accompanied this recommendation in the 1970 Report) that appointment of Associate Deans responsible for cohesive subgroups within a large faculty might hamper the development of cohesiveness across a wide spectrum of disciplines, the organizational advantages of such appointments may outweigh the possible fragmenting effects. The Faculty of Arts and Sciences is now firmly established, and it is now appropriate for them to give this option serious consideration.

3. Title of Dean

The 1970 Task Force recommended that the title of Dean be reserved for Deans of a Faculty. At the present time, no Deans except Deans of Faculties exist.

We recommend that this exclusive use of the title of Dean continue, and not be blurred by careless usage, particularly for functions at the Associate and Assistant Dean level.

4. Responsibility of a Department Chairman

The 1970 Task Force emphasized that the ideal arrangement in an academic department is one in which the Chairman holds his position of leadership because of the confidence his colleagues as well as his administrative superiors have in his integrity, judgment, and aspirations toward excellence. The Report pointed out that the Chairman's responsibility to the Department as a collectivity is an important aspect of the promotion of a sense of collegial responsibility for the educational enterprise, and recommended that the official responsibilities of Department Chairmen be broadened. We do not recommend that faculty and students be appointed to the Trustees.
reappointment. A recommended replacement for the present charge appears as Appendix IV.

5. Terms of Office of Academic Administrators
The 1970 Task Force recommended that subject to earlier termination at the pleasure of the appointing authority:

a. The term of office of the President should be a single term of twelve years.

b. The term of office of the Provost should be seven years, subject to a single renewal for a second term of five years after review.

c. The term of office of a Dean should be seven years, subject to a single renewal for a second term of five years after review.

d. The term of office of a Departmental Chairman should be five years, subject to a single renewal for a second term of three years after review.

The Task Force believes that these are useful guidelines which set reasonable outside limits to administrative service. The guidelines should be set down explicitly and the reviews specified should be defined and routinely performed. Specific review procedures are now being developed by the Senate Committee on Consultation and the Administration.

6. Integration of Undergraduate Education
The 1970 Task Force recommended the integration of undergraduate education at the University of Pennsylvania and the establishment of a Faculty of Arts and Sciences which would have responsibility for all undergraduate degrees. Although a Faculty of Arts and Sciences has been established, no integration of undergraduate education has occurred. We believe that the integration of undergraduate education deserves the most serious study. We recommend that the Steering Committee of University Council, in consultation with the Deans of the undergraduate schools, promptly establish a select panel to consider the integration of undergraduate education. The panel should include knowledgeable representatives from all Schools which are significantly involved in undergraduate education. The panel should assess the advantages and disadvantages of integrating undergraduate education, and report its findings and conclusions to the University Council.

7. Student Membership on Committees
The 1970 Task Force recommended that as a general norm each committee of the University and of its schools have at least two student members and as many as twenty-five percent. Although it is evident that this recommendation has been generally implemented at the University level, the evidence of implementation at the school or departmental level is not readily available. We recommend that the Provost regularly remind the Deans of the desirability of including students on Committees, and that the Deans in turn remind their Chairmen. The Chairmen and the Deans should regularly report, to the appropriate Dean and to the Provost respectively, on their accomplishments in meeting this guideline.

8. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness in Promotion Consideration
The 1970 Task Force recommended that students' opinion on the effectiveness of teachers be taken into account in the consideration of promotions at the department and higher levels. It also recommended that reviewing authorities not approve a promotion unless they are satisfied that both the procedures used to collect and the documentation of student opinion. Teaching performance has been given much greater emphasis since the report of the 1970 Task Force. Evidence of student opinion is now routinely required by reviewing authorities at the School and University levels. It is important to assure that this certification of evidence not be reduced to a purely pro forma exercise, and that Departments treat teaching ability as a serious component of qualification for promotion, particularly to tenure. Regular inquiries to the Department from the Dean regarding customary practice may be beneficial.

9. Advising and Counselling
The 1970 Task Force recommended that the question of the renovation and revitalization of the system of academic advising be the subject of a detailed study. It further recommended that Departments provide adequate counselling for all students served by their courses.

While the advising and counselling in some areas appears to be nearly adequate, on the average it is at an unacceptably low level. If the University is to prosper and attract and hold excellent students they must be provided with appropriate academic services. We recommend that the advising and counselling system be made the subject of an extensive study, the results and conclusions of which should be given wide dissemination. Furthermore, the responsibility for coordinating advising and counselling services should be assigned either to the Council of Undergraduate Deans or to an appropriate Vice Provost.

C. Additional Recommendations
The 1970 Report contained several recommendations on the Faculty Senate and Student Government, which are also part of the governance at the University of Pennsylvania. One of these recommendations, which has not been implemented, is that the Student Government be formally recognized in the Statutes of the Corporation. We believe that this is still a reasonable recommendation. We recommend that a new Article VII be added to the Statutes:

Student Government

1. Students of the University may adopt forms of student governance by referenda open to all fully matriculated students in the school(s) in question, or by other democratic means which are broadly representative.

2. Such associations shall have the authority to discuss and express their views upon any matter which they deem to be of general University interest. These associations shall adopt rules governing their operation and procedures for the administration of activities and functions delegated to them. In addition they shall have the power to make recommendations to the Council and Administration and to solicit information from them.

III. Governance Problems Created By Shrinking Resources
In a period of generally increasing resources, the costs of improving existing programs or developing new programs can be taken from the added resources. While there is often vigorous debate about which program should be improved or developed, this debate is tempered by the realization that the ultimate decision need not require significant sacrifices from the participants. On the other hand, in a period of shrinking resources, any improvement or new development must come at the expense of existing programs. Any discussion of new or improved programs must then inevitably assume, either explicitly or implicitly, that necessary resources will be reallocated from within the University rather than derived from external sources. Under these circumstances the debate on program development can become undesirably vigorous.

There is a basic conflict in the making of important decisions, particularly those dealing with reallocation of resources, between the protection of the continued viability of different parts of the University on the one hand and the involvement of the various constituents in the decision-making process on the other hand. Public decision-making may require public discussion of the possibility that a given program will be curtailed or abolished. Even the possibility that this will happen is often extremely detrimental to the recruiting of both students and faculty and to the retention of the best staff members. Any announcement setting in motion a public deliberative process to determine which of a number of activities will bear the brunt of a specific expenditure reduction is likely to injure them all.

Since the appropriate approach for each difficult decision is likely to be different from all those appropriate for previous decisions, it is not possible to develop an all-purpose prescription or even a general outline. The quality of decisions will continue to depend primarily on the ability of those who must make them; the acceptance of difficult but correct decisions will continue to depend on the basic intelligence of the University. However, a few observations and recommendations may be helpful.

1. The Task Force on Governance recognizes that actual decisions on reallocation of resources must always be made and will usually be formulated by administrative officers of the University. Indeed, one of the essential attributes of a good administrator in an era of limited resources is the ability to make sound decisions on reallocation. It is imperative that the governance process not become so cumbersome that tentative decisions are endlessly debated while necessary action is deferred.

2. The Task Force is convinced of the desirability of obtaining advice on major decisions as widely as possible. Such advice, at least on occasion, may result in unending new alternatives or unanticipated pitfalls and may thus play an essential role in the formulation of the decision itself. Even where no new insight is provided by an advisory review mechanism, the review itself can help justify necessary decisions which might otherwise prove corrosive to the University Community.

3. It seems clear to the Task Force that the views of various constituencies must be considered in the decision-making process. There are some cases in which public debate may not be harmful and may even be helpful. Public discussion is clearly applicable to some important areas in which a particular unit of the University has already been identified for assessment with respect to its future role in the University. Such public discussion is particularly necessary where there is prima facie evidence that the activity is not being conducted at a level which is consistent with the University's objectives and aspirations, or where the prospect is that a choice will have to be made between diminishing or terminating support for the activity or significantly increasing the allocation of resources to it. The decision to close the School of Allied Medical Professions is a recent example of a case in which wide public discussion was necessary.
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On the other hand, public discussion may simply not be feasible in many situations. Looking backwards, it seems clear that the proposed economies in the Division of Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics, which led to the decision to drop ice hockey from varsity status, illustrate the situation where administrative decision-making without wide public University consultation is in the best interest of the University.

It may not be easy as particular cases emerge to distinguish between the two kinds of situations. However, it is the responsibility of administrators who must make decisions to be aware of the impact of those decisions on all constituencies of the University and to consult as widely as possible, particularly where the impact on the University may be large.

4. The present Advisory Committees and review mechanisms appear to be completely adequate for most circumstances. There are many bodies already in existence which could be assigned further roles in this process if necessary, ranging from standing committees of University Council to the full Council itself. It is not obvious that new advisory bodies and review apparatus would be more effective. It is clear that no advisory body can function effectively if its advice is not sought.

5. Advisory Committees and review mechanisms must be more widely recognized before they are called upon for critical judgments, rather than materializing in an ad hoc fashion to justify a predetermined approach to a particular problem. Frequent efforts should be made to keep the community aware of the review mechanisms which exist. In particular, the roles of the Budget Committee and of the Educational Planning Committee need to be publicized.

6. More public information on fiscal problems might sensitize the community to pending administrative decisions. One approach would be for the Administration to keep the University Council fully informed about fiscal realities and to attempt to solicit general advice on priorities and on decision criteria.

7. It may be useful to have a small group available to provide advice on what advisory mechanisms might be most appropriate in particular situations. Such a group would advise only on procedures, never on the substance of the decision itself. The Senate Committee on Consultation might be called upon to perform this service. When an Administrator (President, Provost, Dean, etc.) was considering an explicit decision he could, if he so desired, ask the advice of the committee. The group might also wish in addition to seek such advice from any constituency which he believed might be particularly affected.

Most decisions on advisory mechanisms would be made without the involvement of this consultative committee. However, in a few difficult situations its advice on procedures might be very helpful. The committee, in order to function effectively, would have to be aware of the consequences of potential decisions for various University constituencies.

8. It is conceivable that circumstances might arise under which the Administration would decide that the present array of advisory mechanisms were not adequate. The Educational Planning Committee, which undoubtedly would have already provided advice on any major issue, might not then be an appropriate group to make an independent review. In such a case, the Administration might wish to seek advice from an existing committee or from a new one with members who had prior exposure to the University community. We believe that the Steering Committee of University Council can best fill this role. It is obviously a very demanding one; however, the need for reallocation of major decisions would occur relatively infrequently. In addition, the Steering Committee should reserve the right to decline any request which the Administration's makes for such a review.

9. We have not addressed the questions of implicit decisions on program reallocations, which may in practice be of greater significance than any explicit decisions. Insofar as these implicit decisions are not recognized it is of course impossible to utilize any formal review apparatus. It is therefore essential that administrators recognize the implications of all decisions they make and try to involve the constituencies most likely to be affected in those decisions which are potentially disruptive at such a stage as possible.

It is the responsibility of administrators to make decisions on allocation and reallocation. Their performance in this critical area provides a basis on which their performance in office must ultimately be judged. Since the advisory and review mechanisms cannot assume any significant portion of this responsibility, it is important that these mechanisms neither unduly delay nor hamper necessary decisions. However, the ultimate vitality of the University depends on acceptance of these decisions by the community. The administrator's discriminating use of advisory mechanisms and thorough understanding of the impact his decisions will make on all segments of the community can both assist in the development of wise decisions and ease the community's difficulty in accepting them.

Appendix I

Charge to the Task Force on University Governance

The immediate responsibility of the Task Force will be to review the status of the recommendations of the Task Force on University Governance which reported in 1970 and to consider governance issues posed by the agreements reached by students and administration during the weekend of March 4-5, 1978. Specifically, the new Task Force is asked to consider those recommendations of the original Task Force which have not been implemented and to give its advice on whether these proposals should be dropped or adopted. In addition, the Task Force is requested to give its advice on issues that are referred to it by the Steering Committee of University Council. Among these matters, the Task Force is requested to turn its attention first to the proposals relating to the role of faculty and students in the work of the trustees. Of these proposals which originated both in the 1970 Task Force and in the sit-in agreement of one-year 객실 in faculty and student membership should be reported upon as soon as possible. These responsibilities should be discharged by the end of this semester.

The other major charge of the new Task Force is to consider the governance problems created by the likelihood that it will be necessary to shrink the size of the University. The group should review the procedures that were followed in recent efforts to reduce or phase out academic and non-academic programs including the School of Education, the School of Allied Medical Professions, professional theater at Annenberg, and certain intercollegiate athletic programs. The purpose of this review should be to determine whether procedures can be developed that will afford adequate opportunity for participation by students and faculty in the choices that will have to be made without providing veto power by the groups most directly affected. It is recognized that this work will have to continue in the fall on this portion of the charge.

—March, 1978

Task Force on Governance

Administration

Britton Harris (SPUP)
William G. Owen (Dev. Office)

Faculty

Peter A. Cassileth (Medicine)
Peter Conn (English)
Noyes E. Leech (Law)
Michael L. Wachter (Economics)
Walter D. Wales (Physics)

Students

Philip A. Carlson (Wh. '81)
Philip J. Kellman (GRF '80)
David D. Langlët (FAS '79)
Randall C. Marks (Observer) (Law '80)

Trustee

Paul F. Miller, Jr.

Ex Officio

President/Provost—Martin Meyerson/Eliot Stellar/
Vartan Gregorian
Chairman of the Faculty Senate—Irving Kravis
Head of the Undergraduate Assembly—Mark D. Lerner
Secretary of the Corporation—Janis L. Somerville (Observer)
(Effective September 15, 1978)

Staff

Barbara B. Wiesel (Office of the Secretary)

Appendix II

Appendix II contains a statement of each of the recommendations of the 1970 Report of the Task Force on University Governance (hereafter 1970 Report). Following each statement is an analysis of the present status of the recommendation, comments by the new Task Force, and a specific recommendation, if appropriate, by the new Task Force.

1. The 1970 Report recommended that the basic structure be retained under which the University of Pennsylvania is governed by the Trustees. This structure has been maintained.

2. The 1970 Report recommended that a total of six Young Alumni Trustees be added to the Trustees, with two being elected each year for three-year terms. This recommendation has been partially implemented; two Young Alumni Trustees are elected every three years for three-year terms.

It appears that the addition of young alumni to the Trustees has provided a useful point of contact with those alumni who are just embarking on professional careers. The purpose is probably most effectively satisfied if the Young Alumni Trustees begin their terms very
soon after graduation. There may be some advantage to making terms overlap, so that some continuity is provided. This goal can be achieved by increasing the number of Young Alumni Trustees. However, care must be taken to assure that the efforts of the Trustees are not diluted by the addition of young alumni who, while well-intentioned, are at this stage in their careers devote the time or effort necessary to make major contributions to the work of the Trustees.

We recommend that a Young Alumni Trustee from the undergraduate schools be elected every second year and that a Young Alumni Trustee from the graduate and professional schools be elected in alternate years. Each Young Alumni Trustee would be elected for a term of three years. Nominations would be made by the Nominating Committee of the General Alumni Society from members of the current year's graduating class of the previous year's graduating class. Election would be by members of those classes. Special efforts should be made to provide orientation so that the newly-elected Young Alumni Trustee can quickly understand the operations of the Trustees.

3. The 1970 Report recommended that the Trustees develop a formal mechanism for terminating the trusteeship of an individual who becomes unable to discharge the responsibilities of his position. Current statutes provide that absence from three consecutive meetings may constitute resignation; however, no formal mechanism exists.

The Task Force found no reason to believe that the current informal mechanisms are not working satisfactorily. Accordingly, no further action is recommended at this time.

4. The 1970 Report recommended that vacancies on the Trustees be promptly filled. It further recommended that the Nominating Committee develop mechanisms to solicit formally suggestions for potential Trustees from all the constituencies of the University. The most recent action by the present Chairman of the Nominating Committee of the Trustees have actively solicited recommendations about possible candidates for Trustee membership.

Overall, the present mechanism appears to be working satisfactorily. It is, however, a mechanism which can easily be neglected.

We recommend that the Office of the Secretary continue to solicit suggestions from the University Community including notifications in the Almanac.

5. The 1970 Report recommended that a continuing effort be made to broaden the membership of the Trustees to achieve diversity. It appears that this has been a continuing effort, within the constraints of the terms of Trustees, and that the Trustees share the concern of the Task Force.

6. The 1970 Report recommended that the Trustees develop a formal mechanism for dealing with questions of conflict of interest concerning its members. We understand that a new policy is being drafted by the present Chairman of the Nominating Committee of the Trustees have actively solicited recommendations about possible candidates for Trustee membership.

We recommend that the Office of the Secretary continue to solicit suggestions from the University Community including notifications in the Almanac.

7. The 1970 Report recommended that two members of the faculty and two students be named as non-voting liaison members for each Committee of the Trustees, to attend at least three meetings per year for informational purposes. Although the meetings of the Trustees and of the Trustee Committees have been more open in the past few years, the recommendation for liaison membership has not been implemented in any effective way.

It appears to us that specific liaison membership on Trustee Committees might provide a very effective conduit for information between the Trustees and the rest of the University Community. However, it is obvious that four liaison members may be excessive for some of the smaller Trustee Committees.

We recommend that faculty members and students be named as non-voting liaison members for appropriate Committees of the Trustees for informational purposes. Since this concept is as yet untested, it is important that it be approached carefully and cautiously if it is to be implemented effectively. In this regard it is important that faculty members and students recognize that there will inevitably be instances in which a Committee of the Trustees will find it essential to meet without the presence of the liaison members. Correspondingly, it is important that the Committee members make special efforts to include the liaison members as fully in the Committee operation as possible. Liaison members should be selected each year before the end of the spring semester by a group consisting of the Chairman of the Trustees, the President, and the Chairman of the Steering Committee of University Council. Selection will be made from nominations presented by the appropriate constituencies. It is expected that the Chairman of the Steering Committee of University Council will return to the appropriate constituency if he is uncertain of its priorities or unable to honor them. The student representation (the proportional representation of graduates and undergraduates) will be determined prior to the selection. Liaison members of the Committees of the Trustees will be expected to report to the appropriate constituencies and the University Council in the spring semester of each year, or more frequently if useful.

8. The 1970 Report recommended that the role and effectiveness of the various advisory boards be reviewed continually by the Trustees and by their appropriate committees. The Trustees have initiated a process of inviting the Boards of Overseers to make formal reports to the Trustees, and have moved toward greater involvement through appointment of Trustees to the Boards.

9. The 1970 Report recommended that the Trustees actively develop the opportunities for informal meetings between its membership and the faculty, student body, and others. This recommendation does not appear to have been adequately implemented.

Although social interchange between individual Trustees and other members of the University family would be beneficial in stimulating understanding and developing, under comfortable circumstances, acquaintanceships which might be of great value in more stressful situations, it seems unreasonable to place the burden of initiating such interchanges directly with the Trustees, who usually are concerned with much more pressing business. It is much more reasonable to assign this responsibility directly to the Office of the Secretary, which not only has the overall task of liaison with the Trustees, but also has the support staff necessary to implement and maintain a sequence of informal meetings.

We recommend that additional opportunities for informal meetings between members of the Trustees and the faculty, student body, and others be developed as needs are identified. We believe that the primary responsibility for arranging such meetings would be assigned most logically to the Office of the Secretary, acting at the request of various University constituencies.

10. The 1970 Report recommended that the Trustees codify the procedure for the selection and election of a new President. Although a procedure was approved by Council, the Trustees have deferred action.

There appears to be no reason to delay codifying the procedure. There is probably a great deal of advantage in codifying procedures at a time when they are not urgently needed.

We recommend that the Trustees codify the procedure for the selection and election of a new President:

When it becomes necessary to select a new President, the Executive Board of the Trustees shall constitute a joint trustee-faculty-student committee to nominate a slate of candidates to the Trustees. The faculty members shall be appointed by the Advisory Committee of the Senate. The student members shall be appointed by analogous procedures evolved by the respective student groups.

11. The 1970 Report recommended that the academic Vice Presidencies for Engineering Affairs and for Medical Affairs be ended. The Vice Presidency for Engineering Affairs has been discontinued, while the Vice Presidency for Medical (Health) Affairs has been continued.

Although the title of Vice President has been retained in the Health Affairs area, the evolution of the position itself has brought its function very close to that of the "Associate Provost for Medical Affairs" which was recommended by the 1970 Task Force. There do not appear to be strong reasons for changing the form of the title, particularly since the present title does have some advantages in extra-University relationships.

12. The 1970 Report recommended the establishment of two posts of Associate Provost; a Senior Associate Provost and an Associate Provost for Medical Affairs. Neither has been formally established.

The present Associate Provost seems to be evolving toward the concept envisioned in the original recommendation for a Senior Associate Provost. In the absence of any other Associate Provost the "senior" designation is unnecessary.

13. The 1970 Report recommended that the present (1970) Vice Provosts dealing with Student Affairs, Research, and Planning be continued. These posts have been changed considerably since the 1970 Report.

The present plans for the Provost's staff include Vice Provosts for University Life and for Research. While we have not been able to reach a consensus on the "best" assignments for the Vice Provosts, it is not obvious that the proposed organization is inferior to any other which has been discussed. The effectiveness of the office in any event depends more on the particular incumbents and the use to which the Provost puts their talents than it will on the details of the organizational structure.
reappointment. A recommended replacement for the present charges appears as Appendix IV.

5. Terms of Office of Academic Administrators

The 1970 Task Force recommended that subject to earlier termination at the pleasure of the appointing authority:

a. The term of office of the President should be a single term of twelve years.

b. The term of office of the Provost should be seven years, subject to a single renewal for a second term of five years after review.

c. The term of office of a Dean should be seven years, subject to a single renewal for a second term of five years after review.

d. The term of office of a Departmental Chairman should be five years, subject to a single renewal for a second term of three years after review.

The Task Force believes that these are useful guidelines which set reasonable outer limits to administrative service. The guidelines should be set down explicitly and the reviews specified should be defined and routinely performed. Specific review procedures are now being developed by the Senate Committee on Consultation and the Administration.

6. Integration of Undergraduate Education

The 1970 Task Force recommended the integration of undergraduate education at the University of Pennsylvania and the establishment of a Faculty of Arts and Sciences which would have responsibility for all undergraduate degrees. Although a Faculty of Arts and Sciences has been established, no integration of undergraduate education has occurred. We believe that the integration of undergraduate education deserves the most serious study.

We recommend that the Steering Committee of University Council, in consultation with the Deans of the undergraduate schools, promptly establish a select panel to consider the integration of undergraduate education. The panel should include knowledgeable representatives from all Schools which are significantly involved in undergraduate education. The panel should assess the advantages and disadvantages of integrating undergraduate education, and report its findings and conclusions to the University Council.

7. Student Membership on Committees

The 1970 Task Force recommended that as a general norm each committee of the University and of its schools have at least two student members and as many as twenty-five percent. Although it is evident that this recommendation has been generally implemented at the University level, the evidence of implementation at the school or departmental level is not readily available.

We recommend that the Provost regularly remind the Deans of the desirability of including students on Committees, and that the Deans in turn remind their Chairmen. The Chairmen and the Deans should regularly report, to the appropriate Dean and to the Provost respectively, on their accomplishments in meeting this guideline.

8. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness in Promotion Consideration

The 1970 Task Force recommended that students' opinion on the effectiveness of teachers be taken into account in the consideration of promotions at the department and higher levels. It also recommended that reviewing authorities not approve a promotion unless they are satisfied with the procedures used to collect and the documentation of student opinion.

Teaching performance has been given much greater emphasis since the report of the 1970 Task Force. Evidence of student opinion is now routinely required by reviewing authorities at the School and University levels. It is important to assure that this certification of evidence not be reduced to a purely pro forma exercise, and that Departments treat teaching ability as a serious component of qualification for promotion, particularly to tenure. Regular inquiries to the Department from the Dean regarding customary practice may be beneficial.

9. Advising and Counselling

The 1970 Task Force recommended that the question of the renovation and revitalization of the system of academic advising be the subject of a detailed study. It further recommended that Departments provide adequate counselling for all students served by their courses.

While the advising and counselling in some areas appears to be nearly adequate, on the average it is at an unacceptably low level. If the University is to prosper and attract and hold excellent students this system must be improved. We recommend that the advising and counselling system be made the subject of an extensive study, the results and conclusions of which should be given wide dissemination. Furthermore, the responsibility for coordinating advising and counselling services should be assigned either to the Council of Undergraduate Deans or to an appropriate Vice Provost.

C. Additional Recommendations

The 1970 Report contained several recommendations on the Faculty Senate and Student Government, which are also part of the governance at the University of Pennsylvania and of which has not been implemented, is that the Student Government be formally recognized in the Statutes of the Corporation. We believe that this is still a reasonable recommendation.

We recommend that a new Article VII be added to the Statutes:

Student Government
1. Students of the University may adopt forms of student governance by referendum open to all fully matriculated students in the school(s) in question, or by other democratic means which are broadly representative.

2. Such associations shall have the authority to discuss and express their views upon any matter which they deem to be of general University importance, and to propose rules, regulations, and procedures for the administration of activities and functions delegated to them. In addition they shall have the power to make recommendations to the Council and Administration and to solicit information from them.

III. Governance Problems Created By Shrinking Resources

In a period of generally increasing resources, the costs of improving existing programs or developing new programs can be taken from the added resources. While there is often vigorous debate about which program should be improved or developed, this debate is tempered by the realization that the ultimate decision need not require significant sacrifices from the participants. On the other hand, when a period of shrinking resources occurs in a period of unchanged resources, any improvement or new development must come at the expense of existing programs. Any discussion of new or improved programs must then inevitably assume, either explicitly or implicitly, that necessary resources will be reallocated from within the University rather than derived from supplementary funds. Under these circumstances the debate on program development can become undesirably vigorous.

There is a basic conflict in the making of important decisions, particularly those dealing with reallocation of resources, between the protection of the continued viability of different parts of the University on the one hand and the involvement of the various constituencies in the decision-making process on the other hand. Public decision-making may require public discussion of the possibility that a given program will be curtailed or abolished. Even the possibility that this will happen is often extremely detrimental to the recruiting of both students and faculty and to the retention of the best staff members. Any announcement setting in motion a public deliberative process to determine which of a number of activities will bear the brunt of a specific expenditure reduction is likely to injure them all.

Since the appropriate approach for each difficult decision is likely to be different from all those appropriate for previous decisions, it is not possible to develop an all-purpose prescription or even a general outline. The quality of decisions will continue to depend primarily on the ability of those who must make them; the acceptance of difficult but correct decisions will continue to depend on the basic intelligence of the University. However, a few observations and recommendations may be helpful.

1. The Task Force on Governance recognizes that actual decisions on reallocation of resources must always be made and will usually be formulated by administrative officers at the University. The essential attributes of a good administrator in an era of limited resources is the ability to make sound decisions on reallocation. It is imperative that the governance process not become so cumbersome that tentative decisions are endlessly debated while necessary action is deferred.

2. The Task Force is convinced of the desirability of obtaining advice on major decisions as widely as possible. Such advice, at least on occasion, may result in uncovering new alternatives or unanticipated pitfalls and may thus play an essential role in the formulation of the decision itself. Even where no new insight is provided by an advisory review mechanism, the review itself can help justify necessary decisions which might otherwise prove corrosive to the University Community.

3. It seems clear to the Task Force that the views of various constituencies must be considered in the decision-making process. There are some cases in which public debate may not be harmful and may even be helpful. Public discussion is clearly appropriate in instances in which a particular unit of the University has already been identified for assessment with respect to its future role in the University. Such public discussion is particularly necessary where there is prima facie evidence that the activity is not being conducted at a level which is consistent with the University's objectives and aspirations, or where the prospect is that a choice will have to be made between diminishing or terminating support for the activity or significantly increasing the allocation of resources to it. The decision to close the School of Allied Medical Professions is a recent example of a case in which wide public discussion was necessary.
31. The 1970 Report recommended that the new Academic Planning Committee and the related administrative officer be called the University Planning Committee and the Vice Provost for University Planning. The committee has been named the Educational Planning Committee, and at the present no Vice Provost for University Planning is contemplated.

While the present name is not identical to the one suggested in the 1970 Report, the Educational Planning Committee appears to be serving the function envisioned by the 1970 Task Force. However, the absence of an officer in the Provost's Office with a specific assignment in the area of planning is distressing. It is essential, in the reassignment of responsibilities within the Provost's Office, that this function not be overlooked.

32. The 1970 Report recommended that the University Planning Committee be specifically authorized and required to conduct an independent periodic assessment of the standing of each of our various academic groups.

The review process, as applied to academic groups within the University, appears to be operational. This process includes participation by the Educational Planning Committee, the Provost's Office, and the relevant Dean. Both internal and external panels are used to facilitate these reviews.

33. The 1970 Report recommended that consultative procedures in which a consultative committee independently recommends a slate of nominees be employed for the selection of Provost, Associate Provost, Vice Provosts, and Deans, and that procedures involving advisory committees but permitting greater administrative discretion be employed for other posts.

It also advised that a small Standing Committee on Consultation (the Chairman, Past Chairman, and Chairman-Elect of the Senate) be available for advice on consultative procedures. The consultative procedures recommended are now part of the Bylaws of the University Council (April, 1977). The Standing Committee on Consultation exists and does advise on consultative procedures.

Although there has been some controversy over the application of these procedures, all recent normal appointments in the Provost's area, including the Associate Provost and the Provost, have been made in this manner. In addition, all of the current set of Deans were so selected. The mechanism does not appear to have presented serious problems except in those cases in which the responsibilities of the position were not well-defined. The best solution to this difficulty might be to reach a full understanding of the responsibilities of an office before filling it.

We reaffirm the recommendation for independent search processes and advisory committees and believe they will, on balance, be of great benefit to the University.

34. The 1970 Report recommended that reports of consultative committees, advisory groups, and the Standing Committee on Consultation should be as full as appropriate and should be widely circulated. This recommendation has not been widely implemented.

Faith in the consultative process (and consequent confidence in the incumbent) can best be established by open publication of relevant information in a journal of record.

We recommend that the charge to each consultative committee include the requirement that a final report, including the general nature of the pool of candidates, explicit or implicit restrictions on the search process, and the statement of whether the candidate selected was on the committee's slate, be published promptly in the Almanac. We further recommend that the Chairman of the Senate, in his reports in the Almanac, report both on the activity or lack thereof of advisory panels and on the actions of the Standing Committee on Consultation.

35. The 1970 Report recommended that, as a general norm, each committee of the University and of its Schools have at least two student members and as many as 25 percent. It suggested that the precise number and proportion of students on each committee should be graded according to the extent to which their experience enables them to contribute meaningfully to the work of the committee. It recognized that this proportion might be significantly higher for those committees dealing with such matters as residence rules and discipline and much smaller (or zero) on committees dealing with faculty appointments and promotions.

Although it is evident that this recommendation has been generally implemented at the University level, the evidence on implementation at the School or Departmental level is not as readily available. The Provost and Associate Provost should regularly remind the Deans of the importance of having students on school committees, and should ask them to remind their departmental chairmen of these recommendations. An occasional request for a report (perhaps to be published) might also be helpful.

36. The 1970 Report recommended that reviewing authorities on promotion proposals at the school and University levels should not approve a promotion unless they are satisfied with the procedures used to collect and the documentation of student opinion. They also recommended that student opinion be solicited in the evaluation procedures used by each department to assess teaching performance.

Since the 1970 Report teaching performance has been given much greater emphasis in personnel decisions. At the present time, evidence from student ratings is required at the Provost's level, and additional evidence (letters from students and faculty) is routinely presented.

37. The 1970 Report recommended that students should be consulted on the appointment of an administrative officer in student life. This is the current practice.

38. The 1970 Report recommended that the question of the renovation and revitalization of the system of academic advising be the subject of a detailed study. Although studies have been made in the past the present system of academic advising is not, on the whole, one which inspires great confidence.

An excellent advising system is one of the most critical elements in assuring an optimal educational experience for our students. Although most of the responsibilities in this area currently fall on individual schools, it is essential that a University overview be maintained. The ultimate future of the advising system is clearly intimately involved with the question of integration of undergraduate education at the University. If a plan for integration should be adopted it is clear that the system of advising must be an important element of that plan. On the other hand, it is important that the advising system be improved even if the undergraduate education is not integrated.

We recommend that a survey be made of the advising systems within the University, and that the results of that survey be made widely available. We further recommend that if a plan for integration of undergraduate education is not developed in the near future the overall responsibility for advising be assigned either to the undergraduate deans' council or to an appropriate Vice Provost.

39. The 1970 Report recommended that the University Council take the initiative in insuring the establishment of disciplinary procedures in the graduate and professional schools. These disciplinary procedures have not been established.

The 1970 Report was written at a time when the University Council was considering procedures for handling disciplinary procedures in the undergraduate schools. No concerted efforts were made, at that time or since, to deal with that problem at the graduate and professional level. At the current time an ad hoc committee of Council is addressing the general question of the judiciary system, and should perhaps be persuaded to give attention to the graduate and professional students.

We recommend that the Council Ad Hoc Committee on the Judiciary be given the added charge of including the graduate and professional students in their considerations.

40. The 1970 Report recommended the establishment of an Ombudsman's Office. This has been done; the Office functions effectively.

41. The 1970 Report recommended that an Office of the Assistant to the President for External Affairs, with responsibility for maintaining contact with the University's neighbors in the community, be established.

The recent re-establishment of the position of Director of Community Relations and the naming of the Director satisfies the spirit of this recommendation.

Appendix III

Minority Opinion on Student Membership
On Board of Trustees

This convened Task Force on University Governance was charged with the consideration of the creation of a one year experimental term for a student trustee of the University. The case for this experiment far outweighs the arguments against it, and yet due to political sensitivities, this proposal, endorsed by the President, the Provost, and the Undergraduate Assembly was nevertheless rejected by the Task Force. While human nature typically opt to maintain the status quo, a university—more than any other institution—offers the ideal setting for constructive experimentation. Furthermore, the 1970 Task Force on University Governance recommended (Recommendation Number 5) that "a continuing effort be made to broaden the membership of the Trustees with respect to ... age ... and other considerations designed to achieve diversity." This was approved by the University Council and partially endorsed by the Trustees.
A young person, in touch with the campus community, can provide a dynamic and creative perspective which is unique to his/her full-time involvement in the University community. However, one argument against a student trustee was his/her transitoriness to the student body and potentially the expectations of other Trustees. While it seems unlikely that a Young Alumni Trustee, one year out of college is in a significantly better position to raise money, the overall validity of this point must be questioned. While in no way intending to diminish the value of capital resources to the University, the designation of one student to an experimental trustee could be looked at as an investment on the part of the University. Not only could he/she provide immediate service to the University, but if properly trained, could provide a capital return to the University in the future.

Another expressed concern was that if given direct access to the Trustees, students would involve the Trustees in the day-to-day operations of the University. Currently, students have as much access to the Trustees as the individual members of the Board choose to allow them. This has not been abused in the past and there is no reason to believe that it would be in the future. The administration must be allowed to run the day-to-day operations of the University. Having a student trustee who is available and accessible to the Trustees, who are individually and collectively involved in myriad tasks of personal and corporate concerns improves the communication and the resultant effectiveness of all concerned.

The last significant issue was that of the legal liability of the Trustees. There were those who opposed the proposal on the grounds that a student should not be exposed to potential legal liability for his/her acts as a trustee. Justifiable as this point is, Article XIII of the Statutes of the Corporation outlines the indemnification of trustees and eliminates this issue from being a major obstacle.

Though the President, Provost, and undergraduate members of this Task Force stood by their original recommendation for the establishment of a one year experimental student trustee position, it became clear that the trustee, faculty, graduate student, and other administration representatives would not support us. Therefore, various compromises were proposed which addressed the above expressed concerns and still provided students with the desired direct access to and participation in the Trustees' activities.

It was proposed that student representation on the Board of Trustees be instituted by using the already existing Young Alumni Trustee positions. The three year Young Alumni term would begin at the end of the junior year. This would not only satisfy the need for a student trustee, but it would also strengthen Young Alumni positions. The training of these trustees and the intangible acknowledged to be inadequate—could now take place under the one year tutelage of trustees and administrators who could provide them with the training they need, yet have never been able to receive because they were not on campus. The individuals could be viewed as alumni-in-training, not just students.

Just as the senior class president is given fund-raising training, so could these student trustees, allowing them to be capital producing trustees. Finally, these individuals would be accessible to students for at least one year of their term. This experience would enable them to better address the needs of the campus community during their two year term as trustee. This proposal was also rejected, primarily due to faculty opposition.

While it was pointed out that the Trustees are not a representative body with constituencies, after careful consideration, we felt that direct student input to the Trustees was so valuable as to warrant a student in some capacity on the Board of Trustees. The attempt to satisfy all expressed concerns and still provide students with full direct access to the Trustees was through the proposal of a non-voting student member for the Trustees. Because we recognized that one vote would not be of great significance, relative to the importance of the students’ presence, we were willing to recommend a student with all rights except that of voting, and therefore free of legal liability, in order to have a student as fully involved as possible. This idea was also unacceptable to the Task Force, even as a one year experiment.

This failure to recognize the full value of student input is particularly disturbing in light of the fact that so much evidence has been presented which makes the concept of a student trustee so appealing. In the 1970 Task Force on Governance report, Richard Clarke wrote:

On many committees it has been true that students contributed more in the way of their time than many other committee members, both in ways of regular attendance and through preparation and research. Initially this degree of participation may have been caused by a sense of comparative background deficiency, but it has been frequently sustained by a respect for the potentialities of the process, regard for the commitment of the faculty and by the inherent drive of youth to isolate problem areas and move toward concrete ends and present remedies.

Thus, while it is true that students are both basically more transitory than faculty (averaging only three years service in the governance system) and enter with a deficiency of data, their desires for accomplishment and need to know, their willingness to give of their adaptable schedules and their intolerance of old rationalizations and prejudices have made their contributions both valuable and unique.

Their uniqueness of view stems from many roots in addition to their insensitivity to worn solutions. Their capacity to question past paradigms is not tempered by considerations of appointments, promotions, or appropriations from the administration. Student relations to the real world problems of the University may often go beyond those perceived in the administration or faculty office. For students know better than the Trustee what the effect of raised tuition or pared financial aid will be, having faced the burden of paying extras. With friends still in high school, students know better than many faculty how curricular and admissions decisions will alter the academic profile of applicants for admission; as full time residents of University neighborhoods they are more attuned to the presence of the builder or the presence of security than the administrator who sleeps in the suburbs fifteen miles away.

Thus frequently the inclusion of student members has brought debate where none had existed before. While it is true that such discussion is more time consuming than perfunctory adoption of proposals or acceptance of the status quo, it is hardly to be argued that reasoned consideration and scrutiny is not more valuable than silence or decision.

Five years ago few could have imagined students contributing to lobbying in Harrisburg for increased educational appropriations, selecting faculty appointees to joint committees, recruiting talented students in high schools across the nation, arbitrating labor disputes, interviewing candidates for the University presidency or spending the summers formulating schedules, design fundraising programs or analyze budgetary implications of long-range programming. Yet all of that has happened without great fanfare or rewards to the students. Yet beyond the uninformed prejudices of those whose involvement with students in the governing process is minimal, one must search hard indeed to find any empirical support for complaints of student incompetence. The contributions of students have been real and they have assisted in advancing the work of the University.

We feel that the decision not to recommend favorably any form of direct student representation on the Board of Trustees is an unfortunate decision in view of the strong support which the concept received from the President, Provost, and Undergraduate Assembly. The students’ desire to be so represented is a very positive sign that they are ready to assume increasing leadership roles in the governance of their University. To thwart these desires is both frustrating and provocative. It is the duty of the Board to identify the problems facing the University, and recommends appropriate solutions, a student trustee will be proposed as a positive recommendation to assist the University in preparing for its future.

Philip Carlson
David Langfitt
Mark Lerner
Martin Meyerson
Eliot Stellar
June 8, 1978

Appendix IV
Responsibilities of Departmental Chairman
Policy Memorandum

To the Administration—It is the responsibility of the Chairman to execute within the department the policies of the University concerning teaching and research, fiscal matters, and other administrative business. The Chairman has the responsibility, after consultation with appropriate members of his or her department, for securing and retaining faculty members of high caliber and recommending those to whom tenure should be granted and to whom promotions should be awarded. It is the duty of the Chairman to submit departmental recommendations in these matters, including the names of those consulting, to the administration for consideration, and a separate statement giving his or her personal opinion.

The Chairman is responsible, after conferring with the faculty and students, for ensuring the appropriateness of the courses and the adequacy of the program offered by his or her department in accord with educational policies established by the faculties concerned. He or she should plan courses and staff them so as to best promote teaching which is effective and stimulating in content and in presentation.

The Chairman has the general responsibility for promoting the quality of the scholarly and research activities of his department. He or she reviews applications for research projects as to their appropriateness and transmits those approved to the administration, making sure that the human, fiscal, and space demands of all such projects are in the best interests of both the department and the University as a whole.

To the Department—The Chairman is the department’s executive officer. In aid of the development and maintenance within the department of collegial respect for the educational enterprise, the Chairman is responsible to the department as a collective for his conduct of its affairs. He or she is responsible for the administration of its teaching, academic advising, research functions and implements its policies.

The Chairman has the obligation to foster the welfare of his or her entire staff, to encourage and facilitate their work and professional development. He or she should take the initiative in reporting the needs and championing the legitimate causes of his department to the Dean. The Chairman carries the basic responsibility for obtaining merited recognition by the University of his or her staff members with respect to promotions and for making recommendations concerning faculty salaries. The Chairman also increases to the Dean and Provost, who have an obligation to supervise this area. Each faculty member has the right to discuss with the Chairman his or her own salary, status, requests for academic leaves, and applications for research projects. If he or she is still dissatisfied, he or she may discuss these matters with the Dean.