UPS Professor: Vukan Vuchic of SEAS

The University's UPS Foundation Chair in Transportation has been awarded to Dr. Vukan Vuchic (right) professor of transportation engineering in the systems department at SEAS. A member of the faculty since 1967, Dr. Vuchic is a world authority on urban transportation who initiated the graduate program in transportation engineering here. The prestigious chair he now holds is one of three endowed at Penn by the United Parcel Service Foundation.

Author of the influential Urban Public Transportation Systems and Technology (Prentice Hall 1981), as well as other books and some 100 papers in his field, Dr. Vuchic has consulted for governments, planners and architects throughout the world. In this country, he lectures widely on the development of systems and policies to alleviate urban transportation problems, testifying for Congress and writing on the topic in the national press.

In 1982 he was the first recipient of Germany's Dr. Friedrich Lehner Medal as one who has "dedicated a life work to urban public transportation and excelled in that effort." He also shared the Urban Design Administration Honor Award given by HUD in 1980, for a project on renovation in Philadelphia (as consultant to Venturi & Rauch).

Born in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, Vukan Vuchic took his diploma at the University of Belgrade and came to the U.S. for his master's in civil engineering-transportation and Ph.D. in engineering-transportation at Berkeley. After teaching in Berkeley's business administration program in 1966, he joined Penn as assistant professor in 1967 and became a U.S. citizen the following year. He was promoted to associate professor in 1970 and full professor in 1975.

Dr. Vuchic is known not only for his research but for his teaching in public transportation, traffic engineering, design of transportation systems and facilities, and related courses—typically, he teaches four courses a year plus advising M.S. and Ph.D. candidates in city and regional planning and at Wharton as well as in his home department. He has been active in University-wide activities—Council Facilities Committee, Penn Language Center, Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty and Committee on Publication Policy for Almanac. He has also held numerous posts in his department and School, including secretary of the SEAS Faculty, chair of the committee on faculty salaries, and member of the School's Penn 250th committee.

Dedicating Lauder-Fischer Hall: A highlight of the Trustees' two-day fall meeting will be Thursday's dedication of Lauder-Fischer Hall as the home of two Penn programs founded in 1983: the Joseph H. Lauder Institute of Management and International Studies, a dual MBA/MA program of Wharton and SAS; and the Wharton Real Estate Center, which oversees requirements for majors and conducts research on public policy and other aspects of the field. All members of the University are welcome at the 11:30 a.m. ceremony in the second-floor student lounge of Lauder-Fischer, located on the Wharton Quadrangle shown here. (In James Mann's sketch above, done from 37th Street facing westward, Vance Hall is at left and the new hall at right.) Davis, Brody & Associates designed the four-story, $6-million structure in brick with slate to harmonize with older buildings nearby. It was funded by Leonard A. Lauder (W '54), Estee and Joseph H. Lauder, Ronald S. Lauder (W '65), Arthur M. Fischer (W '52), and a number of additional donors. Planting starts in the spring for the Wharton Quadrangle, which will have some 30 trees plus shrubs, ferns and ivy. Design is by Hanna Olin and support is from William Mack (W '61) and Shearson Lehman Hutton.

Medal of Arts: Ian McHarg

Professor Ian McHarg (above), founding chair of Penn's department of landscape architecture and regional planning, was awarded the 1990 National Medal of Arts by the National Endowment of the Arts. President George Bush and Mrs. Bush made the presentation September 10 at the White House, citing his persuasive Design with Nature, his teaching in and out of the classroom, and his legacy of landscapes planned according to his own principles—from Woodlands in Texas to Parkistan in Teheran, with Baltimore's Inner Harbor and the Lower Manhattan Plan as major urban examples. Nine other major medals and awards, and Professor McHarg's three honorary doctorates, "pay tribute to a landscape architect and planner who not only has spoken eloquently of our need to live in harmony with nature, but who has provided us with ample tools to do so," President Bush said. On his return from Washington, Professor McHarg lent the medal to the Centennial Exhibit 100 for 100, celebrating the Graduate School of Fine Arts' anniversary; it is now on display in Meyerson Hall.
**From the President**

**On the Violation of Open Expression Guidelines on May 17, 1990**

Last May 17, during the first plenary session of Penn's 250th Celebration, events occurred inside the Civic Center during an address by former President Ronald Reagan which have raised serious concerns regarding the application of the University's Open Expression Guidelines. In my view, these events constituted a prima facie violation of both the spirit and the letter of the Guidelines.

What actually happened that day and who was ultimately responsible have been difficult to determine. It appears that the ejection of three students (two of whom were bearing placards and one who came to their aid) from the Civic Center resulted from a misinterpretation of the actions of the placard holders on the part of the Philadelphia Police and the Secret Service. I have asked the director of the local office of the Secret Service and the Philadelphia Police to provide us with any further specific information about the actions of the students from the auditorium in the hope of shedding further light on the incident.

Let me review how we approached the issue of the open expression guidelines before the event. My goal was to make certain that we were fully prepared to apply the procedures of the guidelines on open expression at the Reagan address. To that end, a group including Dr. Sol Goodgal, Vice Chair of the Committee on Open Expression, and representatives from University Life, the University Police, the University General Counsel, and my office, met before the event to work out the appropriate arrangements to assure open expression.

The group faced two clear practical realities: first, that an organization comprised almost completely of non-University persons, ACT-UP, had stated its intention to disrupt the Reagan address; second, that the Secret Service could intervene at any time, no matter what the University wished, in their judgment the safety and security of the former President was at risk.

After a lengthy review of possible actions by ACT-UP and the Secret Service, the group, with Dr. Goodgal's approval, reluctantly concluded that, while the University clearly remained committed to open expression at the event, the procedures outlined by the open expression guidelines did not fit the practical realities.

Within these limitations, the University worked to maintain the maximum range of expression, making sure that members of the community could bring placards into the hall, arranging for University Police to be stationed throughout the audience to deal with any incidents in a sensitive manner, and posting open expression monitors to act as observers and to assist if possible. It was through the intervention of members of the administration that many of those members of the community who opposed Reagan and who wished to make their views known were admitted to the Civic Center. After the incident, members of the administration, including Marna Whittington and George Koval, made vigorous efforts to assure that both the Philadelphia Police and the Secret Service have the ousted students readmitted to the Civic Center. Their attempts to preserve the right of free expression came into conflict with an interpretation of safety and security by organizations beyond the control of the University. I deeply regret that their efforts did not prevail.

This unfortunate experience points to an area of the open expression guidelines that needs further thought and refinement. I will ask the Committee on Open Expression and the University's General Counsel to give serious consideration to finding ways to sustain the University's policies when non-University persons have such a determinative influence on the tenor of a University event, particularly when a potentially controversial individual whose safety is of concern, is the focus of that event. The limitations of our current policy were painfully evident on May 17, 1990. In the meantime, should any future event appear to pose similar difficulties for the preservation of the right of open expression, I will consult the Committee on Open Expression and other appropriate members of the community well in advance to see if we can arrive at a more effective short-term approach.

Once the Committee has forwarded its advice and recommendations, we will publish them in *Almanac* for comment. I will welcome the views of the Committee and the community, and will act on them expeditiously.

— Sheldon Hackney
Two Reports of the Council Student Activities Committee: On Student Activities Funding and on Student Support Services

I. On Student Activities Funding

Background

The Steering Committee of the University Council charged the 1989-90 Student Affairs Committee with “re-examining all issues related to the process of student activities funding for both undergraduate and graduate students.” To accomplish this, the Committee established a subcommittee on Student Activities Funding which spent three months gathering information and hearing concerns about the process of student activities funding. The subcommittee:

1. Sent a letter to students and administrators active in the area of student activities funding requesting information about how funds are allocated and for an evaluation of current procedures. (Individuals contacted are listed in Appendix A).
2. Held an Open Forum on January 22, 1990, that was advertised in the Daily Pennsylvanian, in flyers, and by word of mouth. Approximately 20 students and administrators attended the forum.
3. Interviewed relevant students and administrators.

This report 1) summarizes how funding for student activities is generated and allocated, 2) reports concerns about student activity funding that were brought to the subcommittee’s attention, and 3) makes recommendations on how the administration might address some of these concerns.

I. Student Activities Funding Sources

The General Fee

Most funds for student activities are allocated from revenues generated by the general fee, which all students pay. For fiscal year 1990, undergraduates paid a general fee of $1,147, graduate students paid $1,848, and professional students paid $1,341. The fees have been different since 1973, when it was decided that different student groups use student services at different rates. FY 1990 general fee estimated revenues totaled $10,697,840 for undergraduates, $3,341,120 for graduate students, and $1,600,240 for professional students. General fee revenues are used primarily to support student services and only secondarily to fund student activities. (Detailed overall allocation of this general fee revenue for FY 1987-88, the most recent year for which this information is available, is listed in Appendix B).

In FY 1990, approximately 5% ($566,000) of the undergraduates' general fee revenue was given to the Undergraduate Assembly, and 3% ($138,829) of the graduate/professional general fee revenue was given to the 12 individual graduate and professional schools and the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly. Unlike the Undergraduate Assembly, the bylaws of the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly mandate that 3% of student activities funds distributed to the schools on a per capita basis, and 5% be given to GAPSA for administrative costs. (Appendix C shows how much each school and GAPSA received for fiscal year 1990.)

Additional Allocations

In addition to these per capita allocations from the general fee, the Office of the Vice Provost for University Life provides extra funds for special student activity organizations. These organizations are:

- The Rowbottom Society, a student group that plans and sponsors social events for undergraduates. Rowbottom was given a budget of $10,000 for FY 1990.
- The GAPSA Special Budget. The GAPSA Special Budget was established in 1986 to provide funding for a university-wide newsletter and for the Graduate Inter-School Activities Council, which supports activity groups that include graduate/professional students from the different schools. The GAPSA Special Budget for fiscal year 1990 is $20,000.
- The Social Planning and Events Committee. The Undergraduate Assembly formed a new branch of student government this year, SPEC, which will coordinate and expand large-scale undergraduate social activities. The administration has agreed to provide funding for SPEC in addition to the UA budget.

Use of Funds—Undergraduate Assembly

The Undergraduate Assembly’s FY 1990 budget of $576,000 ($566,000 from general fee revenue and $10,000 carryover from FY 1989) was allocated as follows:

- Undergraduate Assembly—$10,450
- UA Administrative—$9,450
- Nominations and Elections Committee—$9,193
- Student Committees on Undergraduate Education—$4,300
- Student Activities Council—$543,994

Student Activities Council

SAC distributed $378,680 (before appeals contingency, etc.) to approximately 150 student activity groups in FY 1990. (A list of student activity organizations that received SAC funding is Appendix D. SAC recognizes organizations that are composed of a majority of undergraduate students and whose officers are undergraduate students. Once recognized, organizations that desire funding from SAC must submit budget request forms which are reviewed by SAC’s Finance Committee, composed of students not affiliated with particular activities. The Finance Committee makes recommendations to the full SAC, which approves budget allocations. The Finance Committee uses a set of guidelines to determine funding recommendations, which include a ban on funding a program that is designed to support or to oppose a particular political ideology or candidate or to influence legislation, and “programs designed to elicit support for religious ideologies and promote membership in sectarian groups.” Other activities that are not funded include meals and some travel expenses.

Uses of Funds—GAPSA & Graduate/Professional Schools

The Graduate and Professional Assembly received a budget of $6,700 in 1990 for administrative expenses and to fund the new student reception. The individual graduate and professional schools received a total of $132,129. The subcommittee did not undertake to determine exactly how these schools allocated their student activity funds, but some information (provided by student affairs administrators and student government officers) is listed as Appendix E. GAPSA allocated $2,385 of the GAPSA Special Budget for the graduate and professional student newsletter, and the remaining $17,615 GAPSA Special funds were given to the Graduate Inter-School Activities Council.

Graduate Inter-School Activities Council

GISAC allocated funds to 20 graduate/professional interschool activity groups in FY 1990. (Organizations which received GISAC funding and how much they received are listed as Appendix F.) As with SAC, an organization must be recognized by GISAC before it can apply for funding. Organizations which are for GISAC membership are those whose membership is drawn from across graduate/professional school lines, and whose officers are all Penn students. GISAC members submit budget requests to the GISAC Steering Committee, composed of four GISAC Executive Board Officers and three GISAC members, elected by the Council. The Steering Committee makes confidential allocations to the groups, based on a number of criteria including the size of the group, the nature of the group's activities, how the group has spent its GISAC funding in the past, and the availability of other sources of funding. Groups that receive funding from SAC are ineligible to receive GISAC funds.
II. Perceived Problems and Committee Recommendations

Through communication with students active in student activities (as funders and recipients) and student affairs administrators, the subcommittee was informed of the following perceived flaws in the current process of student activity funding:

1. **Need for Increased Social Activities for Undergraduates.** Several undergraduate student leaders told the subcommittee of a need for increased social events for undergraduates which are currently not eligible for SAC funding. The UA has addressed this problem structurally through the formation of SPEC, as mentioned above, and the administration has committed itself to finding funding for the new student governmental organization.

   **Recommendation:** The administration provide initial funding for SPEC, and monitor its success in meeting undergraduate needs for social activities.

2. **Lack of Funds for Political and Religious Activities.** As noted above the only source of funding for political and religious activities is the Graduate Inter-School Activities Council. This leaves undergraduate organizations wishing to undertake political or religious activities without any financial support; two groups who expressed concern to the subcommittee on this issue are the Young Americans for Freedom and The Red and the Blue. Organizations composed of both undergraduates and graduates may request funding from GISAC (which currently funds the Penn Democratic Socialists of America, the Muslim Students' Association, and other political and religious groups), but GISAC leaders noted that GISAC funds are very meager as compared to SAC's. Students noted that GISAC funds are very meager as compared to SAC's. (Details in Appendix H.*)

   **Recommendation:** The role and support needs of political and religious student groups on campus—which vary widely in their resources—need to be periodically assessed. (Preliminary work was done by the Finance Committee's subcommittee on religious organizations in FY 1988-89.) It may be necessary in the future to establish alternative sources of support, both financial and otherwise, for these undergraduate activities.

3. **The Situation of Mixed Undergraduate/Graduate Groups.** According to SAC guidelines, as noted above, organizations that are more than half graduate that include a graduate student as an officer are ineligible for SAC funding. Many “mixed” organizations therefore turn to funding sources which have more restrictions than the current system. By completely separating graduate and undergraduate funding structures, and thus failing to provide mixed groups with an opportunity to get funding, it is claimed that the University is discouraging undergraduate/graduate interaction.

   **Recommendation:** If the University desires to foster interaction between undergraduate and graduate students outside of the classroom, the administration may wish to consider establishing programs which facilitate integrated co-curricular programs. As an initial step, it is recommended that a committee be charged in the near future with assessing undergraduate/graduate interaction and making recommendations for improving it.

4. **Inconsistencies Between Undergraduate and Graduate Funding.** Students involved in graduate student activities expressed concern to the subcommittee that while 5% of the general fee that undergraduates pay is returned to them as student activity funding, only 3% of total graduate and professional student general fees are returned to GAPSA and the individual schools. (See Appendix G.*) Since there has been an overall increase in both centralized and school-based graduate and professional student activities in recent years, GAPSA requested in February 1990 that the percentages be equalized. The administration responded to this request in March with a plan which will raise the graduate/professional student percentage from 3% to 5% through the addition of a special activities fee surcharge. At the end of the five-year period, graduate and professional students will receive 5% of their general fee back in student activities funds. (Details in Appendix H.*)

   **Recommendation:** See below under #7, Overall Lack of Funding.

5. **The Structure of Graduate/Professional Student Funding.** According to GAPSA’s bylaws, 95% of student activity funds for graduate and professional students are allocated directly from the Vice Provost for University Life’s office to the individual graduate and professional schools. Although GAPSA does not want funds to the individual schools to be reduced, its leaders pointed out the problems this arrangement causes:

   a. There is no process that monitors what happens to the funds given the individual schools. The subcommittee was not able to determine whether the administrators of all the schools pass along these funds to student governmental organizations.

   **Recommendation:** The Office of the VPUL should see to it that funds given to individual schools for student activities are allocated to student governmental organizations, or are used for activities to which student governmental organizations have agreed.

   b. This arrangement left GAPSA with an FY 1990 budget of $6,700 for administrative expenses, supplemented by the $20,000 GAPSA Special Budget provided by the VPUL. While GAPSA has been using this small budget to sponsor GISAC activities that bring together graduate and professional students from different schools, it is seriously limited in what it can accomplish (especially as compared to SAC’s much larger budget). Leaders from GAPSA and from GISAC constituent groups speak of the need for more funding for centralized graduate student activities. The VPUL has increased the GAPSA Special Budget from $20,000 to $42,500 for FY 1990-91, which will improve the situation. After 1991, however, the amount of the GAPSA Special Budget will depend upon negotiation between GAPSA, the school governments, and the administration.

   **Recommendation:** The administration is encouraged to monitor the needs of centralized graduate student activities in the future to ensure that they receive adequate funding from general fee revenues.

6. **Lack of Adequate Funding for International Student Groups.** Many students claim that international student groups are not well-served by the current structure of student activities funding for the following reasons:

   a. Since most international students (especially graduate students) are under severe financial constraints, their organizations find it difficult to raise funds through member contributions. International student organizations thus depend on support through student activities funds to a higher degree than other types of student organizations.

   b. One of the primary functions of international organizations is to bring students from the same homeland or cultural background together. SAC however, does not provide funding for international student activities which are primarily social in nature (although GISAC does).

   c. International student leaders feel their student groups are not provided the recognition they deserve (in terms of funding) for the major role they play in informing orientation, support and other forms of assistance to Penn’s large international student population. They also stressed that international student groups (which often overlap with religious/cultural groups, such as the Muslim Students’ Association) play an important role in community relations and in providing the University with culturally diverse social and educational programs.

   **Recommendation:** The administration is encouraged to monitor the needs of international student activities in the future to ensure that they receive adequate funding from general fee revenues.

7. **Overall Lack of Funding.** Given that student activities funding is allocated from the general fee, which also provides funds for most student support services, many student groups feel that student activities “compete” for resources with important offices such as Student Health. Leaders of SAC and administrators from some graduate and professional schools say that they do not have enough funding to support groups who request it while other graduate and professional school administrations subsidize student activities to make up for this shortfall. As mentioned above, the Office of the Vice Provost for University Life has also provided additional funding for undergraduate activities and centralized graduate student activities.

   **Recommendations:**

   a. The apparent inequity between schools’ resources needs further examination.

   b. The recent policy developed by GAPSA and the administration for increasing student activity funds might well be followed on the undergraduate level. (See Appendix I—Provost letter and five-year plan.) Upon GAPSA’s request, the graduate and professional student general fee will go up an additional $3 per year (beyond the normal increase) for five years starting in fall 1991. This additional $3 will be used solely for graduate and professional student activities.

   **Recommendations:**

   a. Continued past insert
II. On Student Support Services

Purpose and Procedure

A subcommittee of the Student Affairs Committee was formed at the opening of academic year 1989-90 to examine the effectiveness, coordination and level of use and availability of the various student victim or crisis support services at the University. No intent was directed to examining support programs for international students since this was accomplished in academic year 1988-89; nor did the subcommittee examine student health since it is monitored by the Student Health Advisory Board. The services examined were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim Support of Public Safety</td>
<td>Ruth Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn Women's Center</td>
<td>Elena DiLapi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Resource Center</td>
<td>Al Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ombudsmans' Office</td>
<td>Gubbin O'Connor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Affirmative Action</td>
<td>Sharon Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Management-Vice Provost's Office</td>
<td>Barbara Cassel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Counseling Services</td>
<td>Ilene Rosenstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Counseling</td>
<td>Bob Schoenber</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step I

An initial information-gathering session was held October 30 with contact people for the various services and members of the subcommittee. The various services were all familiar with each others' work, but had never before met all together. Nevertheless, the existing system of protocols, referrals and case conferences appears to function well, given the constraints of confidentiality and the limited resources of several of the offices. All present commented on the value of holding such meetings. Since the largest number of these services falls under the Vice Provost for University Life, such annual meetings could be called at her office's invitation, and might prove helpful in keeping the services informed of activities, functions and developments in their various services.

Step II

In an attempt to gather specific information about each service, as a follow-up to this meeting, formal questionnaires were sent to each of the services. In-person or telephone interviews were also held. A copy of the questionnaire is available on request to the Office of the Secretary. The services supplied information on function, caseload and staffing from which figures on cases were extracted (see table below).

Because of the extremely varied nature of the functions and activities of these services, this table provides only a vehicle for more precise questions. It serves as an exploratory tool, rather than a means of comparison. Some services are more closely related to ongoing counseling and ongoing programming than are others. This is also variability in how cases are counted; several services do a great deal of telephone counseling that is not reflected in the numbers below. While most of the services have pressing needs, the counseling service and victim support of public safety appear to suffer severe staff and space shortages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Support Services: Staffing and Caseloads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim Support of Public Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn Women's Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Affirmative Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step III

In addition to the meeting, questionnaires and interviews, an Open Forum was held February 13 to solicit student input on these services. It became apparent that for many students, the diversity of services is confusing, and self-defeating when it comes to outreach. Most students vaguely know that such services are there when they need them, but when it comes to a crisis, they often cannot make contact, or do not know who to call first. This is true even for residential staff, and is particularly problematic for students who live off-campus and thus do not have the benefit of residential living staff. Students working in the various services feel a sense of competition for student body attention and concern.

It was the impression of graduate and professional students that, especially during non-office hours, there was too much reliance on residential staff support, a support system they do not benefit from. A similar complaint exists with outreach and awareness programs in general. Some schools, particularly the medical school, are conscientious about providing support services to their graduate and professional students; others make no school-based effort, or lack resources to do so. Both undergraduates and graduates stressed the need for a 24-hour, professionally-staffed (or monitored) hotline, both as an immediate contact for crisis situations as well as for referral to other appropriate services. Other colleges and universities handle matters this way. It would drastically simplify what the average student needs to know if facing a crisis situation. One would merely know to dial 999-HELP. Furthermore, it may reduce the number of persons necessary for "on-duty service" in off hours.
Several students raised issues of awareness and outreach, especially for younger students, and cited the difficulties of overtaxed services like the Women’s Center. While several of these services feel that they are only scratching the surface by taking clients who come and get help, and are not reaching uninformed but needy individuals, further outreach only adds to overburden by generating more inquiries from students who did not report past incidents, or did not know such services were available. For example, peer counseling groups like STAAR* have notably increased the number of people who then seek further help at the Women’s Center.

Observations and Recommendations

The following are drawn from information gathered by steps 1-3 above:

1. **A Central Hotline.** This is a service that has been proposed in the past, but rejected because of questions of expense and liability, and is to be distinguished from a peer hotline. It is used at other colleges and universities for handling crises, referrals and off-hours situations. Benefits include:

   - A single contact point for the average student to remember. It is difficult for any student to keep track of all options, especially in a moment of crisis. The hotline would offer professional crisis counseling as well as referrals for ongoing or less urgent problems.
   - 24-hour service. A central hotline would meet this need, as well as make necessary referrals. While additional phone staffing might be handled by trained volunteers, there should always have a professional present to take emergency calls. In the past, many students were shocked and upset to encounter an answering machine.
   - Fair distribution of access. Off-campus students, who include a large number of graduate and professional students, would be served. In some ways, the hotline could be looked on as providing a “central R.A.”
   - Enhancement of current staff and levels of office service. The hotline is not a substitute for present services. It is a needed addition and not a replacement. Nor is it recommended instead of the currently proposed peer rap-line. Rather, it offers relief to existing services. Calls that may or may not be appropriate to current services or require professional attention could be directed to the central hotline, thus freeing the services themselves out of the “sorting and referring” process and freeing up their time for more effective use.

2. **Regularly Scheduled Combined Support Services Meetings or Retreats for Coordination and Program Development.** Such meetings could be called at the invitation of the VPUL’s office, while recognizing that not all services fall under that office. All services’ annual or semi-annual reports would serve as basic tools. There has been an expression of concern that services are not fully integrated into the computer information system of the Campus Police whether located in the same building as the police department or not. The in-service training for University Police on how to handle victims needs improvement, with Crime Prevention activities given the adequate resources and staff attention they deserve.

3. **Clearly Defined Levels of Service and Resources to Match.** Attempts should be made to integrate clear program objectives and levels of funding and not treat them as separate issues. At the present time, only the Ombudsman’s Office and the Crisis Management Office of the VPUL are able to meet their objectives. Most disconcerting is that these two offices have no proactive, preventive awareness functions, yet these are precisely the functions that make the campus more hospitable, and are the most likely to be affected by inadequate budgets. Services which serve purposes of reducing victimization should be empowered and not seen only as the recourse of victims. Their programs should be specifically targeted and effectively funded. Specific observations and recommendations for services falling in this category appear below:

**Office of Affirmative Action**

The office largely serves the staff by monitoring the University’s equal opportunity and affirmative action policies and programs. But, whether by design or default, the OAA has become the sole service for students with self-identified disabilities, the registered number of which currently stands at 104 (80% undergraduate, 20% graduate). While these two functions are not inherently incompatible, the effect is to remove students with disabilities from the usual channels of student services. This current function of the OAA should be formally recognized and not only by specific designated staff, but with considerations of office location. Blockley Hall is not easily accessible to disabled students. The attempt to open a satellite office in Houston Hall failed for lack of support and staffing. It is essential that an easily accessible, permanent and fully-staffed office be fully a part of student services, whether under the auspices of OAA or not. We recommend that a committee examine this early next year for specific recommendations and concrete proposals.

**University Counseling Service**

The counseling service suffers from inadequate staffing and office space with serious consequences in delayed follow-up appointments and restricted programs. The counseling service staff is dedicated and effective, but overburdened and will become more so when new programs and referrals expand their clientele. This service needs support, particularly as attention to graduate student services is growing and services expanded. This priority is urgent.

**African American Resource Center**

Still in the process of defining campus role and activities when this report was compiled in school year 1989-90.

**Penn Women’s Center**

The Women’s Center suffers problems of office space and inadequate resources. Furthermore, the configuration of its current space in Houston Hall does not permit confidential counseling. This condition needs to be addressed soon and not left for a future Campus Center. Since the Women’s Center serves all women, (students, faculty, staff and community), its current level of staff and funding may be shortchanging students. The role and effectiveness of this service need to be re-examined in order to better serve students and all women at the University. It may be that faculty, staff and community resources and services located in another facility, or with this service’s current budget, could be better integrated into the computer information system in one important area, the outreach and awareness programs would be enhanced and services to all constituencies improved.

**Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Counseling**

The LGB Counseling Office needs appropriate office space for confidential counseling. Its efforts to incorporate education and sensitivity to sexual minorities on campus within the University structure and bureaucracy itself should be supported.

**Victim Support of Public Safety**

There is an urgent need for increased staff and improved facilities, especially with the enormous growth of the campus police force. This is an area of great concern for students, faculty and this committee. The current staff of victim support operates with an overtaxing load and, relief is necessary. The single director and one assistant handled 1989 cases in 1989. Office space is inadequate and there is no access to office equipment after 5 p.m. and on weekends, when most incidents occur. Important information within the department is not always shared in a timely manner. So that all cases can be investigated and followed, and victim services provided, victim support and crime prevention need to be fully integrated into the computer information system of the Campus Police whether located in the same building as the police department or not. The in-service training for University Police on how to handle victims needs improvement, with Crime Prevention activities given the adequate resources and staff attention they deserve.

**Ex officio:**

Stanley E. Johnson (University chaplain)
Benjy Karch (chair, UA)
Patricia Karouma (Office of the Vice Provost for University Life)
Mohamed Saadi-Elmadaj (chair, GAPSA)

Comment on the reports above may be sent to the chairs or members of the committee c/o the Office of the Secretary, presently at 121 College Hall/6382. The office’s temporary relocation to 42nd and Pine Streets is now tentatively set for October 16.-Ed.

* STAAR operates from the Office of Health Education, Student Health Services, under the guidance of Susan Villari (652-7126), but coordinates outreach and referral activities with the Women’s Center.—Ed.
DEATHS

Generations of Wharton alumni will remember her for her supervision of the statistics laboratory, in the era of desk calculators. She gave enormously of her time, energy, knowledge, and sympathy in advising students in their academic and personal lives. Her grand finale at Wharton was the organization of the fiftieth anniversary celebration of the Statistics Department in 1981. At that time, Nobel Laureate Simon Kuznets, sole survivor of the founding faculty of the department, addressed a gathering of friends and former students, who had returned to Wharton from across the country for a fond reunion. Nancy was at the heart of the arrangements for this splendid celebration.

Nancy's many friends on the faculty and staff of the department, the school, and the university are deeply saddened by her passing, and recall with gratitude her many kindnesses.

She is survived by her brother, Walter J. Schnerr; her nephew, Peter Allen; and two grandnieces, Kristin Elizabeth Allen and Kellie Mary Allen. Donations in her memory may be made to the American Cancer Society or the American Heart Association.

Dr. Edward M. Sewell, adjunct professor of pediatrics and former director of the Division of Respiratory Diseases at CHOP, died September 5 of pneumonia. He was 67. At the time of his death, Dr. Sewell was also professor of pediatrics at Thomas Jefferson and director of employee health services and occupational health for the Philadelphia Department of Public Health.

An alumnus of Penn, Dr. Sewell began practice in 1950—the first black pediatrician in Philadelphia, according to family members. He served as the director of health for the Philadelphia school system from 1970 to 1974. He was director of the Cystic Fibrosis Center and the Division of Respiratory Diseases at CHOP from 1974 to 1980. From 1975 to 1985 he also served as chairman of the Philadelphia Pediatric Pulmonary Center, and he was the president of the American Lung Association in 1983.

Survivors are his wife, Jean; two daughters, a son, a sister, and her mother. Memorial contributions may be made to the American Lung Association of Philadelphia/Montgomery County.

Scott Singer, 29, a doctoral candidate in public policy, died September 27 from injuries sustained when he was hit by an automobile on September 25 near Market Street and John F. Kennedy Boulevard. Mr. Singer came to Penn after taking his B.S. at Minnesota and his M.S. at Carnegie-Mellon, then serving as an associate manager at AT&T for two years. He was scheduled to receive his Ph.D. in May 1991. He is survived by his wife, Connie Singer.

Adolescent Weight Management

A new study on Adolescent Weight Management is being conducted at Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic with the participation of CHOP. The two-year program is directed by Dr. Robert Berkowitz, associate lecturer in psychiatry at the Medical School. Dr. Virginia Stallings, director of Nutrition Support Services for the Division of Gastroenterology and Nutrition at CHOP and assistant professor of pediatrics at Penn Med will coordinate the nutrition portion of the program.

The program seeks 14 to 16-year-old girls who are 40 pounds or more overweight. During the first 10 weeks, participants will be placed on a specially formulated adolescent low-calorie dietary supplement. The second 10 weeks will involve being gradually reintroduced to food. For more information call Dr. Berkowitz at 243-2875.
Penn Future Forum: October 9 and its Sequels

The Penn Future forums, sponsored by the Student 250th Committee, mix Penn and outside panelists in discussions on the future of higher education and of Penn; all four set for this fall involve the audience.

Ivy League and Ivory Tower: Examining the University’s Role in Society (October 9, 4 p.m.) will evaluate the connection between the teaching/research functions of academia and the larger society. The role of large, urban universities will be emphasized. On the panel are:

Amy Cohen, Ph.D. candidate in history, administrative coordinator of the program for assessing and revitalizing the social sciences.

David Noble, professor of history, Drexel University; co-founder with Ralph Nader of the National Coalition for Universities in the Public Interest.

Robert B. Schwartz, program director for education, The Pew Charitable Trust.

Ralph Smith, associate professor of law at Penn; executive director of the Philadelphia Children’s Network.

Rosemary Stevens, professor of history and sociology of science at Penn.

Other Forum Dates


November 13—School Into Life: College Experience Outside the Classroom.

December 4—Visionary Penn: Creating a View of People and Places to Come.

University of Pennsylvania Police Department

This report contains tallies of part 1 crimes, a listing of part 1 crimes against persons, and summaries of part 1 crime in the five busiest sectors on campus where two or more incidents were reported between October 1, 1990 and October 7, 1990.

Date Time Location Incident
32nd to 34th; Spruce to Walnut
10/04/90 8:32 PM Bennett Hall Bike taken
10/05/90 12:30 PM Hayden Hall Bike taken
10/05/90 4:00 PM Bennett Hall Front bike taken
10/05/90 6:48 PM Bennett Hall Bike taken
10/05/90 8:52 PM Towne Building Knapsack and contents taken
34th to 36th; Spruce to Locust
10/03/90 9:30 PM Williams Hall Bike taken from rack
10/03/90 10:25 PM Houston Hall Wallet & contents taken from purse
10/05/90 12:49 PM Furness Building Unattended purse taken
10/06/90 8:13 PM Irvine Auditorium Brass wall plaque
36th to 37th; Locust to Walnut
10/02/90 12:53 PM Christian Association Envelope with cash taken
10/02/90 10:04 PM Annenberg Center Bike taken
10/03/90 1:22 AM Annenberg Center Wallet taken
10/03/90 10:04 AM Annenberg Center Property taken from theatre
36th to 37th; Spruce to Locust
10/02/90 12:59 PM Steinberg/Dittrich Wallet taken/ recovered less cash
10/04/90 11:15 PM 3600 block Locust Purse & contents taken
10/07/90 12:30 PM 37th St subway Shopping bag taken from subway
Expressway to 32nd; University Boulevard to Walnut
10/03/90 11:02 AM Hollenback Center Unsecured wallet taken
10/04/90 5:51 PM Hollenback Center Cash taken from office
10/07/90 12:45 PM Hollenback Center Secured bike taken from driveway

Safety Tip: Knowing what to report to the Police is often just as important as when you report it. Sometimes even little things can be of great help to ongoing investigations of other crimes. Virtually anything out of the ordinary or the least bit suspicious should be reported immediately. Never assume that someone else will call the Police or that it is not that important. Everything is important when it affects your security.

Fitness and Learning

11 Anti-Idiotypic Antibodies as Probes for Epithelial Na+ Channels; Thomas R. Kleiman, Medical Renal Electrolyte; 4 p.m., Department of Physiology Library, Richards Building (Department of Physiology).

12 Structure and Function of Clara Cell 10 kDa Protein; Gurumukh Singh, department of pathology, University of Pittsburgh; 12:15 p.m., Institute for Environmental Medicine, Seminar Room-Room 1, John Morgan Building. Information: 898-9100 (Institute for Environmental Medicine).

14 Muscarinic Receptors, G Proteins, and Ion Channels; David E. Clapham, Department of pharmacology, Mayo Clinic; 4 p.m., Physiology Library, Richards Building (Department of Physiology).

17 Regulation of Cytoskeletal Structures in Neurons; Mark Black, department of anatomy, Temple University Medical School; noon-1 p.m., Clinical Research Building Auditorium (Cell Biology Graduate Group).

October at Penn

Conference

14 Bioelectrical Repair and Growth Society, 10th Anniversary Meeting; symposium will review 55 papers from 10 countries discussing bioelectric effects; Penn Tower Hotel. Information: 387-8333 or 1-800-356-PENN. Through October 17.

Exhibit