Teaching Awards in Nursing: Judy Verger, Peggi Guenter

Judy Verger, lecturer in nursing and coordinator of the Clinical Skills Laboratory, has been chosen for the School of Nursing's 1991 Teacher of the Year award.

Nursing's Teaching Assistant of the Year is Peggi A. Guenter, who teaches anatomy and nutrition to undergraduate nursing students.

Ms. Verger has been on the school's faculty for the past five years, teaching pediatric clinical nursing to both graduate and undergraduate nursing students. At the Clinical Skills Laboratory, she helps undergraduate nursing students develop the skills which are regarded as the cornerstone of clinical nursing practice.

Support letters for Ms. Verger say she has "fostered a nurturing, stimulating and creative environment in which undergraduate students learn valuable clinical skills.

Ms. Verger holds a master's degree from Penn in nursing of children, and a bachelor's degree in nursing from the University of Delaware. Her funded research and professional lecturing focuses mainly on the protein and calorie needs of critically ill children.

Ms. Guenter, a doctoral candidate in nursing at Penn, has a dissertation in progress on nutrition and AIDS patients. She earned her bachelor's degree at the Medical College of Virginia and her master's from Penn, and has published widely on nutrition support.

Presidential Young Investigators: Composto, Kumar and Voth

The National Science Foundation's Presidential Young Investigators this year include three young Penn faculty members—two in engineering and one in chemistry.

They bring to 22 the total of Penn men and women who have won this highly competitive award, for which all young faculty of all colleges offering science and math may compete.

(And one of last year's Presidential Young Investigators now adds a Sloan Fellowship—see right)

The NSF award, which provides each of the winners with up to $100,000 a year for five years, will support the research of:

Dr. Russell Composto, assistant professor of materials science and engineering. Dr. Composto is a Gettysburg College alumnus who took his Ph.D. from Cornell in 1987, then held a postdoctoral fellowship at the University of Massachusetts and served as guest scientist at the Brookhaven National Laboratory before joining Penn. Winner of Cornell's Tau Beta Pi Excellence in Engineering Teaching Award in 1994, he works in polymer physics and engineering, the application of ion beam techniques to solid state and materials characterization problems, and related topics.

Dr. Vijay R. Kumar, assistant professor of computer and information science at SEAS. Dr. Kumar majored in mechanical engineering at the Indian Institute of Technology in Kanpur, took his advanced degrees from Ohio State in the field, and came to Penn in 1987 as a member of the mechanical engineering and applied mechanics faculty of SEAS. He moved to CIS in 1989, and now does research in kinematics, robotics, mechanism design and control while teaching in these and related areas.

Dr. Gregory Voth, assistant professor of chemistry. The winner of a Packard Foundation Award last year—and earlier of Lilly Foundation and Dreyfus Foundation Awards for teaching and scholarship—Dr. Voth is a graduate of the University of Kansas with a Ph.D. from CalTech who did postdoctoral work at Berkeley. His research focuses on the theory of chemical reaction dynamics in condensed phase systems.

Sloan Fellow: Arjun Yodh

Dr. Arjun G. Yodh, assistant professor of physics, is one of the 89 young scientists chosen from over 500 U.S. and Canadian nominees in physics, chemistry, math, neurosciences and economics for the Alfred P. Sloan Research Fellowship, which provides $30,000 for each fellow's flexible use over two years.

Dr. Yodh is a Cornell alumnus who took his Ph.D. at Harvard and did postdoctoral research at AT&T Bell Labs before joining Penn in 1988. He has since won a Lilly Award, NSF Presidential Young Investigator Award, and Office of Naval Research Young Investigator Award. His work is in nonlinear optics as a tool for studying phenomena in condensed matter physics.

Leaving SSW: Dean Austin

The School of Social Work's Dean Michael J. Austin will step down at the end of his seven-year term in 1992 to join the University of California at Berkeley as professor in the School of Social Welfare.

Dr. Austin, who came to Penn from the University of Washington at Seattle, is a Berkeley alumnus who came east for his master's and Ph.D. from Pittsburgh. He cited family ties as a factor in the move: "This is the first time in my career when I will be able to combine professional interests with family priorities."

"Dean Austin has accomplished much during his years here," said President Sheldon Hackney. "Under his guidance, the School of Social Work has doubled in enrollment and in annual giving. We are grateful for the leadership he has brought." Established under Dean Austin's aegis were a new Ph.D. program alongside the traditional DSW, and three new certificate programs in cooperation with local religious institutions—in Jewish Communal Studies with Gratz College, in Catholic Social Ministry with St. Charles Seminary, and in Lutheran Social Ministry with the Lutheran Theological Seminary. Five dual degrees have also been developed, combining the MSW with the BA, MBA, and other degrees in city planning, law and education.
A Continued Dialogue on the Size of the Administration by Stephen Golding

The Office of Resource Planning and Budget, at the request of Provost Aiken and Dr. Pollock, has reviewed the information provided in the February 14, 1991 “Report on the Size of the Administration.” Our analysis found that the Committee reported several numbers different from those in the University budget documents. We have sent the Committee our findings under cover of a separate letter. Some of these differences may simply have been typographical, however, we do not believe the amended numbers change substantially the ratios used in the report to support its conclusions.

Our greatest concern, as highlighted in President Hackney’s comments, is that the report presents only a partial analysis, based on one ratio—new tuition dollars compared with increases in unrestricted faculty and staff salaries—to draw some very broad conclusions about fundamental University budget policy and resource allocation decisions. The calculations in the report are accurate, but by themselves do not provide the reader with sufficient perspective to analyze thoroughly broader allocation decisions or to understand the larger context in which decisions on new tuition dollars were made.

It is important when discussing the issue of long-term budgetary growth in general or growth of administrative costs in particular to look at the broad picture of what has transpired in the University over the last decade. In order to accomplish this, we have prepared a series of expanded charts that show what has happened in the areas highlighted in the Senate Committee’s report. The data used to develop the first two charts have come from the same documents used by the Senate Committee on Administration. In the analysis presented here, total budget numbers were used in order to project the most complete picture. This was done, because we believe it is important to understand the interrelationships between restricted and unrestricted funds, and to understand that restricted and unrestricted direct expenditures together play a significant role in defining the resources available to a school. It is also important to understand that General University (subvention) must be included in any spending analysis of academic priorities, as these resources are ultimately distributed to the schools and resource centers in the form of salaries, fellowships, grants, etc. For example, in FY 1991 commitments were made of over $1.1 million for faculty salaries, $1.5 million for the Trustee Professor Program, $9.9 million for Graduate Fellowships and Research Assistants, and $1.1 million for Research Projects funded by the Research Foundation. In addition, the University earmarked $2.0 million in indirect cost...
recoveries for the renovation and enhancements of research facilities. These costs ultimately are accounted for in school budgets, but initially budgeted in the General University. Together, unrestricted, restricted, and General University resources reflect the total allocation decisions that were made in supporting academic programs and other school-based initiatives.

When discussing subvention allocation decisions, an erroneous comparison that is frequently made is the difference between the assignment of subvention and of central costs allocated to a school. In fact, these two items are not related. In general, allocated costs represent services and facilities costs that are consumed in large measure by the academic enterprise. The assignment of the costs to the schools and centers is based on a series of algorithms which attempt to measure the extent to which the units "consume" central services. Subvention, which in the past has provided greater general program support, is also used to a very large degree to support academic initiatives that are central to the mission of the University. In many ways, the more targeted allocations of subvention funds can be viewed as investments in the academic future of the University. The returns on these investments may lag the initial outlay, but the goal is to maintain the excellence of our academic programs.

The first chart, Schools, General University, Student Aid, Research Centers, Auxiliaries and Administrative Service Budgets, compares the overall budgets for the major organizational units of the University for fiscal years 1980 and 1990. The chart shows no significant change in the percentage of total budgetary resources available to the schools including general University subvention in the decade of the 1980s (58.7% in 1980 versus 58.6% in 1990). The chart also reflects the emphasis on increasing graduate fellowships and on maintaining the policy of need blind admissions in light of reduced federal support for student financial aid (9.6% in 1980 vs. 11.6% in 1990); in fact, the central administration grew the slowest and now comprises a smaller proportion of the budget (11.4% in 1980 vs. 13.6% in 1990); and it shows the growing importance of unrestricted funds supporting the academic core of the University that were generated partially as a result of the last campaign (Campaign for the '80s) and more recently by the current Campaign for Penn.

The second chart, Academic, Administrative and Clerical Salary Budgets without HUP, for schools, resource centers and the central administration, looks at the same time period of the 1980s. CPUP salaries are included in this analysis, and use a larger proportion of academic salaries for clinical faculty in the Medical School are funded by the Clinical Practices. This chart compares the relative proportion of the budgeted payroll by employee classification to see what changes, if any, have taken place. As reflected in the Committee's Report, we do see a change in the ratio of unrestricted and restricted salaries (46.6% in 1980 vs. 51.4% in 1990) compared to faculty salaries as a percentage of payroll (54.0% in 1980 vs. 48.6% in 1990). What we also see is that when restricted and unrestricted salaries are combined, academic salaries have grown faster than administrative and clerical salaries and consume a larger proportion of the University's total payroll (57.3% in 1980 vs. 61.7% in 1990) than in 1980.

One valid argument is that gross budget numbers do not provide a clear picture of what has happened to salaries over the decade of the 1980s. Salary data must be combined with other information such as headcounts, employee benefits, and changes in salary policy. Collectively, these measures reflect the decisions that were made and provide a better understanding of the total picture.

The Office of Resource Planning and Budget has worked with the Office of Institutional Research to develop some information regarding changes in University headcounts over the past decade. What we see in chart three is that there has been little change in the number of tenure track faculty over the ten year period—an increase of 55. This does not mean, however, that there has not been substantial growth in academic employment throughout the University as the clinician educator track increased by 212. As can be further seen at the bottom of chart four under the section "Total University" while administration had the highest percentage of growth (55.4%), the actual number of new employees hired in classifications that were either academic or that directly supported the University's academic activities exceeded new administrative employees by 2,589 (3,099-514). Much of the 2,275 increase in the three academic categories, or A-2, is due not only to tenure track and clinician educators in the standing faculty, but also to growth in the number of lecturers, instructors, research assistants, and teaching assistants who are classified as associated and academic support faculty, and all of whom support the University's academic and research enterprise.

We also believe that comparisons dealing with salary policy should be made as a part of total budgetary policy in order to understand how all the resources are being used. Chart five, Changes in Unrestricted and Restricted
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The University’s plan for FY 1992 sustains these accomplishments and addresses the proposed Commonwealth budget cut of $18.6 million while not interrupting significantly the initiation of the goals and objectives outlined in the Academic Five-Year Plan. In developing a response to Governor Casey’s proposals, the University administration approached the problem from the broadest perspective and developed a strategy that spread the impact of the cuts over the central administration and to a significantly lesser degree the academic units (or the Schools & Resource Centers). We considered all available resources and made trade-off decisions on services and programs in order to protect the academic core. This plan included: higher than anticipated increases in tuition and fees; a cut of $4.0 million in administrative costs; a redistribution of General University resources (subvention) to the schools and resource centers; a reduction of three hundred positions across the University; and an unbalanced budget for the first time in fifteen years. The true measure of our success will be how effectively all resource allocation decisions made during this process maintain the future quality of our academic programs.

As we look to the future, the Academic Five-Year Plan, therefore, becomes a foundation upon which future resource allocation decisions will be made. Over a year of effort by ten working groups comprised of a broad spectrum of the University community went into the development of the Plan. Today the deans and resource center directors are taking the next step as they develop and blend their own plans with the University Plan. It is only through these plans that the priorities of the University can be judged. What we must do for the future is develop benchmarks to assess how successful we are in meeting the priorities stated in the plans. The “Report on the Size of the Administration” represents a start toward understanding the complex issue of resource allocation decisions and the impact these decisions have on the lives of all members of the Penn community. The task at hand, as President Hackney stated last month, is to move forward from here to insure that future allocation decisions are consistent with and can be measured against the goals and objectives of the University’s planning efforts.

**Impacts of Budget Cuts**

In the light of the anticipated loss of $18.6 million from the Commonwealth, Senior Vice President Marna Whittington told the A-1 Assembly Wednesday, there will be a lot of discussion about how Penn spends money. “We will plan in an evolutionary, not a revolutionary, way” to protect the core of the academic enterprise, she echoed the Provost. “You don’t start and stop intellectual endeavors.”

In the announced reduction of 300 positions (faculty and staff), priority will be given to attrition, reassignment and retirement to limit the number of layoffs. Penn’s 2200 A-1 employees have a turnover rate of 16%, which is in fact greater than 300, she said. “There is no need for free-floating anxiety,” she added. “Penn is not doing a hiring freeze but rather will establish parameters for units and let line managers make allocations.” For layoffs that do occur, there will be a task force to help employees, staff relations support, written guidelines for supervisors and information for the rank and file.

Productivity is another factor she cited: “It is incumbent on us as supervisors to make sure all employees are fully productive... to assess how units are organized and do critical tasks first,” eliminating discretionary activities. Penn must continue to be serious about nurturing, cultivating and developing staff skills as they have under the leadership of Barbara Butterfield, she added.

As employees, Dr. Whittington said, people should understand what’s expected of them, how supervisors perceive what they are doing, and use the employee evaluation as a way to improve communication in departments. Penn is reducing costs in other ways, such as using pre-sorted first-class mail rather than regular first-class, a 26% cut in essence balancing out the recent postal rate increase. Trash removal’s significant expense is being reduced by increased recycling (now at 30 tons of paper per week) and re-examination of the removal process.

Other reductions would be too cumilative such perks as first-class air travel and attending multiple conferences in a given year.

In response to a query on indirect cost recovery, she said that Penn’s rate of 65% is pre-determined for this fiscal year next. Due to new federal regulations, liquor will probably be unallowable for reimbursement in the future, and Penn will review subcode structures to accommodate such changes.

**Revised Eleemosynary Policy**

The University has had a policy since at least 1986 of not making charitable contributions from University funds to other eleemosynary organizations (i.e., any organization supported by charitable giving regardless of tax-exempt status), unless a written waiver is granted by the President. Because Penn solicits gifts for educational and research purposes of the University, it is inappropriate for these funds to other uses or organizations, no matter how worthy. In light of the current budgetary situation, I wish to re-affirm this policy: payments by the University to other eleemosynary organizations in the form of a gift or contribution is prohibited, un-approved in writing by the President. Effective July 1, 1991, I will not longer grant such waivers.

—Sheldon Hackney
Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, my name is Arthur Asbury. I am a neurologist at the Medical School of the University of Pennsylvania. It is my privilege to represent today the Association of American Universities and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. The associations' memberships include 150 university campuses on which the preponderance of medical research conducted in the United States is conducted. The NIH budget for fiscal year 1991 is $5 billion, of which the FY 1992 appropriations are $1.254 billion. This compares with $8.775 billion from the administration's request. At the heart of this recommendation is a conviction that investigator-initiated research is the core of NIH supported medical research. Sustained growth in this quintessential element of the enterprise is an irrefutable part of our perception of the NIH.

We believe that to maintain the nation's leadership position in biomedical research there must be adequate appropriations to fund at the very minimum one-third of the proposals recommended by reviewing study sections. Further, they must be supported at the level of funding determined by experts as required to implement the research plan in the proposal. In recent years, under the pressures of inadequate funds and the demand that reasonable numbers of scientists be supported, the NIH has resorted to regrettable mechanisms that appear to create more funds. In doing so, we do not find it a contradiction to place before you proposals the cost of which may exceed what you reasonably believe can be spared for medical research. As it is our obligation to set priorities among the various claims to available funds in your Subcommittee, it is our responsibility to convey to you our strongest beliefs concerning the funding levels that are essential if medical research in this country is to progress in its mission. We urge that all of you attack all humankind and exact intolerable prices not only in human suffering but, indeed, in tax dollars paid by the citizenry.

It is the dedication and commitment of you and your colleagues and those members of Congress who preceded you who helped create the extraordinary medical research system represented by NIH and ADAMHA that provides the fundamental justification for our request. By now one can be ignorant of the impact medical research has had on the well-being of our people, but more important is where this research has led. Across so many disciplines medical research has reached a point of strategic opportunity. The lines of basic and applied research are narrowed. New knowledge gained awaits the next state of research that will lead to new surgical techniques, medications and other medical technologies that could soon make inroads on the penalties of sickness and disease and injury. It will be tragic if the paths taken and supported so well by you and your colleagues encounter barriers at this opportune moment. It would be a tragedy in the sense that the ancients define tragedy as opportunities unfulfilled. It is important to note that the Administration has built this understanding in their FY 1992 proposal. Specifically, the proposed budget is $500 million short of meeting the real costs of the grants proposed.

Our two associations are active participants in the Ad Hoc Group for Medical Research Funding. In essence, we endorse the appropriations recommendations of the group. They include the following. For 1991, we propose $9.777 billion for all NIH programs. This compares with the FY 1991 appropriation of $8.775 billion. At the heart of this recommendation is a conviction that investigator-initiated research is the core of NIH supported medical research. Sustained growth in this quintessential element of the enterprise is an irrefutable part of our perception of the NIH.

We believe that to maintain the nation's leadership position in biomedical research there must be adequate appropriations to fund at the very minimum one-third of the proposals recommended by reviewing study sections. Further, they must be supported at the level of funding determined by experts as required to implement the research plan in the proposal. In recent years, under the pressures of inadequate funds and the demand that reasonable numbers of scientists be supported, the NIH has resorted to regrettable mechanisms that appear to create more funds. In fact, so-called "downward negotiations," now referred to as "adjustable worth" or other terminology, vitiate the health of medical research. We concur with the recommendation of the Congress in last year's appropriations that called for scientific judgments to determine proper funding levels and fully funding awards at those levels.

Research centers often serve as bridges between basic research and their application. They take a variety of forms and structures, often in highly specialized areas of research and they include the General Clinical Research Centers. The recommendation that a limitation be placed on their number was an arbitrary barrier to the advancement of research. Their number should be determined only by scientific merit and need and they should be funded adequately.

The notion of "pipeline" is central to the future of research activity. We support the recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences regarding the appropriate number of research trainees in the National Research Service Award (NRSA) Program. A final area of great concern is the Biomedical Research Support Grant (BRSG). We supported this program at the FY 1989 level. While the funds involved are a minuscule portion of the NIH budget, their value is very high. Over the years, they have been a major mechanism for supporting young scientists in establishing themselves prior to reaching the point where they may be funded through the normal competitive process. They have bridged a few months between grants of senior research scientists, have provided just a small amount of dollars needed for additional temporary personnel or computer time, and have been a lever in the total process of academic medical research. Their very flexibility makes their availability imperative.
COUNCIL

For the University Council meeting Wednesday, May 8, three key items on the agenda are the election of Steering Committee members; continued discussion of revisions for the Racial Harassment Policy (Almanac April 30); and discussion of the ROTC on campus in the light of the report below and last May's action, also below.

Letter to the Chair of the Steering Committee (4/10/91)

On October 17, 1990, you wrote to me as chair of the Senate Committee on Conduct asking us "to make a recommendation to Steering regarding the resolution passed by Council on May 9, 1990 regarding R.O.T.C." (Attachment #1*) The resolution stated the University Council Steering Committee would monitor the application of the University's policy against discrimination on the basis of sexual or affectational orientation as to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and that R.O.T.C. would not be permitted to remain at the University after June, 1993, unless it adheres to the non-discrimination policy. (Attachment #2*)

This issue was raised by a former student, Peter Laska, in a letter to President Hackney, dated April 29, 1990. (Attachment #3*) Mr. Laska has expressed to the Committee on Conduct that his desire was to continue his training at the University of Pennsylvania and to be commissioned an officer in the U.S. Navy. He did not wish to terminate his enrollment in N.R.O.T.C. He wanted to serve in the Navy. The Navy, however, would have excluded him from N.R.O.T.C. and from service in the Navy based solely on his homosexuality. Mr. Laska became aware that the N.R.O.T.C. knew about his homosexuality and resigned because of the harassment he claims to have experienced while a student in the N.R.O.T.C. program. (Attachment #4*) The N.R.O.T.C. program at the University of Pennsylvania unanimously recommended that midshipman Laska be disenrolled from the program because of his homosexuality. (Attachment #5*) The N.R.O.T.C. program at the University of Pennsylvania then recommended to the Chief of Naval Education and Training that Midshipman Laska be disenrolled from the program, not be recommended for any active enlisted service, and the Government seek recoupment of tuition and fees paid to him because he had admitted to being a "practicing homosexual." (Attachment #6* and #7*) At the present time, the R.O.T.C. program at the University of Pennsylvania is governed by the Department of Defense policy on homosexuality. This policy clearly states that homosexuality is incompatible with military service. "The presence of such members (homosexuals) adversely affects the ability of the armed forces to maintain discipline, good order and morale; to foster mutual trust and confidence among service members; to ensure the integrity of the system of rank and command; to facilitate assignment worldwide deployment of service members who frequently must live and work under close conditions affording minimal privacy; to recruit and retain members of the armed forces; to maintain the public acceptability of military service; and to prevent breaches of security." (Attachment #8*)

Based on the above information, the R.O.T.C. policy discriminates against students on the basis of sexual orientation in direct contradiction to the policy of the University of Pennsylvania. The Faculty of this university can no longer support a program on this campus that is in direct contradiction to the policies of the University. Therefore, the Committee on Conduct supports the resolution of the University Council that R.O.T.C. not be permitted to remain at the University of Pennsylvania and recommends that the University Council advise the administration of the University to terminate the R.O.T.C. program in 1993. It is the understanding of the Committee on Conduct that when the R.O.T.C. is not permitted to remain on the campus, it does make arrangements for its cadets to continue their military training at nearby colleges. (Attachment #9*) We, therefore, recommend that those students seeking a military commission and those seeking financial aid through the R.O.T.C. program be allowed to receive military training at another college or university while a student at the University of Pennsylvania. We further recommend that the University of Pennsylvania join the effort of M.I.T. and other universities to eliminate discrimination based on sexual orientation by the Department of Defense.

Kenneth D. George, Education, Chair, Committee on Conduct
Helen C. Davies, Microbiology/medicine
Jerry C. Johnson, Medicine
Robert F. Lucid, Engineering
Ann E. Mayer, Legal Studies
Sohrab Rabii, Electrical Engineering

DEATHS

Dr. Dorothy Ann Mereness, 80, dean emeritus of the School of Nursing, died April 20 at Chestnut Hill Hospital following a brief illness. Dr. Mereness, dean of the School from 1965 through 1977, had a long and distinguished career in the field of psychiatric nursing. After taking her nursing degree from Case Western Reserve University in 1941, she received a masters' degree from the University of Pittsburgh and a doctorate in education from Columbia Teachers' College in 1956. A member of the NYU faculty from 1955 to 1963, she wrote several books and numerous articles on nursing, including a textbook used in most undergraduate programs. After leaving Penn she was a consultant to Abdul Aziz University in Saudi Arabia.

Dr. Liana Mereness was survived by a sister, Margaret Hind, brothers James and William, two nieces and three nephews.

Contributions may be sent to the Center for the Study of the History of Nursing at the School of Nursing. A memorial service will be held 5 p.m., May 22 in the auditorium of the School of Nursing, ground floor, Nursing Education Building.

Dr. Roy D. Schmickel, 55, a world authority on the molecular biology of human genetic disorders and professor and chairman of human genetics, died April 25 at his home in Stone Mountain, Georgia. Dr. Schmickel was appointed chair of human genetics in 1981. He graduated from Oberlin College and Duke University School of Medicine. He had previously held faculty appointments at the University of Michigan and Johns Hopkins University schools of medicine, as well as positions with the National Institute of Health and the President's Council on Mental Retardation. He had been on long-term disability leave from the University since November, 1987, when he suffered a debilitating sports accident.

Both a pediatrician and a genetic researcher, Dr. Schmickel specialized in the study of hereditary diseases and was a counselor to expectant mothers. Dr. Schmickel also led research on identifying the genetic material responsible for a kind of muscular dystrophy, work which could have led to a cure for the disease.

He is survived by his wife, Leigh Schmickel, two daughters, Barbara Haan and Suzanne Schmickel, two sons, David and Daniel Schmickel, his parents Bert and Barbara Schmickel, two sisters and a granddaughter.

Donations may be made to the Roy D. Schmickel Scholarship Fund at Duke University School of Medicine, Medical Center Development, 1100 Swift Avenue, Durham, North Carolina 27705.
Whereas the University of Pennsylvania is committed to act in the Navy based solely on his homosexuality. Mr. Laska became aware that the N.R.O.T.C. knew about his homosexuality and resigned because of the harassment he claims to have experienced while a student in the N.R.O.T.C. program. (Attachment #4*) The N.R.O.T.C. program at the University of Pennsylvania unanimously recommended that midshipman Laska be disenrolled from the program because of his homosexuality. (Attachment #5*) The N.R.O.T.C. program at the University of Pennsylvania then recommended to the Chief of Naval Education and Training that Midshipman Laska be disenrolled from the program, not be recommended for any active enlisted service, and the Government seek recoupment of tuition and fees paid to him because he had admitted to being a “practicing homosexual.” (Attachment #6* and #7*) At the present time, the R.O.T.C. program at the University of Pennsylvania is governed by the Department of Defence policy on homosexuality. This policy clearly states that homosexuality is incompatible with military service. “The presence of such members (homosexuals) adversely affects the ability of the armed forces to maintain discipline, good order and morale; to foster mutual trust and confidence among service members; to ensure the integrity of the system of rank and command; to facilitate assignment worldwide deployment of service members who frequently must live and work under close conditions affording minimal privacy; to recruit and retain members of the armed forces; to maintain the public acceptability of military service; and to prevent breaches of security.” (Attachment #8*)

Based on the above information, the R.O.T.C. policy discriminates against students on the basis of sexual orientation in contradiction to the policy of the University of Pennsylvania. The Faculty of this university can no longer support a program on this campus that is in direct contradiction to the policies of the University. Therefore, the Committee on Conduct supports the resolution of the University Council that R.O.T.C. not be permitted to remain at the University of Pennsylvania and recommend that the University Council terminate the R.O.T.C. program in 1993. It is the understanding of the Committee on Conduct that when the R.O.T.C. is not permitted to remain on the campus, it does make arrangements for its cadets to continue their military training at nearby colleges. (Attachment #9*) We, therefore, recommend that those students seeking a military commission and those seeking financial aid through the R.O.T.C. program be allowed to receive military training at another college or university while a student at the University of Pennsylvania. We further recommend that the University of Pennsylvania join the effort of M.I.T. and other universities to eliminate discrimination based on sexual orientation by the Department of Defense.

Kenneth D. George, Education, Chair, Committee on Conduct
Helen C. Davies, Microbiology/medicine
Jerry C. Johnson, Medicine
Robert F. Lucid, Engineering
Ann E. Mayer, Legal Studies
Sohrab Rabii, Electrical Engineering

DEATHS

Dr. Dorothy Ann Mereness, 80, dean emeritus of the School of Nursing, died April 20 at Chestnut Hill Hospital following a brief illness. Dr. Mereness, dean of the School from 1965 through 1977, had a long and distinguished career in the field of psychiatric nursing. After taking her nursing degree from Case Western Reserve University in 1941, she received a masters' degree from the University of Pittsburgh and a doctorate in education from Columbia Teachers' College in 1956. A member of the NYU faculty from 1955 to 1963, she wrote several books and numerous articles on nursing, including a textbook used in most undergraduate programs. After leaving Penn she was a consultant to Abdul Aziz University in Saudi Arabia.

Contributions may be sent to the Center for the Study of the History of Nursing at the School of Nursing. A memorial service will be held 5 p.m., May 22 in the auditorium of the School of Nursing, ground floor, Nursing Education Building.

Dr. Roy D. Schmickel, 55, a world authority on the molecular biology of human genetic disorders and professor and chairman of human genetics, died April 25 at his home in Stone Mountain, Georgia. Dr. Schmickel was appointed chair of human genetics in 1981. He graduated from Oberlin College and Duke University School of Medicine. He had previously held faculty appointments at the University of Michigan and Johns Hopkins University schools of medicine, as well as positions with the National Institute of Health and the President's Council on Mental Retardation. He had been on long-term disability leave from the University since November, 1987, when he suffered a debilitating sports accident.

Both a pediatrician and a genetic researcher, Dr. Schmickel specialized in the study of hereditary diseases and was a counselor to expectant mothers. Dr. Schmickel also led research on identifying the genetic material responsible for a kind of muscular dystrophy, work which could have led to a cure for the disease.

He is survived by his wife, Leigh Schmickel, two daughters, Barbara Haan and Suzanne Schmickel, two sons, David and Daniel Schmickel, his parents Bert and Barbara Schmickel, two sisters and a granddaughter.

Donations may be made to the Roy D. Schmickel Scholarship Fund at Duke University School of Medicine, Medical Center Development, 1100 Swift Avenue, Durham, North Carolina 27705.
Speaking Out

Query on Retirement Info

Last semester I received in the mail at home a large 64-page brochure from Benefits-Human Resources entitled "Summary Plan Descriptions: Pennflex, Health and Welfare." With the brochure was a cover letter dated December 1990 and signed by Andrienne S. Riley and Dennis F. Mahoney, Manager of Benefits. The letter states in part: "The Summary Plan Descriptions for the University's Retirement Programs will be mailed early next year."

When may we expect to see this second brochure?

—Robert L. Hermann
Development / University Relations

Response to Mr. Hermann

The materials referred to by Mr. Hermann, the Summary Plan Descriptions (SPDs), are explanations of the benefits plans in the non-technical language intended to make plan provisions understandable to plan participants. During the past few months the benefits office has sent out two booklets to plan participants—the Health and Welfare SPDs and updated Pennflex materials.

The SPDs for the Retirement Programs have been delayed due to ongoing program design work related to both new legislation and new plan features. For example, the TIAA-CREF made cashability of TIAA balances available this month and after consultation with the Personnel Benefits Committee, this feature has been incorporated into Penn's plan. Since payout options are an integral part of the Summary Plan Description, it was deemed prudent to delay publication and include these new features. Accordingly, we have revised the publication schedule. The SPDs will be issued in the next few months.

We apologize for not alerting the community earlier regarding this delay. The Benefits Office is committed to informing the community about plan provisions and we are pleased to know that people are relying on these documents. If there are any questions about plan provisions before distribution of the SPDs, feel free to contact the Benefits Office at 898-7281.

—Andrienne Riley,
Director, Human Resources
(Total Compensation)
—Dennis F. Mahoney,
Manager of Benefits

Funds for Nurse/Physician Projects

Up to $10,000 per project is available through the School of Nursing's Clinical Collaboration Program to fund projects involving clinical collaboration between a nurse and physician in a practice setting. Projects must involve a nurse who is a full-time faculty member, or doctoral student, at the School of Nursing. Preference will be given to projects which include physicians affiliated with HUP or Children's Hospital.

Application deadline is June 3. For further information, contact the School at 898-1942.
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Criteria for Selection of Partners in the Penn's Way Campaign

Standards for the eligibility of charitable organizations to participate in the Penn's Way Campaign are as follows:

An organization which is either:

1. a fundraising organization disbursing funds to ten or more constituent organizations providing health, human or educational services primarily in the eight county Philadelphia Metropolitan Area (Philadelphia, Bucks, Chester, Montgomery, Delaware, Camden, Burlington, and Gloucester); or
2. a joint fundraising organization which is a federation of ten or more constituent organizations each of which is providing health, human or educational services primarily in the eight county Philadelphia Metropolitan Area.

Such organizations shall be placed on the list of those organizations certified by the University as eligible to receive contributions from University employees via payroll deduction or direct payment provided that the requirements set forth below have been satisfied. Each applicant organization shall supply the President's Office with the following:

1. A copy of a certificate from the Internal Revenue Service indicating proof of its 501(c) (3) status.
2. A copy of its charitable solicitation registration issued by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania authorizing it to raise funds within the Commonwealth.
3. A statement by the organization that it is providing health, human or educational services or funding for health, human or educational services primarily in the eight county Philadelphia Metropolitan Area.
4. A copy of its statement of non-discrimination as approved by its Board of Directors. This statement is applicable to each Federation and each constituent member agency.

All eligible organizations shall contribute a fair share of the administrative promotional expenses of the Campaign under an equitable formula to be established by the University.

—Sheldon Hackney, President

Defining an Undergraduate Writing Requirement

At its meeting on 2 April 1991, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences approved the establishment of an Undergraduate Writing Requirement to be implemented from the fall of 1992. An undergraduate will be able to fulfill this requirement in one of four ways, by taking:

1) a Freshman English course: About 65% of freshmen currently enroll in courses in the Freshman English program that focus on writing skills. Several new "writing about" specific subject-matter courses have recently been added as part of this program;
2) a course-affiliated Writing Seminar: The Writing Committee has helped to institute a series of writing workshops associated as sections to broad undergraduate courses; these laboratory seminars are taught by advanced graduate students in each discipline, with participation by the senior faculty members teaching the subject-matter courses;
3) a Faculty Writing workshop: The committee requests that faculty with existing or new writing-intensive courses propose them to the committee for approval as part of the requirement; and
4) Two Writing-Across-the-University-affiliated sections of SAS courses.

Further information may be found in the full report submitted by the Writing Committee. The report has also recommended that a survey of writing-intensive courses, majors, and programs be conducted and that appropriate "Writing at Penn" publicity be prepared as part of the implementation of this requirement.

Faculty who wish to propose existing or new courses as "Faculty Writing Workshops" should forward material on the course to Peshe Kuriloff in the WATU office (413A Bennett Hall/6273). Criteria for these workshops require that they be small group courses and involve both extensive writing and supervised revision.

SAS Writing Committees:

Guy Welbon (Chair)
Margaret Mills
John Richetti
David Williams

Free Skin Cancer Screening

Private, individual screenings for skin cancer will be provided without charge by dermatologists from Penn's Medical Center at their King of Prussia offices Saturday, May 18, 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. The service is sponsored by the American Cancer Society in coordination with Penn Medical Center's department of dermatology to raise public awareness of the dangers of skin cancer.

Although melanoma, a deadly form of skin cancer, is considered to be one of the easiest to detect, treat and cure, the number of cases is on the rise. In 1990 alone, the American Cancer Society predicted that the number of new cases of skin cancer would reach 600,000. Of those cases, 27,600 would be melanoma—an increase of seven percent over the previous year.

For an appointment for a free screening by a Penn dermatologist, or more information, call 337-8882. Penn Medical Center's King of Prussia office is located in the Merion Building at 700 Henderson Road at South Gulph Road.
update may at pen

fitness/learning

women and heart disease; 8:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m., school of nursing; registration $10. information: riina nemchik, ext. 4522 (school of nursing center for continuing education).

talks

research libraries at the turning point; richard de gennaro, former penn libraries director; 3 p.m., rosenwald gallery, 6th floor van pelt library (library's assembly).

combined degree research day: poster session; display of current and recent work of combined degree candidates; 1 p.m.-3:30 p.m., outside suite 100, medical education bldg. information: ext. 8-8025 (school of medicine combined degree programs).

ethics and preparation for a career in biomedical research; robert levine, department of medicine, yale university; 4 p.m., auditorium, clinical research building (school of medicine combined degree programs).

what every biomedical scientist should know about lyme disease; sandra evans, us army, cynthia lord, princeton university, durand fish, new york medical college; 2:30-5:30 p.m., weomner amphitheater, new bolton center (school of veterinary medicine).

deadline: the deadline for the summer at penn pullout calendar is tuesday, may 14.

philadelphia garden tours

the morris arbor eum will offer its fifth annual university of pennsylvania philadelphia garden tour of private gardens in chestnut hill and wyndmoor from 12:30 p.m. to 5 p.m. on saturday, may 11. the seven private gardens vary in size and style, including large estate gardens and immaculate small gardens. guests will also visit the morris arboretum for refreshments and can purchase a variety of unusual small plants there.

proceeds benefit both penn's arthritis research program and the morris arboretum. tickets, maps and a brochure are now available, at $20; a patron tour ticket, $40, includes lunch at a bonus garden before the tour. for more information: betsy lukens at 247-5777 or esther lobb at 662-7292.
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