Honorary Degrees May 17

As some 5000 students take their degrees in the University’s 237th Commencement on Monday, May 17, six honorary degrees will also be conferred. The 1993 recipients are:

Justice Miriam Ben-Porat, comptroller general of Israel and former Israeli Supreme Court Justice.

Dr. Jeanne Quint Benoliel, professor emeritus at the University of Washington, a pioneer in research on death and dying issues in health care.

Hillary Rodham Clinton, first lady of the United States, who will deliver the Commencement Address.

Dr. Alfred Gelhorn, now director of medical affairs for the New York State Department of Health, who was dean of the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, director of the Penn Medical Center and professor of medicine and pharmacology from 1968 to 1973.

Dr. Ralph Landau, a pioneer in chemical engineering technology who is consulting professor of economics at Stanford University, a fellow of the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard, and a Penn trustee.

Dr. William Julius Wilson, Lucy Flower University Professor at the University of Chicago, a distinguished sociologist noted especially for his writing and teaching on urban poverty.

Commencement Hotline Reminder

The 24-hour hotline established by the Office of the Secretary provides faculty, staff, students and families of graduates with Commencement information. The hotline is (215) 573-GRAD, or Ext. 3-GRAD from any campus phone.

And the correct dates for Penn’s upcoming Commencement Weekend events (given incorrectly in last week’s Almanac, for which the editors apologize) are: Baccalaureate, Sunday, May 16, and Commencement, Monday, May 17.

Acting President July 1: Claire Fagin

Dr. Claire Fagin, Dean Emerita of the School of Nursing, was confirmed Friday by the Trustees Executive Committee as interim president of Penn starting July 1.

Dr. Fagin, who led Penn Nursing to national prominence during her 15 years as dean, will serve until the Trustees name a successor Dr. Sheldon Hackney, who announced his resignation to the University community last week (Almanac April 20). As President Clinton’s nominee for chair of the National Endowment for the Humanities Dr. Hackney will shortly undergo Senate confirmation hearings. He said he will leave Penn not later than June 30.

Trustees Chairman Alvin V. Shoemaker said last week that he expects a new president to be chosen by mid-1994.

“Claire Fagin brings energy, vision and dedication to this interim post, which will be particularly important to Penn in this transition period,” said Mr. Shoemaker. “We are pleased that she has accepted our invitation and look forward to working with her during this next year.”

Dr. Fagin said she intends to keep the University on track and moving ahead.

“Claire Fagin brings energy, vision and dedication to this interim post, which will be particularly important to Penn in this transition period,” said Mr. Shoemaker. “We are pleased that she has accepted our invitation and look forward to working with her during this next year.”

Dr. Fagin said she intends to keep the University on track and moving ahead. "We are pleased that she has accepted our invitation and look forward to working with her during this next year."

Abrams Award for Distinguished Teaching: Dr. Bernstein

Dr. Lawrence Bernstein, a leading scholar of Renaissance music, has been chosen for the Ira Abrams Memorial Award for Distinguished Teaching by faculty in the School of Arts and Sciences.

The Award, originally given to two distinguished teachers each year, was withdrawn for two years and restored by a faculty committee who recommended “significant changes in the award process to strengthen its importance as a major symbol of excellent teaching,” Dean Rosemary Stevens said. “Together we agreed that only one award will be given, and that the prize will be increased to $5000, and moreover, the winner’s department receive $5000 too. The winner’s department receive $5000 too. Lawrence Bernstein is over and above an award-winning teacher and distinguished scholar,” she added. “He is a dedicated and much appreciated citizen of the School and University.”

Dr. Bernstein, who came to Penn in 1970 after teaching at Rutgers, Princeton, Columbia and Chicago. A winner of the Guggenheim Award and the Albert Einstein Prize of the American Musicological Society, he holds the Leonard Shapiro Term Chair in Music at SAS.

The Abrams Award “seeks to recognize intellectually challenging and exceptionally coherent teaching.” Dr. Bernstein was nominated by students from majors spread throughout the school. An anthropology student called him the most positive influence of his four years. A chemistry major found him one of the most important figures in his college career, and a music major headed for medical school named Dr. Bernstein’s course his finest academic experience. Described as fiercely intellectual and gripping, compassionate and generous, Dr. Bernstein was summed up with “There are many who are intellectually brilliant, but there are few that are brilliant in both the mind and the heart.”
On Salary Guidelines for 1993-94

As you are aware, the loss of our Commonwealth appropriation and other economic factors have created significant budget difficulties for the University. During the current fiscal year, the potential impact these would have created was absorbed largely through major cuts in budgets administered centrally. A number of initiatives were not funded as a result, including the Trustee Professorship program and the Undergraduate Initiatives Fund, while others received no increases such as the Research Foundation and the Research Facilities Fund.

We have had to wrestle with a number of issues over the last several months, the two most significant being the continuing loss of Commonwealth support for the School of Veterinary Medicine and the requirement to recognize post-retirement health care benefits to our employees (FAS 106), a potential liability of $870 million which is to be funded over a twenty-year period. Unfortunately, we do not have sufficient endowment to take up the slack of the lost Commonwealth funds and with the added spending pressures this year, we find previously traditionally tight budgets now severely strained.

During the course of our budget discussions with the deans, a number of them specifically sought relief from the initially proposed FY 1994 salary guideline of 4.0 percent. Their view was that a salary pool of 4.0 percent would cause them long-term problems. Some deans entertained the prospect of no salary increases, but the majority felt that by reducing the proposed salary pool, a school-based compensation policy could be crafted that was fiscally prudent and rewarding productive employees.

The result is that even in these difficult times, we are able to offer a salary pool that we think will permit Penn to continue to attract and retain faculty and staff of the highest quality.

As before, the principle that has guided our salary planning for the 1994 fiscal year is to protect the academic quality of the University to the greatest extent possible. We are committed to maintaining faculty salaries that are competitive with our peer institutions and to continuing the emphasis on strategic salary increases for classified staff. Within the limits of our financial constraints, we have tried to provide as large a salary increment as possible.

Although individual salary decisions are made at the school level, with deans issuing to department chairs guidelines reflecting relevant resource constraints, certain uniform standards have been established that apply to all schools. Salary increases to continuing faculty are to be based on general merit—extraordinary academic performance including the recognition of outstanding teaching, scholarship, research and service. We continue to maintain the policy initiated several years ago of not establishing a minimum base increment for continuing standing faculty; the entire pool available for salary increase is to be allocated on the basis of performance. There is, as in the past, a minimum academic base salary for new assistant professors; this year it will be $35,000.

There will be a Provost’s Salary Reserve as in previous years for promotions, equity and competitive issues for faculty, but it will be smaller than in the past. In addition, if schools provide for raises for faculty above 4.0 percent, deans will lose access to these moneys. This policy is based on the assumption that schools that can provide salary increases over 4.0 percent have sufficient flexibility in their budgets and do not need University help for FY 1994.

For regular monthly- and weekly-paid classified staff (full-time A-1 and A-3 staff and part-time A-4 staff), the salary increase range will be two to four percent. Every effort will be made to reward staff within these guidelines with a maximum increase to base salary that does not exceed $2000. Salary increases may begin at 2% for performance which “meets established requirements.” Increases which are as much as 4% of base salary. This is particularly encouraged for individuals with exceptional levels of performance; this one-time payment may be employed. The one-time payment may be as much as 4% of base salary. This is particularly encouraged for individuals with exceptional levels of performance; this one-time payment may be employed. The one-time payment may be as much as 4% of base salary. This is particularly encouraged for individuals with exceptional levels of performance; this one-time payment may be employed.

Both faculty and staff have the right to appeal decisions regarding their salaries; for faculty the appeal may be directed to the department chair, the dean, and the Provost; for staff the appeal may be directed through the appropriate line of supervision, i.e., supervisor, center director, dean, or vice president.

Decisions about salary are among the most important decisions that we make. We believe these guidelines will enable us to make decisions that will insure the quality of the University and reward faculty and staff for their contributions to the overall accomplishment of our missions while helping to retain a strong and financially-viable institution.

Sheldon Hackney  Michael Aiken  Janet Hale
President  Provost  Executive Vice President

Guidelines for the Faculty/Staff Salary Increase Program

I. Funding Parameters

The salary base and salary increases for FY94 for continuing faculty and staff are to be funded from each school, center or administrative budget. Specific funding instructions, including directions about salary reserves for faculty and staff, will be communicated directly to school deans and appropriate center directors.

II. Faculty Guidelines

A. The minimum academic base salary for new assistant professors will be $35,000.

B. Last year’s policy will be continued for another year. Thus, this year there again will be no minimum base increment for the individual members of the standing faculty. Deans will exercise their judgment concerning low salary increases without the Provost’s approval.

C. Funds will be available through schools to provide salary increases to faculty based on general merit.

D. A significant share of these school funds should be allocated to faculty members for outstanding teaching. In June, the Dean of each School will inform the Provost as to how this provision has been implemented.

E. In the past, the Provost has made available funds to support continuing faculty to cover promotions, extraordinary academic performance, market adjustments, and adjustments of salary inequities. Despite the continuing uncertainty regarding the restoration of our Commonwealth appropriation, the Provost will provide support for these purposes from the Faculty Salary Reserve, but only one-half as much as in previous years. Given the difficulty in closing the FY 1994 budget, however, for any school that exceeds an average 4.0 percent salary increase for standing faculty, the Provost will reduce on a dollar for dollar basis an amount equal to the excess over 4.0 percent up to the school’s allocation from the Faculty Salary Reserve. The rationale behind this is that any school that can provide salary increases beyond 4.0 percent has sufficient flexibility in its budget and will not need University help. Deans should also make every effort to provide from school resources salary increases that recognize promotions, performance, and other adjustments.

III. Nonacademic Staff

A. Individual annual salary increases are to be based on job performance. No increase should be given to an individual whose performance is less than “meets established requirements.”

B. With fiscal constraints to consider the increase to salary budgets for FY1994 is 2.5%. Every effort should be employed to reward staff within the guidelines of 2 to 4% with a maximum increase to base salary that does not exceed $2000. Salary increases may begin at 2% for performance which “meets established requirements.” Increases which are less than or more than the guidelines must be documented.

C. For individuals who have highly productive and meritorious performance a one-time payment that does not increase the base pay may be employed. The one-time payment may be as much as 4% of base salary. This is particularly encouraged for individuals with exceptional levels of performance; this method should not be used to supplement base increases for individuals with lower levels of performance.

D. This year, the scales were updated mid-year on February 1, 1993. [See Almanac: January 26, 1993.] The scale midpoints have been adjusted on average by 3.75% for both monthly-paid and weekly-paid staff, with corresponding adjustments to the minimums and maximums. Based on early market review, it is projected that the salary scales will not be adjusted in February 1994. However, the salary scales will be reviewed mid-year in subsequent years, with any required advance to minimum adjustments to be effective February 1.

E. Detailed guidelines will be distributed to schools/units.

— S.H., M.A., and J.H.
### Speaking Out

#### Plight of the Part-Time

Ms. Lois Ginsberg’s letter (*Almanac* April 6) regarding the effect of salary increases focuses my attention on another segment of the University population—the part-time employee. The 2.5% increase, though certainly welcome, will not go very far in keeping us up with inflation, as Ms. Ginsberg also noticed. We will still remain further behind other University employees since we are faced with the burden of paying a health insurance increase—as much as or more than $1,000 for the upcoming year (Blue Cross 100 Plan), or an increase of 11%. This will be the second successive year of an 11% increase. The unfortunate consequence is that our 2.5% doesn’t begin to fill the gap.

Other University employees will face increases in their health care costs but these are stanch, at least to some degree, by the University contribution which lowers the out-of-pocket cost considerably.

An example, using the Blue Cross 100 Plan—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekly paid full-time employee pays</th>
<th>$33.94</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University weekly contribution is</td>
<td>72.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total weekly cost is</td>
<td>$106.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The part-time employee pays the entire $106.07. Perhaps in addition to the suggestions made by Ms. Ginsberg, administrators and faculty could consider the total salary/benefits impact on all members of the University community and use their intellect and concern to consider some more equitable solutions.

—Judith Gensib, Administrative Assistant University Dining Services

#### Response to PFSNI

I am pleased to receive the above letter and petition from the Steering Committee of Penn Faculty and Staff for Neighborhood Issues. You call for making the well-being of the communities surrounding the University an highest priorities. One of our goals is to provide input to University decisions affecting our communities from the thousands of University-affiliated people who are directly affected by these decisions. We want to work cooperatively in partnership with all constituencies, including the Trustees and President’s office, to assure that Penn contributes effectively to the well-being of our neighborhoods. Our petition reads:

*Statement of Community Concern by Penn Faculty and Staff to the President and Board of Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania*

We, the undersigned members of the faculty and staff of the University of Pennsylvania, strongly feel that the fates of the University and its surrounding neighborhoods are intertwined: neither can continue to prosper without the success of the other.

We further believe that these communities stand at a critical juncture. Over the next decade, they will either continue to thrive as an asset to the University or they will fall into decline, with extremely serious consequences for Penn.

We urge you to respond to this challenge by making the well-being of the communities surrounding the University among the highest priorities of the institution over the next ten years.

Quite simply, we are asking the Trustees and Penn’s new administration to work actively with us to promote stable, thriving communities surrounding the University. To succeed, this commitment must be an integral part of Penn’s overall commitment to the stability and success of the greater Philadelphia community and must be seen as one of Penn’s top priorities in the decade ahead. With such an affirmation as a foundation, our organization is prepared to work diligently and imaginatively with Penn to see that our mutual goal is achieved.

We welcome the support of anyone in the University community.

—G. Richard Shell for the PFSNI Steering Committee:
  - Carolyn P. Burdon, Faculty Senate
  - Steven Carey, Treasurer’s Office
  - Peter Dodson, Anatomy & Geology/Vet
  - Thomas Ewing, Facilities Planning
  - Anne Froehling, Facilities Planning
  - Sally Johnson, Alumni Relations
  - Kathryn D. Kester, Landscape Architect
  - Robert E. Lundgren, Facilities Planning
  - Yvonne Paterson, Microbiology/Med
  - G. Richard Shell, Legal Studies/Wharton

---

**Speaking Out** welcomes reader contributions. Short, timely letters on University issues can be accepted Thursday noon for the following Tuesday’s issue, subject to right-of-reply guidelines. Advance notice of intention to submit is appreciated.—Ed.
This is a time of remarkable transition in Penn's history. As I have written to many of you this past week, Sheldon Hackney has been one of Penn's greatest leaders and the results of his remarkable leadership are evident in almost every quarter:

— the diversity and quality of Penn's faculty, staff and students,
— the strength of our undergraduate academic and living/learning programs,
— the success of the Campaign for Penn,
— and the strength of our financial management, including our endowment which has reached $1 billion for the first time in history.

I know that we will have other formal and informal opportunities to thank Sheldon and Lucy in the months ahead. But on behalf of my fellow trustees I do want to reflect now our extraordinary respect for him and for his firm leadership that was just what was necessary to lead this large and complex place to its next stage of excellence.

I often have thought of Sheldon as Penn's greatest play maker. He recruited the right team, put it on the field, called the brilliant plays and passed the ball off to the right person at the right time. And if no one was uncovered in the field, he had the speed and finesse to run the ball himself. For all of us who worked with him we know that he at no time had any interest in taking the credit for Penn's record successes; only that they happened and that the efforts of others were acknowledged.

Thank you, Sheldon.

Sheldon and I have also given a great deal of thought to this transition, which of course includes a farewell to Michael Aiken as he assumes the Chancellorship of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

In Claire Fagin and Marvin Lazerson we have identified an unusual team that brings enormous strengths and capacity for leadership. As we search for Penn's next permanent president, we will at the same time focus together on those issues that must move forward at Penn. Not one of us at this table, or Claire or Marvin, will allow a loss of Penn's momentum in securing its place as the international research institution that is committed to undergraduate education.

While we will be meeting to further define our agenda, with Sheldon's help, a number of key issues will be important:

- The further strengthening of our undergraduate programs and living/learning environment, even in a time of fiscal constraint.
- Building further on the excellence of our graduate and professional schools.
- Continued focus on community, both in terms of Penn's support of its own diverse community and in terms of its partnership with the West Philadelphia and Philadelphia communities.
- The completion of the Campaign for Penn and the achievement of its subgoals.
- The need to continue the reduction in Penn's administrative cost base (in the central administration and in the schools).

We must continue our progress in these areas and we look to the entire Penn community for assistance. It may be a year like no other, but I pledge my support to all of you as we work toward these objectives. I know every one of my colleagues does the same.

— Alvin V. Shoemaker, Chairman of the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania

‘Nirvana’: AIF Hits $1 Billion

As of April 15, 1993, Penn's endowment topped $1 billion for the first time in its history, Investment Board Chairman John Neff announced at the April 23 stated meeting of the Trustees Executive Committee.

Thirteen years ago the University's endowment stood at $134 million, Mr. Neff recalled. Though inflation played its part in the rise, so did performance, with Penn's Associated Investments Fund has consistently outperforming the Dow Jones, Standard & Poor's and other averages and indices.

"For the period December 31, 1979, through April 15, 1993," said the April 23 report, "the AIF appreciated by 654.6% per share while the Equity Fund rose 828.4%, and the common stock portion increased 940.2%. The DJIA gained 635% and the S&P 500 increased 606.5% for the same period. In this period, the Fixed Income portion of the AIF increased by 415.7%. From December 31, 1979, through March 31, 1993, the Fixed Income category rose 407.7% versus a 349.3% advance in the Lehman Bros. Govt./Corp. Index and a 355.3% increase in the Salomon Bros. Broad Index."

Mr. Neff’s one-word description of the feeling: "Nirvana.

Action on Leadership: In addition to considering the selection of Dr. Claire Fagin as interim president (page 1), the Executive Committee confirmed Dr. Marvin Lazerson as Interim Provost and Professor Ira Schwartz as Dean of the School of Social Work (Almanac April 13).

Emergency Medicine: The Committee adopted Dr. Donald Langenberg’s resolution to establish a Department of Emergency Medicine in the School of Medicine, effective July 1, to facilitate the recruitment of faculty and personnel for emergency services and “to attract the most outstanding candidates for the leadership of the program.” Noting that there are over 20 such departments nationwide, and over 96 accredited residency programs, the resolution said that “In research, the potential exists to move into areas not yet explored elsewhere and thus to make historic advances in fashioning a new discipline which would bring great credit to Penn.”

HUP Operations: For the HUP Board, Trustee Susan Cath-erwood reported on the reviews in progress for the University of Pennsylvania Health System Implementation Plan, not yet unveiled publicly but scheduled for discussion Monday, April 26, with the Medical Faculty Senate Steering Committee. It is to go to the full Medical Faculty Senate on May 27, to the Medical Center Trustees, then the University Trustees for bylaws and articles of incorporation for the Physician Network involved. A set of Health System Bylaws will also be proposed for adoption—to the Medical Center Trustees on June 21 and the University Trustees in the fall.

Campus Plans: One of a dozen Finance Committee Resolutions approved allows for renovation of 3906 Spruce St. as a chapter house for Alpha Chi Omega Sorority (at its expense).

At meeting’s end, Chairman Alvin Shoemaker directed attention to a new architectural model of the north campus. The new design modifies the Revlon Center itself slightly, and eliminates an auxiliary building that had been shown at the very corner of 36th and Walnut. Photographs are expected for release next week.

About Claire Fagin and Penn Nursing: A School of ‘Firsts’

Dr. Claire Fagin came to Penn in 1977 as the third dean of the School of Nursing, succeeding Dean Dorothy Mereness. Starting with a bachelor’s degree in nursing from Wagner College in Staten Island, Claire Fagin had taken a master’s from Teacher’s College, Columbia, and Ph.D. in nursing from NYU; she had been professor and chair of nursing at CUNY, director of graduate programs in psychiatric mental health nursing at NYU, and director of the Health Professions Institute of Lehman College. Besides scholarly papers she had twice produced books that the American Journal of Nursing pronounced “book of the year”: one in community health nursing in 1970 and the other in pediatric and psychiatric health nursing in 1972. Most of all, she had established a reputation for cheerful activism on behalf of nursing as a full partner in health care delivery.

When she arrived at Penn, the School had six standing faculty members (though few, they were happily like-minded about the profession) and a freshmen class of 30. Fifteen years later, through efforts Dean Fagin attributes primarily to faculty colleagues, students, alumni and staff, the School had 48 standing faculty members (27 of them Fellows of the American Academy of Nursing), an entering class over 70, a doctoral program, dual degrees and minors with Wharton and SAS, Penn-Israel Exchanges, a Center for Nursing Research drawing $7 million a year in external grants; a Center for the Study of the History of Nursing, the list goes on. In that 15-year period Penn nursing scholars cracked such barriers as grant-getting from NIH and publication in the New England Journal. This spring under new but similar leadership by Dean Normal Lang, Penn’s Graduate School of Nursing was ranked first in the nation in a national survey in U.S. News & World Report.

Not least of the “firsts” were endowed chairs for nursing—of which there were few in the nation and none at Penn. The School now has a van Ameringen professorship, the Margaret Bond Simon, and a Trustee Professorship. As Dean Fagin left office, the new title of Leader Professor was conferred. In her “retirement” she has been president of the National League for Nursing; chair of the Board of Health Promotion and Disease Prevention at the Institute of Medicine, National Academy of Sciences; and advisor to the World Health Organization.
Farewell to Mike Aiken

The Office of the Provost would like to extend an invitation to all members of the University community who wish to attend the farewell reception for Provost Michael Aiken on Friday, May 7, 1993, 5 to 7:30 p.m. in the Furness Library.

Please join us in bidding him a fond farewell.

— Members of the Provost’s Staff

---

Senate April 21: An Overview

At the Faculty Senate’s plenary meeting April 21, there were three farewell appearances—those of President Sheldon Hackney and Provost Michael Aiken in addition to the traditional one of the outgoing Senate Chair.

Dr. David Hildebrand’s remarks as chair are in this issue, pages 6-7, along with two of the shorter Faculty Senate Committee Reports (on Administration, and on Conduct). Excerpts from the President’s talk, which included details of the reengineering of the University now in progress, and of the Provost’s discussion of Penn as seen through the eyes of a blue-ribbon visiting committee, are scheduled for publication next week.

Also planned for a future issue is Dr. Jean Crockett’s study for the Committee on the Faculty’s, on unapping the retirement age. She gave an oral report on faculty plans and preferences, and on some proposed options to replace the early retirement plan being phased out.

Announcing that it will be essential to conduct a mail ballot on proposed changes in Just Cause and Other Personnel Procedures. Dr. Hildebrand said he will ask proponents of various positions to frame written statements to be distributed in conjunction with the ballot.

Death of John Miller

Dr. John Miller, a professor emeritus of chemistry who had been at Penn more than 50 years when he retired in 1979, died on April 15. Dr. Miller took his A.B. from Penn in 1929, his M.S. in 1930 and his Ph.D. here in 1932, when he began teaching. After retiring, Dr. Miller remained editor of the Penn Chemist.

Known for his work in physical chemistry, Dr. Miller published more than 90 scientific papers, served as a judge of the quality of submissions for 17 scientific publications, and held several patents based on his research. He was a member of the American Institute of Chemists and the Electrochemical Society, among others, and was a consultant to many organizations including IBM, Wyeth and Co., the Franklin Institute and the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Dr. Miller served on the board of the Lenape Club, a forerunner of the Faculty Club at Penn, and on numerous committees of the College, College for Women, Wharton School and Engineering School.

“His whole life was his profession and Penn,” said his wife, the former Elizabeth Gregg Snyder. Outside the University he was a trustee of the Fathers’ Association of the Lawrenceville School and a member of the United Fund Steering Committee.

Dr. Miller is survived by his wife of 52 years; his son, J. Gregg; a daughter, Margery Kampen; four brothers, one sister and three grandchildren.

In lieu of flowers, contributions may be made in his memory to the Chemistry Department, c/o Dr. Amos Smith, 127 Chemistry/6323.

---

AGENDA OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Wednesday, April 28, 1993

3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.

1. Chair’s Report
2. Report on activities of the Academic Planning and Budget Committee
3. Annual discussion on the following motion: “SEC unanimously adopted a motion to continue its participation in University Council for the 1992-93 academic year. SEC adopted the further motion: that the Senate Executive Committee shall continue to monitor the implementation of the revised Council Bylaws made in 1991-92 and vote no earlier than March 1993 and no later than the end of the academic year 1992-93 whether to continue its participation in University Council. This motion parallels a similar action taken each April since 1991. The sense of SEC was that such a motion should be considered and voted on each year.”
4. Discussion on the Task Force on Revision of Just Cause and Other Personnel Procedures.
5. Selection of faculty to serve on a Consultative Committee for a President
6. Selection of six SEC nominees (for 4 positions) for the 1993-94 Steering Committee of the University Council. Election of four faculty members will occur at the May 5 Council meeting.
7. Selection of twelve faculty to serve on Exit Interview Panels. In the initial year six will serve a one-year term and six a two-year term.
8. Discussion of Faculty Senate agenda for 1993-94.
9. Determination of whether the SEC meeting scheduled for June 2 should be held.
10. Adjournment by 4:30 p.m.

Questions can be directed to Carolyn Burdon, Executive Assistant to the Faculty Senate Chair by calling 898-6943.

---

From the Senate Office

The following is published in accordance with the Senate Rules.

Agenda of the Senate Executive Committee Meeting

Wednesday, April 28, 1993

3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.

1. Chair’s Report
2. Report on activities of the Academic Planning and Budget Committee
3. Annual discussion on the following motion: “SEC unanimously adopted a motion to continue its participation in University Council for the 1992-93 academic year. SEC adopted the further motion: that the Senate Executive Committee shall continue to monitor the implementation of the revised Council Bylaws made in 1991-92 and vote no earlier than March 1993 and no later than the end of the academic year 1992-93 whether to continue its participation in University Council. This motion parallels a similar action taken each April since 1991. The sense of SEC was that such a motion should be considered and voted on each year.”
4. Discussion on the Task Force on Revision of Just Cause and Other Personnel Procedures.
5. Selection of faculty to serve on a Consultative Committee for a President
6. Selection of six SEC nominees (for 4 positions) for the 1993-94 Steering Committee of the University Council. Election of four faculty members will occur at the May 5 Council meeting.
7. Selection of twelve faculty to serve on Exit Interview Panels. In the initial year six will serve a one-year term and six a two-year term.
8. Discussion of Faculty Senate agenda for 1993-94.
9. Determination of whether the SEC meeting scheduled for June 2 should be held.
10. Adjournment by 4:30 p.m.

Questions can be directed to Carolyn Burdon, Executive Assistant to the Faculty Senate Chair by calling 898-6943.

---

The Next Stage in Bicycle Policy: Restrictions in Central Areas

Last year after extensive consideration and debate, the University Council recommended a three-part program to enhance bicycle and pedestrian safety on the Penn campus (Almanac April 14, 1992). As provided for in Council’s recommendations, the Council Committee on Safety and Security has informed me that as of March 29, 1993, the first two phases of this programs (the installation of extensive new bicycle parking facilities and provision for bicycle registration by University police to reduce thefts) are substantially complete. Pursuant to Council’s resolution, the Committee on Safety and Security has therefore advised me that it is now appropriate to proceed with the third phase of the program, involving restrictions on the daytime riding of bicycles in the central areas of campus.

I have therefore instructed Commissioner of Public Safety John Kuprevich, Vice Provost for University Life Kim Morrison, Vice President for Facilities Management Art Gravina, and Executive Vice President Janet Hale, to take such steps as may be necessary to implement Council’s recommendations regarding restrictions on bicycle riding, effective September 1, 1993.

These steps, to be carried out in consultation with the Council Committee on Safety and Security, should include appropriate educational and informational efforts addressed to current students and other members of the University community, as well as to students who will enter the University next fall.

Additional information on bicycle restrictions will be published in Almanac, Compass, and other campus information sources by Commissioner Kuprevich and the Council Committee on Safety and Security.

— Sheldon Hackney

---

Death of John Miller

Dr. John Miller, a professor emeritus of chemistry who had been at Penn more than 50 years when he retired in 1979, died on April 15.

Dr. Miller took his A.B. from Penn in 1929, his M.S. in 1930 and his Ph.D. here in 1932, when he began teaching. After retiring, Dr. Miller remained editor of the Penn Chemist.

Known for his work in physical chemistry, Dr. Miller published more than 90 scientific papers, served as a judge of the quality of submissions for 17 scientific publications, and held several patents based on his research. He was a member of the American Institute of Chemists and the Electrochemical Society, among others, and was a consultant to many organizations including IBM, Wyeth and Co., the Franklin Institute and the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Dr. Miller served on the board of the Lenape Club, a forerunner of the Faculty Club at Penn, and on numerous committees of the College, College for Women, Wharton School and Engineering School.

“His whole life was his profession and Penn,” said his wife, the former Elizabeth Gregg Snyder.

Outside the University he was a trustee of the Fathers’ Association of the Lawrenceville School and a member of the United Fund Steering Committee.

Dr. Miller is survived by his wife of 52 years; his son, J. Gregg; a daughter, Margery Kampen; four brothers, one sister and three grandchildren.

In lieu of flowers, contributions may be made in his memory to the Chemistry Department, c/o Dr. Amos Smith, 127 Chemistry/6323.

Marlies Russo-Stock of IRHE

At presestime Almanac was advised of the death over the weekend of Marlies Russo-Stock, administrative assistant in the Institute for Research in Higher Education. Ms. Russo-Stock, 38, was fatally injured in an automobile accident Saturday in New Jersey.

She is survived by her husband, Art Fendt; the couple lived in Sewell, N.J.

Additional details are expected for publication next week.

---

Farewell to Mike Aiken

The Office of the Provost would like to extend an invitation to all members of the University community who wish to attend the farewell reception for Provost Michael Aiken on Friday, May 7, 1993, 5 to 7:30 p.m. in the Furness Library.

Please join us in bidding him a fond farewell.

— Members of the Provost’s Staff
Chair’s Report to the Faculty Senate

Plenary Meeting April 28, 1993

Our listeners yawn as we bore ‘em
With properly donnish decorum.
We’d gravely debate
On matters of weight,
If ever we got up a quorum.

It is my honor to begin this report to the faculty with a salute to two thoughtful, hard-working, and astonishingly patient pillars of the University: Past Chair Louise Shoemaker and Chair-elect Jerry Porter. Their ideas and their support have been invaluable and I thank them deeply. And as most of you know, Carolyn Burdon, Executive Assistant to the Senate, provides great help over in the Senate Office. She has a long memory in the workings of the Senate. Peter Dodson, the Secretary of the Senate, has been a most cheerful and most reliable help. So have so many of you who have served on the Senate Executive Committee and the standing committees of the Senate. Thank you. A special thanks to Peter Conn and his nominating committee, who magically managed to persuade Barbara Lowery to serve as the new Chair-elect. To Barbara, welcome and best wishes for a speedy recovery from the twisted arm.

On behalf of all those who have contributed to the work of the Faculty Senate this academic year, I offer a report, a prognosis, and some musings of my own.

The official agent of the Senate during the year is the Senate Executive Committee. This year, continuing an initiative begun during Al Phillips’ term as chair and continued during Louise Shoemaker’s, the President and Provost have been attending portions of most SEC meetings for rather free-wheeling discussions. Granted, the opportunity to attend a committee meeting does not add variety to their lives, but the practice affords an opportunity for reasonably open, and reasonably reasonable, discourse on issues of concern. I urge that the practice continue. Of course, the three chairs also meet with the President and Provost twice a month, a crucial practice for the functioning of the University.

As you will hear shortly, SEC has focused most fully on three topics. The evolving proposal of the Task Force on Just Cause Procedures is certainly important and somewhat controversial. The work of this group, headed first by the late Bob Davies and now by Morris Mendelson, is central to the governance of the faculty. Surely the enormous amount of work by this group requires that the rest of us give serious attention to the issue. I hope that the largest portion of today’s meeting can be devoted to the issue. In particular, the proposal contemplates a University-wide body to hear allegations of faculty misbehavior. There is a crucial question here: Are we to be a single faculty or are we to be a loose aggregation of a dozen separate schools?

The second area of major concern has been the imminent abolition of a mandatory retirement age for Penn faculty. The Committee on the Faculty, chaired by Lou Girifalco, has wrestled with the possible consequences of this change for well over a year. So has a special subcommittee on retirement chaired by Jean Crockett. This is a difficult topic, because there is so little evidence to go on. We don’t think this is going to be a huge problem, but it’s easy to imagine situations where some faculty become unproductive but refuse to retire, leaving departments or schools starved for new faculty positions. Indeed, there are financial incentives for faculty to continue working indefinitely. It’s certainly physically possible to continue teaching and research to a considerable age; there’s not a lot of heavy lifting involved. And it’s more than possible that the experience and insight of senior faculty will be more valuable to Penn than would be the case had they retired. However, there is reason to be wary of individual problems—and concerned about an imbalance of financial incentives. One proposal from the Committee on the Faculty and its retirement subcommittee is on the agenda for discussion today. We hope that something like this proposal can be adopted to help balance the gains and problems of uncapping mandatory retirement age.

A third topic of concern has been the ever-popular issue of increasing administrative costs at Penn. For several years, the Senate’s committee on administration, chaired first by Sol Pollock and then by Lee Peachey, has been working (pick your preposition) with, against, or around—I’d say with—the administration to get a handle on the nature of the problem. Although we do not have a definitive statement on the exact size of the problem, there is general agreement that Penn needs to work hard on reversing the growth of administration. As a result, the President has announced formation of an administrative cost oversight group consisting of four administrators, four deans, and four faculty members. I am confident of two things: This group will have effect, and it will be known as the Dirty Dozen. We on the faculty should recognize that reversing that growth will require us to be thoughtful and limited in our demands for administrative help. Some tasks can be simplified, some can be omitted entirely, but some we will have to do ourselves.

These, then, have been our primary issues during this year. Of course, there have been other topics for discussion and debate, but I believe that there will be most useful to focus today’s plenary meeting on these three.

As you know, Penn will soon have a new President and Provost. President Hackney and Provost Aiken are moving to new tasks. On behalf of the faculty, I want to convey to both of them my appreciation for their enormous efforts over the years for the betterment of Penn. Is Penn a better university now than it was when they began their positions? For me, the answer is clear—yes, it surely is. They would be the first to say that much of that improvement has come from the individual and collective efforts of the faculty. But it is proper for us to acknowledge that the University and the faculty owe them much for guiding the university through uneasy times.

Personally, I have enjoyed working with them over the year. There have been times of considerable disagreement; the lions have not yet lain down with the lambs—and I’ll let you decide who’s who in that lineup. In particular, the budget for next year is not a terribly happy document for the faculty, or for much of anyone associated with Penn. But our dealings have been civil, thoughtful, and perhaps even productive. My thanks to both for their patience and good humor.

You may have noted the lamentations of The Daily Pennsylvanian concerning the departure of so many top officials at Penn. Although I respect the people who are leaving, I do not believe that we need join in the bleating. This university functions through the ideas and energies of thousands of people, including almost two thousand standing faculty. Lots and lots of us will still be here. Indeed, there will be uncertainty. Yet that very uncertainty allows opportunity to look at the future and what we want Penn to be. There is a chance and a need for the faculty to speak to Penn’s agenda for the future. Jerry Porter, the Chair Apparent, has some ideas for Senate activity next year, and will have some time at the end of this meeting to outline them.

There is a particular concern for one part of the faculty’s activity at Penn—our teaching, particularly of undergraduates. Most of us like to feel that we are conscientious about teaching. That is not good enough. Until we have approaches to teaching that allow us to improve, we’ll have the same old story:
A lecture is that process whereby ideas go from the notes of the professor to the notes of the student without going through the minds of either. I do not believe that teaching at Penn is generally distinguished, though there are individual pockets of excellence. Other universities are learning to do it
better. Unless we as a faculty and as a university take the teaching process very seriously indeed, we are setting ourselves up for a decay in our student base. I don’t believe Penn, as a university, takes teaching seriously enough. We are firmly committed to bare adequacy. Consider: How many of you have in use any process other than examinations and papers to assess which of your teaching procedures are not effective? How many of you have given more than cocktail-party consideration to alternative approaches to your teaching? How many of you could look at your teaching of 10 years ago and point to clear, evident changes? Some of you, to be sure, could give me lessons on how to do these things. But I’m worried that many of us simply keep on keeping on in our teaching.

There are reasons. Teaching is hard work, and it is by and large repetitive work; therefore, it lacks the zest of novelty, which is so important to us, and part of the reason why research is fun. Good teaching is inherently private. It is inducing learning in another person. That’s terribly difficult to assess in any reliable way. And few of us have any systematic way to evaluate our own teaching, let alone to experiment and find ways to improve it.

As a university, we don’t seem to care enough about teaching even to try to evaluate it seriously. Most of us have recently gone through the charade of student evaluations, or will shortly do so. What happens? Forms given out, bored students filling in circles, some smartass wisecracks at the end, send it in, the end. Anyone who has read the evaluation comments has to be a bit depressed by their superficiality. And did you ever consider that all the students who have dropped the course aren’t filling out the form? This is not serious evaluation of serious effort.

Why do we think we can evaluate research work? One key reason is that the results are public and available for inspection. There are printed indicators of our teaching that could be made public—namely, our syllabi, paper assignments, and exams. I submit to you that if I could examine the syllabi and exams of professors in my discipline, I could rather easily and reasonably accurately determine who is taking the job seriously and who isn’t. To be sure, I could not determine how effectively the syllabus is carried out, but at minimum I would know whether the professors were attempting substance or fluff.

I urge that each school require, as part of the dossier for tenure or promotion, inclusion of syllabi, paper assignments, and exams for the entire teaching career of a faculty member since the last personnel action. Some would argue that using syllabi and exams in promotion and tenure decisions would interfere with academic freedom. I cannot agree; those are, or should be, public documents as surely as any publication. In fairness, I suggest that the requirement be announced and apply only to course materials distributed after the announcement date.

I would also urge that we rethink how we ask students to evaluate our work. The current practice is confounded with all sorts of problems associated with the end of a semester. If at all possible, I would like to have a re-evaluation from students sometime after the conclusion of the course. It would be most interesting to know what my students thought of my course a year or two later. Once the effect of fun and games, and/or terror, had worn off, what stuck? What last effect did I have? The answers might not be cheering, but they should be more meaningful than the current evaluations. Obtaining retrospective evaluations would not be easy, but the gain to them is obvious.

Finally, we need to develop systematic methods for improving our work. I am intrigued by some—not all—of the ideas of Total Quality Management (TQM). I refuse to regard my students as customers, because I cannot and will not pour wisdom and skills into their tanks. But I do like the approach of continuous feedback and incremental improvement. If you can get beyond the corporate rhetoric of most of the discussions of Total Quality Management, you might also find some ideas that would change your style a bit.

These are not easy steps to take. I expect that many, indeed most, faculty will think that I’m talking to someone else. But I believe that the problem is pervasive and urgent. We must teach better.

Thank you for putting up with me today and throughout the year.

David H. Hildebrand

Motion by Past Chair Louise Shoemaker

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate extend a rousing vote of thanks to David Hildebrand for a year’s worth of wit and wisdom as Chair of the Faculty Senate. We look forward to an equally productive year from Professor Hildebrand as he achieves the honorable status of Past Chair!

[Passed unanimously with prolonged applause.]

Report of the Senate Committee on Administration

April 21, 1993

1. The Report of the Joint Faculty-Administration Committee on Cost Containment Within the University appeared in the Almanac January 19, 1993. This report, in agreement with the Pollack report issued earlier, documented significant increases in administrative headcounts and expenditures relative to academic headcounts and expenditures within the University over a period of 10 years from 1981 to 1991. The committee report also recommended the establishment of an Oversight Committee consisting of faculty and administrators whose task will be to create and help implement a series of measures for monitoring and reducing administrative costs within the University. Clearly a second purpose of these efforts will be to make available additional funds, freed up from cuts in administration, and to channel these into the academic functions of the University.

2. Unfortunately this Cost Oversight Committee has been slow in starting its activities. Recently a meeting that was to have included the President of the University had to be cancelled. The explanation of the cancellation became apparent a few days afterwards with the announcement in The Daily Pennsylvanian of the nomination of President Hackney to head the National Endowment for the Humanities for the Clinton administration.

3. We hope that with resolution of changes in administrative officers of the University at the highest level, the Cost Oversight Committee will begin its work this summer. In the fall, I expect to continue as a member of the Oversight Committee, and will turn over the Chair of the Senate Committee on Administration to its new occupant.

Lee Peachey (biology), Chair

For the 1992-93 Senate Committee on Administration

Marshall E. Blume (finance) ex officio: David K. Hildebrand (statistics), Faculty Senate Chair

David McDevitt (animal biology/vet) Gerald J. Porter (mathematics), Faculty Senate Chair-elect

Elsa Ramsden (provost’s interdisciplinary) Marilyn E. Hess (pharmacology)

1992-93 Annual Report Senate Committee on Conduct

April 7, 1993

This is the fifth annual report of the Senate Committee on Conduct, which was established in 1988 as a standing committee of the Faculty Senate in order to help implement University policies on racial and sexual harassment.

During the academic year we received no complaints of racial or sexual harassment. The chair was given (and, speaking only for himself, took), the opportunity to comment on the proposals of the Task Force on Revision of the Just Cause Procedure, which would establish new tribunals that would succeed to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Conduct. This report may, therefore, fittingly be the last annual report of this committee.

Marilyn E. Hess (pharmacology)

Madeleine Joullie (chemistry)

Michael B. Katz (history)

Howard Lesnick (law), Chair

Gino Segre (physics)

Gary A. Tomlinson (music)
The catalogs of over 100 research libraries are now accessible via the worldwide Internet.

Governments have been subverted by citizens with fax machines. Telephone service, which will be administered by PennTrex, the unit of the Center for Advanced Communications, will provide data, voice, and video service. Assuming that bids for construction, wiring, and operation are within the approved planning parameters, 1,500 students will have “wired” rooms by fall semester, 1993, with connections for all 7,100 students in residence to be installed by September 1996. ResNet is expected to make on-campus living more attractive and to change the way Penn students communicate, study, and interact with University administration.

Rationale

As Penn approaches the 21st century, the University must be prepared for—and prepare its students for—the challenges of an increasingly information-rich, international, multi-media, multi-cultural world. Consider:

- The catalogs of over 100 research libraries are now accessible via the worldwide Internet.
- Discussions from AIDS to poetry to semiconductors to zoology are carried on via electronic mail and electronic bulletin boards among faculty, students, and others around the world.
- Governments have been subverted by citizens with fax machines.

Wired! A COMING ATTRACTION AT PENN

Laura, a junior in the College, is worried about the term paper due Monday. Can’t put it off any longer; might as well get started, even if it is midnight—and pouring rain. Let’s see what information is available on “President Clinton’s options for health care reform.” She turns on her personal computer and connects via PennNet to Franklin, the Library’s online catalog.

Fourteen books on health care reform published since 1990, and most are checked out; not a great start. Too bad it’s so near the deadline; a search in other universities’ libraries might have found books worth requesting via inter-library loan. Perhaps journal articles would be a better bet. Aha! Fifteen articles in Medline from 1993, and the abstracts are online: mostly views from the medical establishment. Wonder what the business perspective is? ABI/Inform has 67 article abstracts on Clinton and health care reform. Only two hours into this, and already a good working bibliography and contrasting arguments are emerging. But what is the Administration’s viewpoint? Can we get official source documents, instead of printed sound bites?

Someone in class mentioned WAIS, “wide area information service,” or some such; said it was accessible via “Gopher.” Who makes up these names, anyway? It’s getting late; let’s try keyword, “Clinton.” Eureka! Speeches, position papers, interviews, announcement of the Task Force on National Health Care Reform, in some kind of “relevance” order; and not just abstracts—full text. Easy to download some of this stuff and review it tomorrow after lunch.

Lunch! Need to cancel with Brian; what’s his e-mail address? Noon is the only time Professor Porter can meet to discuss the make-up project. And the trip to Princeton Saturday; are the train schedules online? What time is the concert? Does Princeton have something like PennInfo? And what’s this voice mail message about the overdue term bill? Better write to Mom and Dad; too bad they don’t have e-mail. What a night! Wonder what’s on cable? An interview with Hillary; could tape it for later. MTV—now that’s more like it.

This scenario (*) is not futuristic. In fact by the Fall, students in five residence halls are scheduled to have cable TV, PennNet Ethernet connections, and wiring for a private phone option. By September 1996 or 1997, all on-campus residences should be wired for multi-media, state-of-the-art information access. The financial plan for this program, named ResNet, was approved by the Board of Trustees at its March meeting, subject to receipt of construction and wiring bids within budgeted parameters.


The Provost, President, and Board of Trustees recently approved ResNet, a program to network every student residence-hall room for data, voice, and video service. Assuming that bids for construction, wiring, and operation are within the approved planning parameters, 1,500 students will have “wired” rooms by fall semester, 1993, with connections for all 7,100 students in residence to be installed by September 1996. ResNet is expected to make on-campus living more attractive and to change the way Penn students communicate, study, and interact with University administration.

Rationale

As Penn approaches the 21st century, the University must be prepared for—and prepare its students for—the challenges of an increasingly information-rich, international, multi-media, multi-cultural world. Consider:

- The catalogs of over 100 research libraries are now accessible via the worldwide Internet.
- Discussions from AIDS to poetry to semiconductors to zoology are carried on via electronic mail and electronic bulletin boards among faculty, students, and others around the world.
- Governments have been subverted by citizens with fax machines.
plan is to wire several buildings each summer, which will be promoted as “wired residences” and priced higher than similar buildings without wiring. That is, all residents of wired buildings will be assessed a higher fee ($70 for 1993-94), and there will be no option to “refuse” data or video service. Thus there will be no incentive to “beat the system,” via e.g. pirating cable signals from neighbors or “daisy-chaining” ethernet connections, and no concern about unsightly and potentially hazardous private wiring. Buildings slated for wiring by fall 1993 target undergraduates:

- High Rise North (932 residents, 1218 outlets)
- Kings Court (221, 232)
- English House (182, 195)
- Quad — Ware College House (170, 180)
- Class of 1925 House (91, 134)

A program to market these buildings to students was launched in February, with encouraging results to date.

Planning, Management, and Support

How will ResNet work? What services will be available? How will students respond? How will learning, teaching, research, and the administration of the University change in response to this major investment in information technology? The answers are beginning to emerge from the work of numerous working committees, all reporting to a Steering Committee, co-chaired by Vice Provost for University Life, Kim Morrison, and Associate Vice Provost for Information Systems and Computing, Daniel Updegrove.

Administrative coordination for ResNet will draw upon the resources of Residential Living, Business Services, and Information Systems and Computing (ISC). One of the first functions will be to survey the current placement of Penn network lines in all residence halls to determine those plans, needs, and concerns. The ResNet phone number is 898-4336, and the electronic mail address is resnet@pobox.upenn.edu. A netnews bulletin board to discuss ResNet is also available: upenn.resnet.

Assistance with hardware setup and software installation, training, and ongoing support will be provided through a combination of residence hall computer lab staff, the Computer Connection, the Computing Resource Center (CRC), and the Office of Data Communications and Computing Services (DCCS). Students signed up for ResNet will receive more detailed information on these services during the summer.

The Construction Contingency

ResNet is a large project, being carried out in a very short time. When it is finished, the 15 residence halls will have roughly the same number of Penn Net connections as the rest of the campus, where network installation has been in progress since 1985. Moreover, the residences, having been built over the decades, represent varied architectural and engineering challenges—and the goal is to do all the work while students are away for the summer.

Substantial economies accrue when installing three types of wiring simultaneously, but complexity increases with the differing technologies and specialized contractors. Nevertheless, if all legal and contractual issues are worked out in the next few weeks, construction, wiring, and testing should be finished in all five buildings before the students return.

The Future

ResNet is a response to both intellectual and pragmatic challenges. Numerous peer institutions have undertaken, or are planning, similar projects: Dartmouth began data networking in dorms nearly a decade ago. Yet both information technology and student preferences are notoriously difficult to forecast. In large measure, ResNet’s success depends on integrating these two dynamic forces.

Steps Taken In Response to GSAC

A motion passed unanimously by the Graduate Students Association Council on March 31 said the graduate students were “pleased with the future directions of the University-wide computer network” as described to the University Council March 17, and added a series of recommendations for increasing access to the system. In response, they were advised of steps that had been taken since December.

Three ResNet companion programs will be initiated in fall 1993, to enhance computing and information access for students. These are:

- Upgrading/networking all computer labs in residence halls.
- Upgrading/upgrading the central modem pool to support higher speed remote access, including Serial Line Internet Protocol (SLIP).
- Providing a central electronic mail and bulletin board (netnews) service for seven small schools Dental Medicine, Education, Fine Arts, Law, Nursing, Social Work, and Veterinary Medicine—to enable their students to participate in the increasingly electronic academic and administrative discourse of the University and the Internet. (Students in the remaining five schools already have e-mail privileges.)

Students will also be added to the online e-mail directory. Each school will be expected to provide training and support for its students (or make appropriate arrangements with other units in the University). The campus-wide Task Force on Electronic Mail will soon be reconvened to address implementation issues; co-chairs of the Task Force are Michael Eley and Daniel Updegrove, Associate Vice Provosts for Information Systems and Computing.

— Office of the Vice Provost for Information Systems and Computing

Proposed Policy on Ethical Behavior with Respect to the Electronic Information Environment

The University by its very nature values openness and promotes access to a wide range of information. Campus information systems have been designed to be as open as possible, and as such the University insists on responsible use of these systems. The use of computers, electronic information and computer networks is essential for research, instruction and administration within the academic community. Because the electronic environment is easily disrupted and electronic information is readily reproduced, respect for the work and rights of others is especially important.

Any behavior which interferes with the administrative, instructional, research, or service purposes and activities of the University or members of the University community will be regarded as an unethical behavior with respect to the electronic environment and may lead to disciplinary action under standard University rules for misconduct and existing judicial, disciplinary or personnel processes. In particular, the University publication Policies and Procedures, the Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators, and the University’s Human Resources Policy Manual include several policies defining the principles and standards of ethical conduct whose violation is exemplified below. Of special relevance among these are the University’s General Code of Conduct, Code of Academic Integrity, Policy on the Confidentiality of Student Records and Information, Policy Regarding Faculty Misconduct in Research, Patent Policy, etc.

The following activities are examples, but not an exhaustive list, of unethical behaviors with respect to the electronic environment:

a) intentionally damaging or destroying the integrity of electronic information;
b) intentionally compromising the privacy of electronic networks or information systems;
c) intentionally disrupting the use of electronic networks or information systems;
d) intentionally infringing upon the intellectual property rights of others in computer programs or electronic information, including plagiarism and unauthorized use or reproduction; or
e) wasting resources (human or electronic) through such actions.

FOR COMMENT

At its March 17, 1993, meeting, the University Council recommended adoption by the President of the following policy, proposed by the University Council Committee on Communications and by the Advisory Council to the Vice Provost for Information Systems and Computing, subject to the inclusion of a clearer statement of the policy’s operative principle and expanded reference to other applicable University policies. These changes have been incorporated into what is now the second paragraph of the policy. The proposed policy is published here for comment by the University community prior to its formal adoption. Written or e-mailed comments should be received by the Office of the President, c/o Dr. Stephen P. Steinberg, Assistant to the President, 121 College Hall, [e-mail: steinberg@A1.Quaker], no later than Wednesday, May 12, 1993.

—Office of President
Summary Annual Report: Retirement, Health and Other Benefits

Pennsylvania Annuity Plan, Life Insurance Program, Long Term Disability Income Plan, Dental Plans, Health Care Expense Account, Faculty and Staff Scholarship Program, and Retirement Allowance Plan of the University of Pennsylvania for the Plan Year ending June 30, 1992

This is a summary of the annual reports for the Plans named above of the University of Pennsylvania for the plan year beginning on July 1, 1991, and ending June 30, 1992. These Plans are sponsored by the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania whose employer identification number is 23-1352685. The annual reports have been filed with the Internal Revenue Service as required under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA).

It is also required under the terms of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 that these Summary Annual Reports be furnished to plan participants. To facilitate a single printing, the reports for the plan year ending June 30, 1992, have been combined. Consequently portions of this summary may refer to plans in which you are not currently participating.

Pennsylvania Annuity Plan: Basic Financial Statement
Funds contributed to the Plan are allocated toward the purchase of individual annuity contracts issued by the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States. Total premiums paid for the plan year ending June 30, 1992, were $189,710.

Life Insurance Program: Insurance Information
The Plan has a contract with the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States to pay all life insurance claims incurred under the terms of the Plan. The total premiums paid for the plan year ending June 30, 1992 were $2,596,376.

Plan costs are affected by, among other things, the number and size of claims. Of the total insurance premiums paid for the plan year ending June 30, 1992, the premiums paid under the experience-rated contract during the plan year were $2,596,376 and the total of all benefit claims charged under the experience-rated contract during the plan year was $2,216,203.

Long Term Total Disability Income Plan
The Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania have committed themselves to pay all long term disability claims incurred under the terms of the Plan.

Dental Plan (Prudential)
The Plan is a pre-paid program providing dental benefits. Since there is no insurance involved, no insurance premiums were paid during the plan year ending June 30, 1992.

Dental Plan (Penn Faculty Practice)
The Plan is a pre-paid program providing dental benefits. Since there is no insurance involved, no insurance premiums were paid during the plan year ending June 30, 1992.

Health Care Expense Account
The Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania maintain a program providing reimbursement of health care expenses funded through salary reduction agreements for full-time faculty and staff. The University provides these benefits in accordance with the terms of the Plan.

Faculty And Staff Scholarship Plan
The Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania maintain a program providing scholarships to full time faculty and staff and their dependents. The University provides these benefits in accordance with the terms of the Plan.

Retirement Allowance Plan: Basic Financial Statement
Benefits under this Plan are provided through a trust with CoreStates Bank of Philadelphia, PA. Plan expenses were $2,974,616. These expenses included $42,976 in administrative expenses and $2,931,640 in benefits paid to participants and beneficiaries. A total of 5,183 persons were participants in or beneficiaries of the Plan at the end of the plan year, although not all of these persons had yet earned the right to receive benefits. The value of Plan assets, after subtracting liabilities of the Plan, was $66,031,951 as of June 30, 1992, compared to $58,263,033 as of July 1, 1991. During the plan year the Plan experienced an increase in its net assets of $7,768,918. This increase includes unrealized appreciation or depreciation in the value of plan assets; that is, the difference between the value of the Plan’s assets at the end of the year and the value of the assets at the beginning of the year or the cost of assets acquired during the year.

Minimum Funding Standards
An actuary’s statement shows that the Plan was funded in accordance with the minimum funding standards of ERISA.

Additional Information
As described below, you have the right to receive a copy of the full annual report of the Retirement Allowance Plan, or any part thereof, on request. The items listed below are included in that report:

1. an accountant’s report;
2. assets held for investments;
3. transactions in excess of 5 percent of plan assets;
4. insurance information including sales commissions paid by insurance carriers; and
5. actuarial information regarding the funding of the plan.

You also have the right to receive from the plan administrator, on request and at no charge, a statement of the assets and liabilities of the plan and accompanying notes, or a statement of income and expenses of the plan and accompanying notes, or both. If you request a copy of the full annual report from the plan administrator, these two statements and accompanying notes will be included as part of that report. The charge to cover copying costs does not include a charge for the copying of these portions of the report because these portions are furnished without charge.

Your Rights To Additional Information About These Plans
You have the right to receive a copy of the full annual reports, or any part thereof, on request. Information for the Pennsylvania Annuity Plan, the Life Insurance Program and the Dental Plan (Prudential) is included in those reports.

To obtain a copy of the full annual report, or any part thereof, write or call the Office of the Vice President for Human Resources, Room 538A, 3401 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 19104, (215) 898-1331. The charge for the full annual report of the Retirement Allowance Plan is $3.50; the charge for each other full annual report is $1.50; the charge for a single page is 25 cents.

In addition, you have the legally-protected right to examine the annual reports at the University of Pennsylvania, Benefits Office, Room 527A, 3401 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 19104. You also have the right to examine the annual reports at the U.S. Department of Labor in Washington, D.C., or obtain a copy from the U.S. Department of Labor upon payment of copying costs. Requests to the Department of Labor should be addressed to Public Disclosure Room, N4677, Pension and Welfare Benefit Programs, Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20216.

— Office of Human Resources/Benefits
To All A-3 Staff Members:

Call for Nominations

The A-3 Assembly invites you to become a part of the nominations and elections process by nominating yourself or someone you feel would best serve the A-3 community. New A-3s to the University are especially encouraged to participate so that we may have a new blend of experience and ideas. The Assembly has recently undergone a reorganization of its constituency; we have added several sources of potential new members such as a peer-to-peer networking group, an A-3 newsletter, an employee recognition program, and an career advancement program.

These A-3 Assembly positions are open: Please consider nominating yourself or someone you know!

A-3 Assembly Executive Board: There are nine vacancies to be filled on this committee. Members of the Executive Board shall be the decision-making body of the A-3 Assembly. All agreements and commitments made for the Assembly shall require ratification by a majority vote of this Board and the sole power to amend the A-3 Assembly’s constitution is entrusted to the Executive Board.

Vice Chair of the A-3 Assembly: The Vice Chair of the Assembly serves as the official representative in the absence of the chairperson. The Vice Chair will speak on behalf of the Assembly and should therefore be knowledgeable and available to speak on all aspects of the Assembly.

Chair of the A-3 Communications Committee: This committee is responsible for publication of the A-3 Assembly Newsletter and coordination of all mailings to all Assembly members.

Co-Chair of the A-3 Employee Recognition Committee: This committee will be responsible for awarding A-3’s University-wide recognition for outstanding service to a University department or to an individual’s community.

Please return your nominations to Sarah McLaurin, Office of the Secretary, 133 S. 36th/3246, or Hanne Weedon, WXPN, 3820 Locust Walk/6134. Nominations should be received by April 30.

Elections will be held Wednesday, May 13, from noon to 2 p.m. in Room 110, Annenberg School. Guest speaker Patrick Lee, from CareerWorks, will speak at 12:30 p.m. and again at 1:30 p.m. Contact Sandy Bates at 898-9457 if you have any questions.

— A-3 Assembly Nominating Committee

The University of Pennsylvania Police Department Community Crime Report

This summary is prepared by the Division of Public Safety and includes all criminal incidents reported and made known to the University Police Department between the dates of April 19, 1993 and April 25, 1993. The University Police actively patrol from Market Street to Baltimore Avenue, and from the Schuylkill River to 43rd Street in conjunction with the Philadelphia Police. In this effort to provide you with a thorough and accurate report on public safety concerns, we hope that your increased awareness will lessen the opportunity for crime. For any concerns or suggestions regarding this report, please call the Division of Public Safety at Ext. 8-4482.

**Crimes Against Persons**

### 34th to 38th/Market to Civic Center

- **Total thefts & attempts**—20
- **Thefts from autos**—2
- **Thefts of bicycles & parts**—5
- **Possessed of stolen property**—1
- **Criminal mischief & vandalism**—5
- **Trespassing & loitering**—3
- **Robberies & attempts**—3
- **Aggravated Assaults**—1
- **Harassment**—4

#### Crimes Against Property

- **Robberies & attempts**—2
- **Thefts of autos**—2
- **Thefts from autos**—2
- **Thefts of bicycles & parts**—5
- **Possessed of stolen property**—1
- **Criminal mischief & vandalism**—5

### 34th to 38th/Market to Civic Center

- **Total thefts & attempts**—19
- **Thefts from autos**—2
- **Thefts of bicycles & parts**—5
- **Possessed of stolen property**—1
- **Criminal mischief & vandalism**—5

- **Trespassing & loitering**—3
- **Robberies & attempts**—4
- **Aggravated Assaults**—1
- **Harassment**—4

### Crimes Against Property

- **Robberies & attempts**—3
- **Thefts of autos**—2
- **Thefts from autos**—2
- **Thefts of bicycles & parts**—5
- **Possessed of stolen property**—1
- **Criminal mischief & vandalism**—5

- **Trespassing & loitering**—3
- **Robberies & attempts**—4
- **Aggravated Assaults**—1
- **Harassment**—4

### Reminder: A-1 Assembly May 7

The A-1 Assembly’s annual elections meeting will be held Wednesday, May 7, from noon to 2 p.m. in the Annenberg School Auditorium.

Contested elections are held for the positions of chair-elect and vice chair-person-elect and for three openings on the six-member executive board (see Almanac April 6).

Speakers for the May 7 session are President Sheldon Hackney and Executive Vice President Janet Hale.

---

ALMANAC April 27, 1993
continued from previous page

04/20/93  9:35 PM  Harrison House  Secured bike taken from rack
04/22/93  9:14 AM  40th/Market subway  Juvenile arrested/turnd over to Philadelphia Police
04/22/93  10:58 PM  Harnwell House  Unattended clothing taken from laundry
04/23/93  7:58 PM  100 S. 39th St  Purse taken from area while dining
04/23/93  11:31 PM  3925 Walnut St  Wallet taken while at establishment
04/24/93  12:14 AM  3900 Block Sansom  Passing money/low broken/robbery gag taken
04/24/93  6:19 AM  4015 Baltimore  Men’s bike taken from inside premises
04/24/93  2:43 PM  Sigma Alpha Mu  Stereo equipment taken from basement
04/24/93  6:18 PM  3900 Blk Baltimore  Passenger side window broken to vehicle
04/25/93  1:07 AM  Alpha Epsilon Pi  Basketball rim/backboard torn down

41st to 43rd/Market to Baltimore: Burglaries (& attempts)—1
30th to 43rd/Market to University: Burglaries (& attempts)—2
Total thefts (& attempts)—12, Thefts of auto (& attempts)—2, Thefts from autos—1,
Thefts of bicycles & parts—2

04/19/93  9:40 PM  Chemistry Building  Rear wheel taken from secured bike
04/20/93  9:05 PM  Hollembach Center  Two bikes taken while unsecured in lobby
04/21/93  10:23 AM  Hollembach Center  Lockers entered/property taken
04/21/93  12:30 PM  Smith Hall  Clothes removed from room
04/21/93  3:00 PM  Rittenhouse Lab  Unattended wallet taken
04/22/93  12:21 PM  Lot # 5  Steering column and vehicle lock damaged
04/23/93  4:30 PM  Penn Tower Hotel  Coat taken from unattended coat room
04/24/93  2:05 PM  Lot # 5  Wallet and keys taken from backpack/arrest
04/24/93  3:13 PM  Hill Field  Wallet contents taken from field area
04/24/93  5:14 PM  Lot # 26  Lock broken to vehicle/wallet taken
04/24/93  7:02 PM  Lot # 5  Vehicle taken from location
04/24/93  8:06 PM  Levy Tennis Pavilion  Unknown attempted to remove rain spouts
04/25/93  7:09 AM  Towne Building  Window entered/property taken
04/25/93  11:53 AM  Towne Building  Window entered/money taken

Crimes Against Society

34th to 38th/Market to Civic Center: Alcohol & drug offenses-1,
04/20/93  9:57 AM  Thomas Penn Dorm  Odor of marijuana/pipe confiscated

Outside 30th - 43rd/Market to Baltimore: Disorderly conduct—1
04/24/93  3:54 AM  42nd/Chester Ave.  Male acting disorderly/charged

18th District Crimes Against Persons
April 12, 1993 to April 18, 1993

Schuylkill River to 49th Street, Market Street to Woodland Avenue
15 incidents, 3 arrests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Incident</th>
<th>Arrest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/12/93</td>
<td>12:35 AM</td>
<td>3417 Spruce</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/13/93</td>
<td>1:43 AM</td>
<td>3000 Market</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/13/93</td>
<td>1:30 PM</td>
<td>4000 Market</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/13/93</td>
<td>5:15 PM</td>
<td>4857 Chestnut</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/14/93</td>
<td>6:25 PM</td>
<td>437 S. 48th</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/14/93</td>
<td>11:44 PM</td>
<td>4500 Chester</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/15/93</td>
<td>12:04 AM</td>
<td>4600 Woodland</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/15/93</td>
<td>6:47 AM</td>
<td>3400 Civic</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/16/93</td>
<td>10:49 AM</td>
<td>4201 Walnut</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/16/93</td>
<td>10:00 PM</td>
<td>4700 Walnut</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/17/93</td>
<td>1:40 AM</td>
<td>4022 Chestnut</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/17/93</td>
<td>2:20 AM</td>
<td>4039 Chestnut</td>
<td>Purs Snatch</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/17/93</td>
<td>7:26 AM</td>
<td>4119 Walnut</td>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/18/93</td>
<td>12:00 AM</td>
<td>4600 Chestnut</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Update

APRIL AT PENN

28  A. Aladar Marberger, 1947-1988: A Memorial Exhibition; special memorial service, 7 p.m. and reception, 8-9:00 p.m.; Esther M. Klein Art Gallery, University City Science Center, 3600 Market St. Exhibit through May 13.

30  Victims Support: A 1993 Update; Vanessa Grant-Jackson of WOAR, Carol E. Tracy of the Women’s Law Project, Debra F. Fickler of Penn General Counsel’s Office, and an unnamed survivor; noon-2 p.m.: refreshments; Smith-Penniman Room, Houston Hall; information Ruth Wells, 898-9001 (Department of Public Safety).

Mechanisms of Differentiation of Human T Helper Cells, Type 1 and Type 2; Sergio Romagnani, University of Florence, Italy; 2:00 p.m.; Joseph N. Grossman, M.D. Auditorium, Wistar Institute (Wistar).

Hypertension 1: A Study to Join
Patients with mild to moderate hypertension (high blood pressure) are needed to participate in a study of the blood pressure-lowering effects of simple potassium salts. Preliminary studies indicate effectiveness in lowering blood pressure with an absence of side effects. The volunteers are provided with free expert evaluation and health care, free lab tests and office visits and a $500 honorarium for completing the study. There is also the potential for future continuing care. For information call Virginia Ford at 662-2780.

Hypertension 2: HUP Screenings
May is Hypertension month. The Hypertension Clinic at HUP is providing two free blood-pressure screenings from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. on Wednesday, May 19, and Wednesday, May 26 in the Silverstein Lobby. For information: Linda Palmquist or Virginia Ford at the Hypertension Clinic, 3 Silverstein, Suite B, HUP, 662-2780.

Childhood Disease Immunization
As part of the Philadelphia Immunization Initiative, Penn nursing students and volunteer nurses will offer free vaccination of young children against childhood diseases April 27-28 from 3 to 6:30 p.m. and May 1 from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. Parents are invited to bring children under 6, along with immunization records if possible, to the clinic at the West Philadelphia Community Center, 3512 Haverford Avenue.

The Philadelphia Immunization Initiative, is coordinated by Ellen-Marie Whelan of the School of Nursing.
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