Senate Slate 1988-89

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate
FROM: F. Gerard Adams, Chair
SUBJECT: Senate Nominations, 1988-89

1. In accordance with the requirements of Sec. II(b)(i) of the Senate Rules, official notice is hereby given of the Senate Nominating Committee's slate of nominees for the incoming Senate Officers. The nominees, all of whom have indicated their willingness to serve, are:

   Chair-elect: Robert E. Davies (molecular biology)
   Secretary-elect: Mary Catherine Glick (res. pediatrics)
   At-large Members of the Senate Executive Committee (to serve a term beginning May, 1988):
   Kenneth R. Laker, (electrical engineering), 1-year term
   James Mulhly (history), 1-year term
   Curtis Retz (law), 1-year term
   Brian Spooner (anthropology), 1-year term
   Janice Bellace (legal studies-management), 2-year term
   Dan Ben-Amos (folklore & folk life), 2-year term
   Howard Brody (physics), 2-year term
   James Lash (anatomy), 2-year term
   Alan Cohen (pediatrics, CHOP), 3-year term
   Beverly Coleman (radiology), 3-year term
   Robert Engs (history), 3-year term
   Ann Keane (nursing), 3-year term
   Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (to serve a 3-year term beginning May, 1988):
   Igor Kopytoff (anthropology)
   Joyce Thompson (nursing)
   Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (to serve a 3-year term beginning May, 1988):
   Roger Abrahams (folklore & folk life)
   Madeleine M. Joullie (chemistry)

2. Again pursuant to the Senate Rules Sec. II(b)(i) you are invited to submit "additional nominations, which shall be accomplished via petitions containing at least twenty-five valid names and the signed approval of the candidate. All such petitions must be received no later than fourteen days subsequent to the circulation of the nominees of the Nominating Committee. Nominations will automatically be closed fourteen days after circulation of the slate of the Nominating Committee." Pursuant to this provision, petitions must be received at the Faculty Senate Office, 15 College Hall, 6303, by Tuesday, March 8, 1988.

3. Under the same provision of the Senate Rules, if no additional nominations are received, the slate nominated by the Nominating Committee will be declared elected. Should additional nominations be received, an election will thereafter be held by mail ballot.

Libraries: New Director, New Title as Vice Provost

Penn Libraries' new chief officer, Dr. Paul H. Mosher of Stanford, will be designated Vice Provost as well as Director of Libraries—a change of title that will also mean participation in the University planning structures, the Provost's Office has announced.

Both President Sheldon Hackney and Provost Michael Aiken said they believe the Director of Libraries must be well informed about academic planning and that the visibility and prestige of the library is a factor in the forthcoming development campaign. "The major purpose of the campaign is to enhance the scholarly reputation of the University," said Provost Aiken. "Enhancement of the University Libraries is vital to the success of these plans. We have asked Paul Mosher to develop a second Five Year Plan for the library that will identify its priorities and help us plan for the allocation of resources to address those needs."

The title was cleared with the Consultative Committee of the Faculty Senate (Chairs past, present and elect), he added.

Dr. Mosher, now deputy director of libraries at Stanford, will take office September 1. "He will bring to the University an outstanding record of professional experience and international recognition for scholarly efforts," President Hackney said.

Penn's Deputy Director of Libraries Joan Gotwals, who has been Acting Director since Richard De Gennaro left for the New York Public Library last year, said Paul Mosher "brings a fine record and reputation. He will be a very strong leader of the Libraries."

"And," she added, "he seems to recognize that we are presenting him with a very strong and dedicated staff."

A 1961 graduate of Portland State University with an M.A. and Ph.D. from Berkeley, Dr. Mosher began his academic career at the University of Washington in 1966, where he was assistant professor of history until 1975. He also headed Washington's Upward Bound Program (1968-69) and chaired the Medieval and Renaissance Studies Group (1970-75). During his time at Washington he was also a visiting professor at Trinity College's Hartford and Rome campuses in the summers of 1971-72-73, holding a Fulbright-Hays Senior Research Scholarship in 1971.

After joining Stanford in 1975 as assistant director for collection development, Dr. Mosher also took a post as lecturer in religious studies, which he still holds. Rising to director of collection development in 1979, he moved on to director of research services in the Stanford Libraries in 1984, and from there to deputy director in 1985.

Dr. Mosher was also a CLR Senior Fellow in the UCLA Graduate School of Library and Information Science, 1983-84, and won the 1984 Blackwell North America Scholarship Award for the best article in the area of library resources. He has published some 25 papers on libraries and librarianship; consulted for numerous West Coast libraries and the New York Public Library in the East; and served on major planning and consultative committees at both Stanford and Washington.
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The Individual Discretionary Research Account (IDRA)

The Individual Discretionary Research Account, IDRA (pronounced edra), would provide limited, but entirely discretionary, funds for all standing faculty for purposes of research and related professional expenses.

As financial stringencies and controls have become tighter in recent years, discretionary funds at the departmental level have been one of the first things to suffer. It has become increasingly difficult for many faculty members to obtain funding for research assistance, travel, word processing, supplies, and similar professional needs. Not only has the funding been more limited, but flexibility has been reduced, as faculty have been reluctant to ask for funds, knowing that the department chairs have few resources to allocate and may turn down all but the most vital requests. The burdens of research-related expenses have fallen increasingly on the personal funds of the faculty members themselves.

In the past year, the tax law has been changed unfavorably for University faculty. Under the Tax Reform Act of 1986, educational travel is no longer deductible and other academic expenses are deductible as miscellaneous deductions subject to a minimum of two percent of adjusted gross income. The IDRA plan represents a response to the recent tax law changes, and should be formulated so as to meet the requirements for continued tax exemptions under the new law.

The basic aim of IDRA is to provide all or most members of the standing faculty with a discretionary account to help finance research and professional expenses. This will benefit most faculty and particularly younger people who do not yet have a record of research accomplishments on which to build funding applications and people in fields where research funding is very limited. The IDRs will provide a new degree of flexibility since account users will be able to use their funds for any academic research purposes other than salaries and released time, making possible exploratory research whose outcome is entirely uncertain as well as funding a wide range of research related professional expenses.

The University's contribution to IDRAs will be small at first, a pilot program. We visualize starting with annual contributions to each IDRA of $500. As we expect, we must begin small, a good way to start might be with $500 for every member of the standing faculty regardless of rank or salary.

Q. How much money would be set aside for each faculty member in an IDRA?
A. It would be nice, of course, to make a large annual provision for funds. If, as we expect, we must begin small, a good way to start might be with $500 for every member of the standing faculty regardless of rank or salary.

Q. Would the University's contributions to IDRAs be in place of a salary increase?
A. IDRA funds are not salaries, but rather funds to defray research and professional expenses. To finance IDRAs every effort will be made to find funding which would not otherwise be available for salaries. (Note that because of the new income tax law, and because of the need to pay social security taxes and employee benefits, the same aggregate allocation of funds would produce a significantly smaller amount of after tax salaries than would be available to faculty members in IDRAs).

Q. Who would be eligible to participate in the IDRA program?
A. It is proposed that IDRAs be established for all standing faculty from assistant professors up.

Q. For what kinds of expenses could IDRA funds be used?
A. IDRA funds should be available for any academic purpose related to research except salaries or release time, i.e., academic travel, research assistance, library searches, computer equipment, journal subscriptions, professional dues, long distance telephone, supplies, books, word processing, etc.

Q. What would the IDRA program achieve?
A. From the University's perspective, IDRAs will reinforce the University's dedication to continued active research by all faculty. This is an excellent, highly imaginative way to support faculty research.

From the faculty member's perspective, it will mean a new source of research funds, limited but entirely discretionary. These funds will serve to fund new research initiatives and for professional activity. Even a small IDRA account will represent a significant improvement in research support for many of the University's faculty. The IDRA proposal is particularly timely as a response to changes in the tax law which reduce the deductibility of professional expenses.

This represents a unique way to improve the University's working environment and may play a significant role in attracting new faculty to the University.
Flaws in Search Process?

The announcement last week of the appointment of Paul Mosher as Director of Libraries ends a protracted search process with the appointment of a well-respected librarian and scholar. He will surely prove a welcome addition to the University.

Nonetheless, this search has raised a number of questions. In mentioning some of them, I do not want to seem to doubt in any way the appropriateness of the choice of Dr. Mosher. I am concerned only with the mechanism of the search process for a new Director of Libraries.

This process was unnecessarily insulting to those who staff the University's Libraries. It will also leave Dr. Mosher at something of a disadvantage in his new position. As far as I know, no candidate, including Dr. Mosher, was invited to meet with representatives of the Libraries until the end of the search process. Only one member of the Libraries' staff served as a member of the search committee. In addition, as far as I am aware, no candidate was invited even to see the Libraries. Only near the end of the search were a few senior library administrators asked to meet with finalists.

The confidentiality of candidates must be respected. Isolating library staff — of all levels — from most of the search process, however, is not the only way to secure confidentiality. This University's librarians have considerable professional expertise and should have had more than one voice on the search committee, if only out of common courtesy. Despite the University-wide implications of such an appointment, it is, after all, librarians whose work will be most immediately affected by this appointment.

Other institutions, including those we consider our peers, significantly involve representative members of their library staff throughout the entire process of their searches for library directors. For example, Brown University Library, during its last two searches for directors, included on its search committee members from the library's administrative, professional staff, and its non-professional, unionized staff, in addition to its Provost and faculty members. Adhering to the same terms of confidentiality as the non-library members of the search committee, library representatives spoke for those in the University with professional expertise in librarianship and with direct interest in the outcome of the search.

The University may want to reconsider its approach to such searches when — not soon, I hope — it needs to look for a successor to Dr. Mosher. This search process has not served the Libraries' staff as collegially or as respectfully as might have been desirable. It has also not served the interests of the new Director as constructively as it could. Any Director should enter such a position with the feeling that he or she knows not only the institution's statistics and top administrators but also knows its staff and has its support in order to get off to a running start. An appointee as strong as Dr. Mosher, to a position as significant to the University as its Director of Libraries, deserves that. He also deserves to know that he is entering upon this position not as an unknown but as a person welcomed by his staff as well as by the University community as a whole.

— Daniel Traister, Assistant Director of Libraries for Special Collections

Response from Dr. Campbell ...

I comment on several issues raised by Dr. Traister's letter from the point of view of the Chair of the Consultative Search Committee for a Director of Libraries. The members of our committee, except for its student representatives who were chosen by peers, were selected by the Provost and President, at whose pleasure we served as a consultative committee. It was understood that we were not a committee heavily weighted with library professionals and staff. Rather, we were a committee primarily of library users who, I believe, collectively had sufficient experience and wisdom to make sound judgements and the wits to secure the advice of professionals in the field.

In any case, we were a committee representative of the University community, but we did not individually represent specific constituencies to whom we were beholden or to whom we reported. A committee composed of representatives of individual constituencies with library concerns — such as the one Dr. Traister advocates — would have been much larger and would have been engaged in the process of selection that would have been more politicized and more dependent on compromise decisions.

Dr. Traister's assertion that "no candidate was invited even to see the Libraries" is incorrect. In point of fact, on October 16 Dr. Traister, one of the candidates, and I shared a Van Pelt elevator on route to the sixth floor. I did not introduce the candidate to him because she had requested anonymity. I accompanied several candidates on campus tours that included library visits; several others preferred to make visits on their own. It is important to remember that the issue of confidentiality is extremely important in a search of this type, particularly for external candidates who hold positions of responsibility at their home institutions. The fact that we were able to maintain confidentiality helped us to produce a group of exceptionally qualified candidates.

Dr. Traister suggests that it would have been desirable to introduce a mechanism permitting more members of the library administration and staff to meet the candidates. Provided it were limited to the finalists, I believe that this proposal merits future consideration. The committee debated this issue; however, we were engaged in a search process that was severely attenuated by turnover in the Provostship, and we therefore elected to present our slate as rapidly as possible without introducing such a time-consuming procedure. The President and Provost were aware (as were we) that two constituencies, composed of faculty and the other of library professionals, had expressed just this wish. Future searches will, I hope, permit inclusion of such an arrangement.

— Malcolm Campbell

Associate Dean for the Humanities, SAS
Professor of Art History

With respect to the composition of the search committee, President Sheldon Hackney adds:

The University's Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators does not spell out the specific consultative procedures for the appointment of the Director of Libraries. However, because of the significance of this position in the academic life of the University we followed the procedures used in naming senior academic administrators.

Former Provost Ehrlich and I met with the University Committee on Consultation regarding the composition of the search committee. In addition, Mr. Ehrlich consulted with Richard De Gennaro, our former director of libraries, among others. I agree with Dr. Traister that Dr. Mosher will be a welcome addition to our University, and I look forward to his arrival.

University Vanpool

Are you tired of parking problems, waiting for SEPTA, or just tired of driving? Here's your chance to sit back and relax, meet fellow University co-workers, and help to keep the roads decongested. A vanpool in the Northeast is looking for riders. If you are interested please call Helen at 662-2062.

— Helen Raucheisen, Secretary, Business Office, HUP
Restructuring the Office of University Life

In commencing a search for a Vice Provost for University Life, we took the opportunity to review the organization and management of the wide range of functions that report to the Vice Provost. As is known, three outside consultants were hired to assist us in this effort. Their report, which was released in early January, stresses the high quality of much that goes on in the Division of University Life and recommends against large-scale movement of responsibilities and offices out of the Division and into other administrative areas within the University. The consultants believe the University should continue to work toward the integration of student and academic life as outlined in the Mendelson Report and that what is needed most from a Vice Provost of University Life if this goal is to be achieved is strong leadership and effective delegation and management. They outline three schemes of administrative organization that they believe would enhance the effectiveness of administration throughout the Division of University Life.

The Consultants' report has been disseminated throughout the University and has been discussed in detail by the Academic Planning and Budget Committee, by the Steering Committee of the University Council, and by the Council of Undergraduate Deans. In addition, we have received letters and reports from individuals and other groups who have reviewed the document. After considering the advice we have received, we have decided to proceed with the administrative organization outlined in scheme one. This scheme retains a strong Vice Provost for University Life who reports directly to the Provost, but organizes the Division of University Life into a more hierarchical administrative structure. Thus there would continue to be a single Vice Provost at the top but there would also be several Associate Vice Provosts reporting to the Vice Provost, each having line authority for offices and programs within the University Life Division.

Our acceptance of this structure does not mean, however, that we shall be reorganizing units within the University Life Division exactly as proposed in the Consultants' report. We believe there needs to be much more discussion about some of the proposed changes. For example, while some believe there is no need for a centralized office on graduate affairs within the Division of University Life, others argue for a graduate student advocate, perhaps someone within the Office of Student Life. We wish to stress that there will be ample opportunity to refine the outlines of the administrative structure we are adopting, and that we will be seeking advice on these matters from the University community.

One issue that has emerged in the discussions of the Consultants' report concerns student financial aid services and the advantages offered by combining into a single entity the four separate offices that currently deal with student financial matters. This would enable us to begin to think in a more creative fashion about the financing of higher education. The cost of a Penn education is significant, and the methods by which families cope with its costs are complex. Support from the government is decreasing, and increasing amounts of aid are coming from University funds intended for the support of academic programs and faculty. The need to focus resources to improve the ways in which our students address and solve their financial problems is clear, particularly since we remain committed to need-blind admissions.

Currently, there are four major offices concerned with student financial services: the Bursar, the Office of Student Financial Aid, the Penn Plan Agency, and the Collections Department. These offices are virtually independent of each other and sometimes have guidelines and policies that are not consistent. We believe that Penn can help students and their families cope with financial matters by better linking these four units. A consolidated approach would provide students a focal point for financial transactions and would facilitate discussions needed for advising and supporting students and families both, when choosing to come to Penn and afterwards. It should also help encourage the development of new, creative approaches to paying for a Penn education, thus enabling students to continue their work here, irrespective of their financial means.

To implement this approach, we have decided that for the next two years, the four offices—Bursar, Student Financial Aid, the Penn Plan Agency, and Collections—will report to a single administrator who in turn will report jointly to Richard Clelland, Deputy Provost, and Marna Whittington, Vice President for Finance. Also, these two will head a Task Force on Student Financial Services that will focus on the development of new and creative policies to insure a need-blind admissions policy and to integrate the policies and services provided by the four offices. At the end of this two year period, the decision will be reviewed.

—Sheldon Hackney, President
—Michael T. Aiken, Provost

Of three options presented by outside consultants, the final structure will most closely resemble Scheme 1, above: the numerous scattered operations involved in University life report through three associate vice provosts who in turn report to the VPUL. The exact groupings of services under each associate vice provost are still subject to change; and, as noted in the call for nominations on page 5, candidates for VPUL will also have an opportunity to give input on final structure. Not shown is the interim placement of offices relating to financial aid, which will be grouped under one administrator who will report jointly to the Deputy Provost and to the Vice President for Finance while a task force study is completed.

ALMANAC February 23, 1988
Evolution of the VPUL

The post now called Vice Provost for University Life has its roots in the University-wide reorganization of 1953, when Dr. Gaylord Harnwell took office as President of the University. The reorganization created a new vice-presidency reporting to Dr. Harnwell and overseeing admissions, registration, student activities, student aid, student union (Houston Hall), physical education and athletics. The title was Vice President for Student Affairs and the man named to it was Gene D. Gisburne, who had been a director of student activities.

In 1965 the units that made up Student Affairs were moved to the Provost’s Office (except for physical education and athletics, which remained with the President’s Office until well into the Meyerson Administration). The vice-presidential title was changed to Vice Provost for Student Affairs, and the first to hold it (1965-67) was Professor A. Leo Levin of the Law School. His successor was the Rev. Mr. John A. Russell, who had been director of the Christian Association and who held an adjunct faculty post in City Planning at the Graduate School of Fine Arts.

In 1972 Mr. Russell left the University for a Commonwealth post, and some responsibilities of the vice-provostship were transferred to Dean of Students Alice F. Emerson (now president of Wheaton College) while the position was reviewed in relation to a new position created under President Meyerson and Provost Elliot Stellar: the post of Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, held by Dr. Humphrey Tonkin, professor of English. The recommendation to change Student Affairs to University Life was first used in what is known as the Mendelson Report (Almanac October 10, 1972), discussing a planning goal called Integrative Educational Life.

For a time the VPUL was a VPUSUL: Vice Provost for Undergraduate Students and University Life. On Dr. Tonkin’s return to teaching in 1976 (he has since become president of SUNY/Potsdam), a nationwide search found Dr. Patricia McFate of Illinois, a scholar in folklore with strong interests in technological literacy who also held a professorship in SEAS. Dr. McFate was VPUSUL until 1978 (when she joined the National Endowment for the Humanities; she has since become president of the American-Scandinavian Foundation), and Dr. Philip H. Mechanick, professor of psychiatry, served as acting vice provost during the search for a successor.

The choice in 1979 was Janice Somerville, who had been Secretary of the University. The title was shortened to Vice Provost for University Life, and Ms. Somerville held the post until 1988, with the appointment of Paul H. Mosher, Ph.D.

Correction to the record will be appreciated.

Report of the Consultative Committee on the Selection of a Director of Libraries

The committee was convened by Sheldon Hackney and Thomas Ehrlich on February 16, 1987 and completed its work on February 15, 1988 with the appointment of Paul H. Mosher, Ph.D.

Members of the committee were: William J. Bank, associate professor of neurology; R. Jean Brownlee, professor emerita of political science and former dean of the College for Women; Malcolm Campbell, professor of the history of art and associate dean for the humanities, SAS; Thomas J. Dilling, C’89*; James C. Emery, professor of decision sciences; Valerie A. Pena, director of the biomedical library; Ames B. Smith, III, professor of chemistry; and Frederick Stark, Ph.D. candidate, SAS. The committee met a total of 24 times, including six interviews with candidates and a session with President Hackney and Provost Aiken to discuss an unranked list of final candidates.

The committee advertised the position and solicited comments and nominations from the Library staff, ACRL personnel administrators and staff development officers, participants in the Wingspread Conference (including foundation officers), and colleagues at peer institutions. In addition, the committee met with Richard De Gennaro, Joan Gutowals, and James Haas (president of the Council of Library Resources and former director, Penn Libraries, Columbia University Library), and consulted with a number of librarians in other institutions and officers in national library organizations.

Committee members discussed several broad issues related to the search, including the varied responsibilities of the Library director and the role of the Library on University, local, and national levels. They reviewed trends and opportunities in library management and administration as well as a number of issues of special concern to the University library. It was agreed that the best candidate should have national standing in the profession; high-level management experience in a research library, including experience in the application of new technologies; ability to provide strong leadership; an understanding of the issues and trends affecting research libraries; imagination and resourcefulness in planning utilization of resources; and a strong commitment to the intellectual and service mission of the libraries.

The committee received and screened 45 applications and nominations, of whom 16 were female and at least two were minority. Of the six candidates who were interviewed, three were female, one was minority. Dr. Mosher was among those candidates who were recommended to the President and the Provost.

—Malcolm Campbell, Chair, Consultative Committee on the Selection of a Director of Libraries
Guidelines For Communicating About People With Disabilities

The Committee for an Accessible University and the Office of Affirmative Action have produced a brochure, Guidelines for Communicating About People With Disabilities. The Committee’s Subcommittee on Terminology began work on this project a couple of years ago in an effort to provide “acceptable terminology” within the context of an evolving national consensus.

The brochure includes portrayal issues that can make the difference between negative portrayal or a straightforward, positive view such as: do not refer to a disability at all unless it is crucial; do not sensationalize a disability; avoid using emotional descriptions; avoid using an overfamiliar tone in referring to people with disabilities. It also lists acceptable terminology (disabled or handicapped) vs. offensive terminology (crippled, deformed).

The chair of the subcommittee is Joan Carey, records assistant in the Office of the Registrar and a member of Penn’s Affirmative Action Council. Other members of the subcommittee included: Andrew Lapat, Col. ’86; Dee Everett, Grad. Arts & Sciences; Ancil George, head of Rosengarten Reserve Room, Van Pelt Library, Arlene Stewart, business administrator, Department of Landscape Architecture; and Alice Nagle, coordinator of programs for the handicapped, Office of Affirmative Action.

Copies of the brochure are available from the Office of Affirmative Action, 1133 Blockley Hall, 6021, Ext. 8-6993.

VoiceMail: A New Service

VoiceMail, a new University service that can be activated from any Centrex telephone, allows calls to be forwarded to a VoiceMail box after three rings. It can then be used in a variety of ways to receive or send messages, check receipt of messages (which will mark the date and time the message was received, and, if they are a mailbox subscriber, their name and extension), answer the telephone when the line is busy, or send copies of messages to share with others. It can also function as a “bulletin board” for announcements by University departments.

One of the “hotlines” now in place to explain Penn services is the SEPTA line (Ext. 8-1923) which enables the caller to get information on the service.

PASS system of discounts for SEPTA Transpasses and Trailpasses (10% discount for Penn employees through payroll deduction). The Class of 1923 Ice Rink also has a voice mailbox (Ext. 8-1923) which enables the caller to get information about their services from one phone call.

Individual VoiceMail users can change their greeting from any touchtone phone in the world, store their messages to retrieve and act upon them later, and determine if someone has received a message, or send a private message. Call the VoiceMail hotline at Ext. 8-1201 for costs for administrative users. Student mailbox offices cost $8/month, but are configured as a different class of service.

Call Joyceann Padovani at the VoiceMail hotline (Ext. 8-1201) for further information. This number will also enable you to listen to recorded information on the service.

OF RECORD

Policy Concerning the Exclusion of Foreign Nationals From Specific Research Areas

The following policy, approved by the University Council on February 10, has been adopted by the University and is effective immediately. It will be incorporated into the next editions of the Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators and the Research Investigators’ Handbook:

Members of the University research community shall not be subject to discrimination based on citizenship with respect to their participation in research activities. While funding agencies may limit their financial support to particular groups (such as U.S. citizens), they may not prohibit the participation of others in University research.

Where a research contract deviates from this policy an exception may be granted by the Vice Provost for Research after review by the University Council Committee on Research (see Section E, paragraph 2 of guidelines for the Conduct of Sponsored Research).

Sheldon Hackney, President
Barry S. Cooperman, Vice Provost for Research

COUNCIL

Synopsis: March 10

Following the reports of the officers, questions were raised regarding the sessions for the persons who will serve as advisers under the harassment policy and the orientation seminars for freshmen to be undertaken as part of the next New Student Week. Concern was expressed that the sessions may be used to inculcate an ideology rather than merely to inform. Those responsible for the sessions stated that the purpose in both cases is purely to inform.

A proposed policy from the Committee on Research concerning the exclusion of foreign nationals from specific research areas (Almanac, October 20, 1987) was introduced. The proposal stated that funding agencies may not exclude foreign nationals from participation in research projects but may limit their financial support to particular groups. It provided that exceptions to the policy may be made by the Vice Provost for Research. The proposal was amended to require that the Committee on Research review all requests for exceptions that come to the Vice Provost, concern having been expressed that the committee otherwise would not be aware of exceptions that are granted. An objection was raised that foreign nationals would be discriminated against if they do not receive compensation for research which they are performing and that in such cases alternative funding should be provided. The Vice Provost indicated that he would investigate the possibility of alternative funding in the case of research projects but said that sheer size would preclude similar treatment for training grants. The proposal was adopted as amended.

Robert G. Lornsdale, Secretary;

Penn License Plates?
The General Alumni Society would like to find out if there is substantial interest among faculty, staff, alumni, students and parents in a proposed University of Pennsylvania license plate to be issued by the Department of Transportation of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Villanova, Temple, University of Pittsburgh and Penn State now have license plate programs such as this.

The license plates would be available to members of the University community who own a car registered in Pennsylvania and are willing to pay a one-time $20 application fee for the license plate in addition to the $20 annual fee charged by the Department of Transportation. Drivers with personalized or vanity license plates would have to relinquish them in order to obtain a Penn license plate.

The Special Organization Plate Program sponsored by the Department of Transportation requires a guarantee of 500 applications before manufacturing the plates. To express interest in obtaining the proposed license plate send a self-addressed, stamped, business-size envelope with the words “I Want a Penn License Plate” printed in the lower left-hand corner to: The General Alumni Society, E. Craig Sweeten Alumni Center, 3533 Locust Walk 6226. The General Alumni Society will tally the responses in the fall and send out more information to all respondents.
From PEN at Penn and the Pappas Program

Poet Allen Ginsburg and Novelist Erica Jong, two writers whose work has epitomized change in American life in recent decades, will be here in the next two weeks under the PEN at Penn Program, and Chief Justice Warren Burger, who held the High Court bench during part of that time, arrives in March as the Pappas Fellow.

Allen Ginsburg's *Howl and Other Poems* electrified the world of letters in 1956 and became the anthem for the Beat Generation; the beat went on in the sixties, drawing huge crowds for poetry readings, often set to music, at anti-war demonstrations and in environmental celebrations such as Philadelphia's Earth Day. Mr. Ginsberg will give a reading with Accompanist Steven Taylor, on Wednesday, February 24, at 4:30 p.m. in B-17 Logan Hall, with questions-and-answers afterward. He will also give a lecture, "Open Form Prosody: Walt Whitman to Jack Kerouac," Thursday from 3-4:30 in Room 200 College Hall. Erica Jong, whose liberated 1974 novel *Fear of Flying* was called "a female Tropic of Cancer" by Henry Miller, began with poetry (*Fruits and Vegetables*, 1971; *Half Lives*, 1973) and returned to it with *Loveroot* in 1975 after her first novel made her a household word. Since then she has interspersed poetry (*At the Edge of the Body; Ordinary Miracles*) with fiction (*Fanny; Parachutes and Kisses*), and combined the two in *Witches*. Her current book, *Serennissima: A Novel of Venice*, is hailed as a poetic and convincing fantasy. Her appearance at Penn will be "An Afternoon with Erica Jong," starting at 4:30 p.m. on March 1, in A2 Rittenhouse Labs.

The two writers are Steinberg Fellows in the series co-sponsored by the New York chapter of P.E.N. and by the School of Arts and Sciences.

Former Chief Justice Warren Burger's two days as a Pappas Fellow will include two events open to the public: a lecture on "Separation of Powers" March 21 at 4 p.m. in B-1 Meyerson Hall, and one on "The Insanity Defense" March 22 at 3:30 p.m. in 100 Law School.

A Preliminary Report from a Safety Consultant

Through the recommendation of Commissioner Tucker of the Philadelphia Police and at the request of the Administration of the University of Pennsylvania, I had the privilege of spending three days on your campus reviewing issues surrounding public safety. Also involved were Captain Tom Cooney of the Philadelphia Police and Ira Somerson, a private security consultant who has lectured at Penn. In the coming weeks the three of us will prepare a report which will contain recommendations. It will be written in a format which can be shared with the general community. We came to your University as interested professionals. In fact, Captain Cooney and the Philadelphia Police Department have a vested interest in the success of our endeavors since your jurisdiction is a concurrent one falling within the corporate limits of Philadelphia.

Community Sensitivity

I am sending you this letter with the hope that it can be shared with the community at large. This is because your unit is at a pivotal point in its short history. In the course of our efforts we listened to a wide range of input. We also dialogue and probed to develop as accurate a picture as possible from which to make our recommendations. Many with whom we spoke had deep feelings about a wide range of social issues that went beyond criminal victimization into such emotion-filled areas as racism, sexism, selective enforcement, and inappropriate conduct by commissioned personnel. They wanted us to appreciate these feelings. We did, but in balance with your own. Although it is constructive to remain aware of these sentiments, the future demands your energy and focus. It is time for everybody to concentrate on that future.

America is unique in the world by controlling police power at the local level. James Q. Wilson of Harvard argues that it has been this decentralization which produces such a variety of solutions and expands what we can now legitimately call police science. You are at a point where you can speak to the concerns of your constituents while advancing the literature of our profession. However, to succeed each of you must show some initiative. This is because your critics want a good faith gesture on your part. This is the way it has always been; it is the role of the public servant to reach out; however, history shows that American communities no matter how fraught with discord do support their local law enforcement agencies when given signs of good faith. Penn should be no exception.

Outreach

In the short period of time I spent with you on patrol I found you to be talented people who can change agents to address both community fear as well as criticism. However, it requires a nondefensive outreach effort on the part of every man and woman in the department, commissioned and noncommissioned alike. We think you are worthy of the challenge.

There is something very noble about policing in a democratic society. The very officer about whom complaints are made today, may tomorrow be asked to lay down his life in behalf of a total stranger. It is therefore in that spirit of community team building and mutual respect that I wish you all the very best. In reviewing the statistics of a number of other institutions around this country, and without getting into the nuances of their interpretation, your record shows an honest effort, not simply on the part of every man and woman in the department, commissioned personnel. They wanted us to appreciate these feelings. We did, but in balance with your own. Although it is constructive to remain aware of these sentiments, the future demands your energy and focus. It is time for everybody to concentrate on that future.
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FEBRUARY AT PENN

FITNESS/LEARNING

Computing Resource Center
25 Bits and Pieces Seminar: How to Choose a Microcomputer; noon-1 p.m., 1st Floor Conference Room, Van Pelt Library. No registration required. Information: Ext. 8-1780.

Lotus Macros: 4:30-6:30 p.m. Tuition is free but materials must be purchased in advance. Register in person at Room 315, SH-DH. Information: WCIT, Ext. 8-1395.

MEETINGS
25 Lesbian/Gay Staff and Faculty Association; noon. Bring your own lunch. Information: Larry Gross, Ext. 9-5620, or Bob Schoenberg, Ext. 5-5044.

TALKS
23 Fictionality Declared; Michael Riffaterre, University Professor, Columbia University, and director of School of Criticism and Theory; 4:30 p.m., Room B-17, Logan Hall (Center for Cultural Studies, Departments of Romance Languages and English, Comparative Literature and Theory Program).

Doing Ethnography of Literacy in an Iranian Village; Brian Street, University of Sussex, U.K.; noon, Room C-34, Graduate School of Education (Literacy Research Center, GSE).

Dean’s Dialogue on Educational Issues in Philadelphia; Marvin Schuman, president, Philadelphia Federation of Teachers; 4-5:30 p.m., Room 110, Annenberg School (Graduate School of Education).

Mechanism of Site-Specific Recombination in Bacterial Nigel Grindley, Yale University; 4 p.m., Lecture B, John Morgan Building (Department of Microbiology and Molecular Biology).

Moral Perspectives and Genetic Engineering; Reverend Daniel Mackle and medical school students; 7:30-8:30 p.m., Penn Newman Center (Penn Newman Center).

25 Ce++ and the Gating of Na Channels; Clay Armstrong, department of physiology; 4 p.m., fourth floor, Richards Building (Department of Physiology).

Somotostatin—A New Approach to Conformational Analysis; Ralph F. Hirschmann, department of chemistry; noon, Pharmacology Seminar Room, Mezzanine Suite 100-101, John Morgan Building (Department of Pharmacology).

Radiation in Society; Rosalyn S. Yalow, Nobel Prize Laureate, Solomon A. Berson Research Laboratories, VA Medical Center, NY; 4 p.m., Medical Alumni Hall, Maloney Building (Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine).

26 Poetry Reading; Mark Strand, noted poet, author and critic; 7:30 p.m., Room B-3, Meyerson Hall (Department of English).

29 Insertional Mutagenesis of the Drosophila Genome with Single P Elements: Mutations Affecting Oogenesis; Lynn Cooley, Carnegie Institution; noon, Room 196, John Morgan Building (Department of Human Genetics).
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