"Public Attitudes about Architects"
Sidney Epstein, A. Epstein and Sons

All architects are not created equal. Unfortunately, however, the public seems to think that all architects are created exceptional. That wishful thinking is the cause of a lot of difficulty. Them is a tendency to discount all of the hard work and excellent design once any kind of mistake is made. Our responsibility is to do our best and to be familiar with the state of the art, not to guarantee perfection.

This public attitude is evidenced by the anecdotal carping recorded in December, 1983 issue of PERSPECTIVES. A developer picks at a number of discrepancies on his drawings. Criticism is leveled at the quality of public housing design without any understanding of the rigid parameters that the government imposes on the architect. A review board finds an instance where the architect did not convey information properly.

We can't do it alone. During the design process we need the attention of the client, which is surprisingly hard to get. We need his or her studied input. We need good communication. Most of all, we need his participation and critical review during the design process.

Our difficulties are compounded by what has happened with professional fees. Unlike the accounting and legal professions where rates of $100 an hour and over are common, architects are expected to work at anywhere from 2 to 3 times the cost of labor, which usually means a billing rate of around $50 an hour. Alternatively, many fees are now being negotiated on a lump sum basis. The profit margins are very low and the work expected of the architect is to investigate more alternate designs, provide energy analysis, be familiar with the latest computer advances, etc. Fees are definitely not what they should be, particularly in the present litigious atmosphere where we are frequently sued for things that are beyond our control.

We do bring troubles on ourselves. Many architects are cavalier about budget estimates. Many take on projects that are too big and complex for their office. They may be eager to try their hand in the design of a type of building where they really lack expertise. Some are never willing to admit they're too busy to take on a project. I do think, however, that most architects have a real desire to do a good job and are excited by their work. They want their clients to be fully satisfied and they have an artist's interest in their end product.

————————————————

"The Architect and the Client"
Ben Weese, Weese, Hickey, Weese

I have often felt that the reasons why particular architects and clients end up together is more interesting than the architecture produced.

Whenever "the" client is in fact a committee there is always a danger that, lacking any strong leadership, there will be no true focus of responsibility. In those few cases where strong leadership, a working hierarchy and a process of delegating tasks do develop, then decision making and reporting back to the whole committee by the natural or appointed leader becomes a genuinely effective structure. But ordinarily committees seek safety in statistics and in common-denominator decisions whereby each member expects to elude responsibility and evade criticism. These individuals often lack any direct knowledge, are unsophisticated about design and construction and are easily taken-in by merely apparent expertise. Their most characteristic question, thus, is "how many fire stations" or "how many crematoria" have you already done and they will opt for the security of thinking that since this is going to be your 101st fire-station, therefore nothing can go wrong. Since they

lack leadership to focus and accept responsibility, committee members tend to remain passive and only perfunctorily involved unless something does go wrong. Then, however, committees become ruthless predators in finding others than themselves to blame.

A somewhat different sort of problem is presented by the committee which, needing to feel busy and occupied, spends inordinate amounts of time passively listening to show and tell from an endless line of architects. They would be far better off spending that time doing research in a library on their own and then returning to report . . . to themselves! But in order to gratify such a committee, the architect is obliged to become an entertainer and showman. What should have been an effective dialogue is thus turned into a kind of tranquilizer instead of a diagnostic inquiry into the relationship between this client and this architect. However there is this to be said for the showman: without him the committee plus architect meetings might never come to an end.

Corporate clients (or developers who wish to cater to them) frequently have such a pressing agenda that the architect is reduced to a decorator and his name is used merely to dress up the image of what, in fact, is a preordained and purely economic "program:" Not surprisingly, corporate clients seek out corporate architects, where there is congruence up and down the line in organization, staffing, life-styles, even modes of dress.

Certain sorts of settings or contexts virtually eliminate any effective exploration of the tremendous potential in client-architect relations. For example, larger mixed-use projects have checks and balances with subspecies of specialists as well. Ultimately the housing specialist and the retail office specialist and the exterior decorator et al are all teamed up and herded about by the construction manager. Or consider the client-type who asks architects to provide an idea of what they can do for them (free or promotional sketches). Frequently this tantalizes some architects but it should usually be viewed as a warning signal that the "client" (1) may not have any money, (2) may not own the land, (3) may not be the real client but a surrogate, (4) may be putting together his developer's brochure, and surely (5) has no genuine conception of how architects (should) work.

Again, it often happens that very large corporate or institutional clients change project representatives during the course of a project. Architects do this sometimes too. The desired result is that the rules can be re-written around some new situation or manager and then the old directives become non-directives in spite of the good memos and job files. The effectiveness of this as a ruse is in direct proportion to the size of the respective organizations.

Finally, in this small list of samples, there is potential for fruitless discussions and poor work even among those clients who are affluent enough to embark on an architect-designed private house. In ascending order of gravity one encounters (1) those who ask you to find some contractor for them who will follow their napkin sketch, (2) those who intensively interview you and all your architect peers seeking some perfect image fit, (3) those who beg you to do your brand name house and permit them to live in it.

Another dimension to architecture itself

In marked contrast to all of these contexts which prevent or corrode the relationship and which frustrate and hamper the architect is the best or ideal client. This client grows during the course of the relationship and becomes very secure, responsible, intelligent and visual. He will have a sense of history and be able to make decisions. Such a client comes fully to understand what he or she wants and turns into a kind of shadow (perhaps frustrated?) architect. Thus the architect comes to be an extension, eventually, of the client's well-formed concept. Now there comes into being a symbiosis of purpose: much time will be devoted to exploring (in words) the psychological and philosophical bases from which both professional and client approach the project. Following this period of mutual insemination, as it were, comes a crucial gestation period. Such a client understands the appropriate division of labor and will be actively involved in everything except for the final creative act. He or she will savor each step of the full process. Even the frustration alluded to above evaporates as the client participates in the creativity, in the entire process and empathizes so deftly that it comes to feel like mutuality of crafting as well.

Whenever a client and an architect interact in this manner the result is truly another dimension to architecture itself. A complex set of needs has been brought to fruition in a building. And when the architecture and the function it

houses are thought of as ends in themselves, rather than simply as a means to profit, then I believe that a whole host of architect/owner competing priorities and frictions are automatically resolved. Illustrating architecture which is or surely can be an end-in-itself are monuments, institutional structures, community buildings and well thought out private homes.

If, though, the work is construed and perceived only or mainly as a conduit to profits (is only a "means architecture" and not an "ends architecture"), then the process which I have just described is twisted and finally aborted regardless of the euphemistic posturing by all parties concerned to make it appear otherwise. People and architecture and the environment too are used up and down the line just to produce profits. People and architecture survive in that world too, but it can get pretty rough.

_____

"Client Relationships: Good and Bad"
John Holabird, Holabird and Root

In order to prepare myself for producing something related to architects and their clients, I reread John Baird's and Devereux Bowly's articles in the December '83 PERSPECTIVES to churn myself up a little. I shall try to deliver a number of comments on different types of clients and the relations, good and bad, between them and an architect. I shall discuss this interface as it has been part of my own experience with public housing authorities, with municipal authorities, with institutions, with federal agencies, with a residence, with a corporation and with a developer.

Interface with Public Housing Authorities
I had two experiences-one as a young design architect on Stateway Gardens, another years later as Design Associate on Patrick Sullivan housing for the elderly at Madison and Paulina-working for public agencies. An architect, however gifted or experienced, always works against a large mass of inertia and "traditional wisdom."

First of all, we couldn't alter the height of building. Second, public wisdom decreed that two elevators could service 22 floors. Third, we couldn't vary the window at all everyone had to use a 4'x 4' sliding sash window willy nilly.

At the first meeting of the Stateway Gardens Committee, we were presented with another architect's latest project plans for Cabrini Green. The C.H.A. would have been just as pleased if we had copied these and gone ahead speedily. So much for stimulating architectural ingenuity.

We fought many battles and won a few. For example, because I had four small children and knew the problems of a mother looking after children and trying to keep house, we got rid of basement laundry and drying rooms. We established laundry rooms on each floor with automatic machines.

At that time, everyone thought the outside corridor entrance from the elevator lobby to each apartment was "groovy." We convinced the Authority that each apartment (seven to a floor) should have its own outside space and be private-and it was so designed. It was small-8'x 10' or so, but it was "their own:' We also told the Authority that we would have no part of the project unless the floors had resilient tile and the corridors had glazed tile-but this was in the days before McNulty Brothers had used the thin coat plaster on concrete block and anything was an improvement over the "jail" character of exposed gray bleak concrete block. Finally, we tilted the buildings on the side to try to orient most of the apartments towards view and breeze, and opened up part of the ground floor as a breezeway. We also curved the required fire lanes to try to humanize the outdoor areas. These may not seem to be major victories but at the time- 1954-they were giant steps and each step was a haggle.

Years later, when we were designing elderly housing, we had a more responsive client. This was during the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations. Federal Housing was giving design awards for its projects there was genuine concern for how people might live and grow.

We plastered the concrete walls, carpeted the corridors, put electric outlets and phone jacks at convenient heights for older people, developed craft studios on the ground floor, sun decks and social centers on the roof, and instead of two identical buildings, we proved that one building with two wings off a large elevator lobby would actually look better, be more cost-effective, and work better.

I guess what I am trying to say is that the public authority client was conservative, cost conscious, not very imaginative and not much interested in innovation because then they as the client would have to think, and to weigh, to make new decisions-much easier to rely on the past!

Interface with Municipal Authorities

For a period, the Public Building Commission of Chicago was the client for a series of school buildings. Jacques Brownston-the distinguished designer at Murphy of the Daley Center-was in command. At the commencement of a job, we were presented with ten (I think) massive volumes of requirements. We were told the sheet size, the lettering style, the structural bay size, the exterior elevation grid, the possible materials, specifications, etc. There were a number of buildings completed during this totalitarian regime and while they are probably useful and well-built, there was very little for the architect to contribute.

One of our really hopeless jobs was with a suburban municipality. First of all the client body-the City Councilors or whatever-came to all review meetings. Every few months these councilors changed and every councilor wanted to leave an imprint on our work. We were always suspected of enriching ourselves on the village's funds, but were expected to send five professionals for meetings of five or six hours once a month-all to be included in our fee. We were often put in position of the bad guys-the out-of-town big city slickers who were trying to change the quality of life in the municipality. Finally, when we did get a set of documents together, it turned out that the municipality didn't have anywhere near the funds that they thought they had set aside for the budget. We lost our shirt financially, and lost our taste for trying to give proper, experienced, professional advice to an elected group who didn' t deserve first class services, or want them for that matter. We became a drafting service and this is not a very gratifying role for a professional consultant. An architect reponds to a client who seeks his best work.

Interface with Institutions

Sometimes the "client" is actually a group which has not reached a consensus. There may be important trustees who in the past have headed corporations which have built many buildings and who thus know what they happen to like. These can be important donors who are in a position to choose the form that their money takes. A college faculty may have strong ideas about form and function, while the administration also has strong feelings, as well as their own institutional architect-clients who have special requirements. In such a case, the architect must relate to a whole series of different attitudes and reactions.

Right after the depression, our office was awarded the huge commission for Northwestern Technological Institute, but the Trustees and Donor decreed that it be done in a Collegiate Gothic Style. It was so designed and built and this led to several additional buildings on the campus in related style. However, we were eventually dismissed by a reform group of Trustees because we were too "old hat:' "Sic semper tyrannis."

Interface on Residence

We are working on a new house for a very nice, intelligent family. We have developed a plan that seems to suit the family lifestyle and a character for elevations and materials but there is no continuity. We make changes, improve plans, send them out, and for two or three weeks-not a word. Then a response-changes, hopefully improvements and new sketches. And then again silence for three weeks.

The Client-Architect relationship is essentially a dialogue with mutual respect. If it becomes monologues back and forth at intervals, it ceases to be a bonding relationship.

Interface with a Federal Agency

The Feds have their own system for review. We worked for one agency. They set review dates-we sent plans in advance-we sent six people to a review meeting. The Fed representatives hadn't even looked at the plans. Finally, two weeks later, we received notes. During these two weeks, we had to find other things for our staff to work on, and so it went throughout the job. The work moved by fits and starts. Good corporate clients, on the other hand, often send good technical persons to review our work while we are working and so that they are continuously aware of the progress and can help-question-comment without delaying the program and momentum of a job. This establishes a relationship of trust and communication.

Interface with a Corporation

We once worked for a two-sided corporation (manufacturing and research). The representatives of both came to design review meetings. The manufacturer's reps traveled coach class and wanted working lunch sessions with sandwiches brought in. The

research people flew first class and wanted long restaurant/ cocktail lunches. What does the architect do with these two? Manufacturing wanted something that looked cheap. Research wanted something that looked splendid and would win architectural awards. Eventually the CEO had to arbitrate between these factions. We tried to be nice to everyone.

Interface with Development
The Developer is often interested in a striking building which will be easy to rent. On the other hand, he knows exactly how much he intends to spend. Sometimes the two are incompatible.

Nowadays, the architect sits in meetings with several developers and representatives, the developers' selected engineer consultants, a landscape consultant, a traffic consultant, and often the financial power behind the developer. The architect must tread a narrow path to satisfy this complex clientele and to end up with a handsome building.

When I was in sixth grade we were given a homework assignment to write an advertisement for our father's business. My father said "Good Buildings Cheap." That has been our motto ever since although not spoken aloud!

"Change Orders"
John Hartray, Nagel, Hartray

Inigo Jones and Christopher Wren shared the social position, educational background, tastes, and sensibilities of the people who commissioned their work. They could represent them in every sense of the word. Their buildings were built on a piecework basis by a construction industry in which the lore of various crafts was handed down through long periods of apprenticeship. As a result their clients experienced few surprises in the course of design and construction.

Today, on the other hand, owners, particularly those who are building for the first time, may feel cut off from the architect and contractor who share many interests. The technical complexity of modern construction requires an exchange of information between builders and designers. They have similar, if not identical, educational backgrounds, and a majority of both groups would probably count building as their primary interest in life.

It is sad to relate, but today's owners are also likely to be separated from architects and contractors in having higher disposable incomes. The construction industry is not lavish in its monetary rewards. Finally, must of the owners' sense of isolation grows out of the American architect's unique legal and ethical responsibilities to the contractor, responsibilities which often appear to conflict with his duties as the owner's agent.

The first unexpected change order is usually enough to turn an owner's uneasiness into paranoia. The architect, who has been paid by the owner to design the building and to draw up the construction contract, reads that contract *with impartiality*, and concludes that because of newly discovered problems the owner owes the contractor additional money.

To the uninitiated this seems to be an act of betrayal.

The added money wont make the building more useful or more profitable. It will only pay for removing a slab of reinforced concrete that was not discovered when the borings were made. Or worse, it will buy a catch basin that the architect forgot to include in the drawings.

"It's not my fault;" says the owner. "Why should I be the one to pay?"

Of course, it isn't the contractor's fault either. In the case of the concrete slab, it isn't even the architect's fault.

If the catch basin had not been omitted from the bid documents its cost would have been added to the bid. It is, after all, the owner's building. But the sense of betrayal persists. "Why didn't my architect protect me? Why did he side with my adversary, the contractor?"

The search for an answer to these reasonable questions begins in the early nineteenth century when improved public sanitation resulted in unprecedented growth in the English population. This created a demand for new construction which could not be met by the old order of gentleman architects and craft guilds.

General contractors offering to construct buildings within a given time for a lump sum forced architects to produce highly defined construction contracts based on detailed plans and material specifications. Quantity surveyors, who calculated the amounts of materials required to

execute these contracts as a basis for bidding and payment, were established as a profession separate from architecture. This separation of contract writing from contract administration greatly clarified professional relationships.

The American experience produced a messier division of responsibilities. As we spread westward, general contractors were in the vanguard. In many cities they pre-date the architectural profession, and in some cases they were its founders.

John Van Osdel, who became Chicago's first architect, was a contractor with a competitive advantage because he made drawings of his projects before attempting to build them. He was encouraged to establish an architectural practice by other contractors who saw the advantage of working from drawings.

The quantity survey system was never established in America. Our contractors were accustomed to doing their own cost estimates, and the establishment by the government of unit prices for construction was not practical under a federal system.

The only remaining function of the quantity surveyor, the impartial interpretation of the contract, was delegated to the architect. This saved the expense of establishing a new profession, but placed American architects in the position of representing all of the adversaries, including themselves, during construction disputes. It is the kind of responsibility that King Solomon would have had if he had been the father of the disputed child.

Contractors and architects have learned to live with this institutionalized conflict of interest, but it is not surprising that owners are confused by it.

When an architect's error causes the owner a real loss (if, for instance, the catch basin had been shown and built in the wrong place and had to be moved), the architect pays for the correction. Owners rarely object to this. But change orders which add to the value of their project as a fair cost seem to cause trouble.

To avoid arguing with an owner, architects are sometimes tempted to try to stick the contractor with the cost of a required change or to negotiate a trade by which the added expense can be made up by a hidden omission somewhere else in the project. Like most unethical behavior, this is ultimately self-defeating. An aggrieved contractor has too many ways of getting even, and an honest omission is much easier to live with than a deliberate misdeed.

If we wrote our contracts in such a way that the owner was protected from every contingency, the cost of this insurance would be added to all bids.

If we established an intermediary profession, we would be paying the cost of arbitration on even the happy jobs.

Most clients eventually come to the conclusion that the system is fair. A Few, I suspect, recognize that it is fair, but continue to complain as a bargaining technique. They pay for their bad manners in the bids on subsequent buildings.

Fortunately, even the most unreasonable and abusive clients are protected by the perverse pride of an industry which measures its worth by the quality of what it builds.

The best owners, blessed with congenital optimism and curiosity, approach the construction process on a basis of trust. They enter into the spirit of one of the most rewarding collective enterprises available to humans. As the job proceeds they may meet plumbers for whom sanitary waste systems are as elegant as trees and masons who save the stones which sparkle for the corners. The enthusiasm of these artisans leaves little room for greed. Happy people always get their money's worth.

_____

"The Importance of the Client in Design"
C. William Brubaker, Perkins & Will Architects

In his book, Architecture Through the Ages (G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1953), Columbia University professor of architecture Talbot Hamlin points out that the imitative phase of early nineteenth century Classic Revival architecture was essentially a lay movement. "Again and again the architects themselves protested against it, for the great architects saw clearly the underlying stupidity of trying to imitate old buildings in new structures built for entirely different uses; but, after all, it was the client who paid for buildings, and it was his taste which must in the long run govern:" Professor Hamlin also notes that Napoleon was a Roman enthusiast, wished to have Paris made over, and personally chose architects who

were inspired by ancient Rome. Jefferson and Washington agreed that their new capitol city should be "classic:"

Analysis of all eras in history reveals how powerful clients influence design. The architect seldom made design decisions alone, whether in Gothic, Renaissance, or Baroque times. This continues to be the case in modern times. Hitler imposed his personal taste on Germany. In recent decades, American corporation executives demanded modern architecture, and today many building developers and owners believe that post-modern design will make their projects more successful.

Frank Lloyd Wright's beautiful, innovative and appropriate houses were the product of his ability to work with clients who also desired to create beautiful, innovative and appropriate homes for themselves.

Mies van der Rohe inspired clients who made very important design decisions when they hired him. It is interesting to note that nearly all of Mies's buildings are being used and maintained as he planned them. That is one good measure of the success of a project.

Winnetka's Crow Island School could not have been a success without a community that cared about education, an enlightened board, good teachers, and a brilliant superintendent of schools.

We must conclude that "design decisions are also made by clients." This is both inevitable and proper. The architect does not and cannot work alone. The design

process and the successful completion of a project require close cooperation between client and architect and other members of the design and construction team.

The client can, and often does, have a profound influence on design before, during, and after the work with the architect. Even in brief outline form, the many opportunities for making design decisions are impressive:

1. The client makes decisions before working with the architect: (a) discerning a need for a new or renovated building. (b) determining the budget, program, and aspirations, (c) selecting the site, and (d) selecting the architect.

2. The client makes design decisions while working with the architect: (a) discussing the project with the architect, (b) reviewing the approving consultants, builders or other team members, (c) making suggestions and demands (requirements and prohibitions), (d) approving and rejecting concepts, designs, plans and details, (e) revising and approving budgets, and (f) deciding whether to proceed with construction.

3. The client makes design decisions after working with the architect: (a) completing the project (interior furnishings, graphics, landscaping, etc.) with or without the architect, (b) making changes, at a later point, in interior spaces, (c) making exterior changes, and (d) determining the quality of tenants and maintenance.

Conclusion: The architect should not and does not work alone.

Instead, the design process and successful completion of a project requires close cooperation between client and architect and at her members of the design and construction team.

_____

"These Educated Clients: The J.J. Glessner Family"
Elaine M. Harrington, Curator of Glessner House

Henry Hobson Richardson and Richardson Morris Hunt were the first two American students who attended the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in Paris at the middle of the nineteenth century. Hunt gained fame as an architect of superior eclectic residences for wealthy patrons and as first president and organizer of the American Institute of Architects, but Richardson is now considered the most important architect of that century and as a major goal of his work he sought to create a truly American architecture.

The attitude of the two men toward their clients varied in a manner that can be read in the products of their relationships- the buildings themselves. In their differing approaches to architecture, Hunt saw himself as a servant of existing values while Richardson was interested in shaping new values. Hunt provided clients however many yards of exquisite French chateau or Second Empire style they wished while Richardson gave his clients a building that

served their purposes at the same time it reflected his aesthetic ideas.

One client in particular, the John J. Glessner family of Chicago, must have been a pleasure for Richardson to work with. That the residence of 1885-1887 that the Glessners commissioned from Richardson gave immediate pleasure to Richardson is clear from Mr. Glessner's 1923 recollection, "From what he [Richardson] told me and what his young men said afterwards, I am convinced that this house of ours is the one of all that he built that he would have liked most to live in himself. It was his last work:' (The Story of a House, John Glessner, 1923.) The house of course gave a much more lasting meaning to this family for whom it functioned well for 50 years.

The Glessner and Richardson families became friends, no doubt in part because they shared similar ideas about what made a good life, and about the food, music, and books of the time. Both Richardson and the Glessners were interested in the English medieval picturesque and the reform and arts and crafts movements. The libraries of each shared some of the same titles and authors, for example, books by Bruce Talbert, John Ruskin, and Lucy Crane.

In addition to using his library as a design resource, Richardson had taught himself through his travels about the French Romanesque, as well as the work of William Morris. John and Frances Glessner had educated themselves in the work of Viollet-le-Duc, the English arts and crafts, and other architecture and design interests through their reading before they met Richardson.

The Glessners had also developed a strong professional and personal relationship with the architect and designer Isaac E. Scott in the 1870s and early 1880s. Scott designed buildings and furniture for the family as well as making ceramics, designing embroidery, and giving them drawing lessons.

So it came about that in their home on Prairie Avenue, the Glessners had sought and savored good design at all levels. These educated clients embraced the total design concept, from Richardson's design for the house, to the furniture made especially for it through his firm, and, by Richardson's own example and interest in the designs of William Morris, even to the fabrics, carpets and wallpapers chosen for their house.

From the structure itself to the details of its furnishings, all were viewed as important and connected ends. This house of almost 100 years and its interior decorations still testify to the mutual ideas of educated clients and a great architect.

_____

"At the Center"

At any one time, there are typically several projects underway at the Center. As this issue of PERSPECTIVES goes to press a project begun last spring is coming to an end, while another one launched in September is gaining momentum. And a project initiated in 1982 has begun to bear fruit in the closing months of 1984. Brief accounts of all three are presented below.

In 1982, the Center was awarded a $74,000 grant from the Exxon Education Foundation to produce a series of instructional modules in applied ethics. The modules were intended for use in a wide range of undergraduate, graduate and continuing education programs. Early this fall Kendall/Hunt publishers announced the publication of the first two modules in the series- Professional Responsibility for Harmful Actions by Martin Curd and Larry May and The Moral Status of Loyalty by Marcia Baron. The remaining seven modules are scheduled for publication in 1985. To order copies for examination or purchase, write Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co., 2560 Kerper Boulevard, PO. Box 539, Dubuque, Iowa 52001.

The focus of the Center's project on the Humanities, Health Care and the Elderly, funded by the Illinois Humanities Council, was the ethical and social issues in health care that affect the lives of senior citizens. During the past decade, the multidisciplinary field of bio-ethics has contributed to scholarly debate, public discussion and social policy on a wide range of moral dilemmas in health care affecting patients of all ages.

The Center conducted a series of 30 workshops in retirement homes and community centers

throughout the Chicago area during the summer and fall of 1984. The primary purpose of the workshops was to provide the elderly with an opportunity to reflect on their experiences. Participating in these sessions with the elderly were humanists drawn from philosophy and religion as well as professionals representing law, nursing and medicine.

The project was directed by Dr. Frederick A. Elliston, former Center Senior Research Associate and now Visiting Professor in the Philosophy Department at the University of Hawaii. A final report describing the project, films and publications relating to health care and the elderly, and organizations and funding sources which are concerned with the welfare of senior citizens will be available in early 1985. Requests for copies should be directed to the Center.

In September, the Center launched a twenty-month study of the ethical issues in organization development (OD) in collab-oration with several OD professional groups. The project is supported by a $90,189 grant from the Ethics & Values in Science & Technology Program of the National Science Foundation.

OD researchers and practitioners apply behavioral science theories and techniques to organizational behavior, employing and evaluating alternative intervention strategies intended to improve organizational performance. The current project will (1) assess the ethical and value dimensions of OD research and practice and (2) institutionalize a program to ensure continuing dialogue on ethical issues after this project is concluded. A series of panels at six OD professional meetings will be convened to analyze the ethical issues in two or three case scenarios prepared by the project's staff and advisory board.

The project is co-directed by Dr. Mark S. Frankel, CSEP Director, and Dr. William Gellermann, Coordinator of the OD Ethics Task Force. It is expected to produce: (1) a Casebook on Ethical Issues in OD; (2) an Annotated Bibliography in OD Ethics and (3) an OD Clearinghouse on Professional Ethics to promote continuing assessment of ethical issues beyond the life of the project. An important goal of the project is to contribute to the development of ethical guidelines for OD researchers and practitioners. Inquiries about the study should be directed to Mark Frankel at the Center.

_____

"Announcements"

WORKSHOP: The Alverno Institute announces a workshop in teaching business ethics for business educators. The dates will be June 10-12, 1985, and it will be held at Alverno College in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. To obtain conference description and registration materials, write to Alverno Institute, Alverno College, 3401 South 39th Street, Milwaukee, WI 53215.

The Journal of Medicine and Philosophy will be receiving articles for publication in upcoming thematic issues. Each issue will have a different editor. Please send your contributions to the appropriate editor. Themes, editors, and deadline dates are listed below:

1. "Rationality and Medicine": Prof. K. Danner Clouser, Department of Humanities, Milton S. Hershey Medical Center College of Medicine, Pennsylvania State University, Hershey, PA 17033; September 1, 1985.

2. "Ethical Issues in the Use of Clinical Controls": Prof. Kenneth Schaffner, Department of History and Philosophy of Science, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260; January 1, 1986.

3. "Money, Medicine, and Markets": Prof. Baruch A. Brody, Center for Ethics, Medicine, and Public Issues, Baylor College of Medicine, One Baylor Plaza, Houston, TX 77030; April 1, 1986.

4. "Ethical Issues in the Use of DRGs": Prof. Stuart F. Spicker, Department of Community Medicine and Health Care, University of Connecticut Health Center, Farmington, CT 06032; July 1, 1986.

5. "Justice Between Generations and Health Care for the Elderly": Prof. Norman Daniels, Department of Philosophy, Tufts University, Medford, MA 02155; January 1, 1987.

6. "Ethical Issues in Research with Animals": Prof. Tom L. Beauchamp, Kennedy Institute of Ethics, Georgetown University, Washington, DC 20057; April 1, 1987.

7. "Comparative Medical Ethics": Prof. Robert M. Veatch, Kennedy Institute of Ethics, Georgetown University, Washington, DC 20057; July 1, 1987.

FELLOWSHIPS: The Center for Ethics, Medicine, and Public Issues
at the Baylor College of Medicine announces its first annual visiting fellowship program in ethics and medicine, which will take place from May 28 to June 21, 1985. For more information, contact: Prof. Baruch Brody, Center for Ethics, Baylor College of Medicine, One Baylor Plaza, Houston, TX 77030.

GRADUATE PROGRAM: The University of Georgia is accepting applications for its Graduate Certificate Program in Environmental Ethics. For further information, contact: Prof. Frederick Ferre, Chair, Environmental Ethics Certificate Program, 106 Peabody Hall, The University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602. (404) 542-2823.

We Gratefully Acknowledge
Support from the Following:
Edwin Rothschild
Robert F. Picken
Marian and Leon Despres
A.A.A.S.
Ms. Martha Friedberg
Ms. Eleanor R. Swift
Ms. Margaret Wright
Ms. Lucille Ollendorf
Ms. Martyl Langsdorf
Dr. Henry L. Recur
Ms. Elizabeth Wilkins
Nancy and Isak V Gerson

The Center for the Study of Ethics in the Professions at the Illinois Institute of Technology was established in 1976 for the purpose of promoting education and scholarship relating to ethical