Since the Removal of DPs

Two steps promised in the aftermath of arrests in the removal of The Daily Pennsylvania two weeks ago—an investigation of campus police activity in the specific incident, and the formation of a task force to look into broader issues public safety practices—are reported on page 3. Provost Michael Aiken gives the make-up, charges and timetables for both the investigating panel and the task force.

See also Speaking Out for an exchange of views among law faculty, pages 4-5; advice from the Committee on Open Expression to the VPUL, page 4, and the text of the 1984 Separation Agreement between the University and The Daily Pennsylvania, pages I-V.

Teaching Awards: Nursing and Wharton Schools

The School of Nursing has announced two awards for outstanding teaching, and the Wharton School its traditional 21 awards—including, in addition to the three shown above, 18 whose photos appear in An HONORS & ...OTHER THINGS insert in the center of this issue.

Nursing: Dr. Mary Ann Lafferty-Della Valle, adjunct associate professor and director of the Laboratory for Biological Research in Nursing, has been chosen for the School of Nursing’s 1993 Faculty Teaching Award, and Graduate Student Cheryl Neisser Frankson is the School’s Teaching Assistant of the Year.

Dr. Lafferty-Della Valle, who joined the faculty in 1974, was praised for her teaching—from freshman chemistry to graduate biochemistry—as one who “provides interesting anecdotal information about nursing and its medical applications, and makes every effort to ensure that her students achieve mastery of the subject matter.” Dr. Lafferty-Della Valle is an alumna of Salve Regina College, R.I., with a Ph.D. in biochemistry from the University of Virginia. She did post-doctoral work in molecular genetics at Penn. Her current research at The Center for Advancing Care in Serious Illness focuses on immunocompetence in patients with serious illnesses.

Ms. Neisser Frankson, a graduate student in nursing administration who taught four sophomore-level general nursing classes, was cited as “a role model who is knowledgeable, empathetic, caring, eager and capable....” Ms. Frankson, an alumna of Gwynedd-Mercy, has been president of the Nursing Graduate Student Organization and vice-chair elect of GASPA.

Wharton: Dr. Joseph W. Harder, Anheuser-Busch Term Assistant Professor of Management, and Robert W. Holthausen, Nomura Securities Co. Professor of Accounting and Finance, are the winners of the third annual David W. Hauck Undergraduate Teaching Award, in which one tenured and one untenured Wharton faculty member receive $15,000 each “for their ability to lead, stimulate and challenge students, knowledge of the latest research in the field and a commitment to educational leadership.”

Dr. Franklin Allen, professor of finance and economics, and vice dean and director of Wharton Doctoral Programs, has been awarded the Helen Kardon Moss Anvil Award, a graduate division teaching award created in 1969 through an endowment by Helen Kardon. It honors exceptional teaching effort and ability “both inside and outside the classroom.”

The Class of 1984 Teaching Award was given to Dr. William C. Tyson, associate professor of legal studies, accounting, management and real estate. The prize recognizes the graduate division faculty having the highest overall teaching rating.

[Dr. Tyson’s photo is in the center-spread with additional winners from Wharton.]
Faculty Early Retirement

For many years the University has maintained a Faculty Voluntary Early Retirement (FVER) program that has provided financial assistance to enable tenured faculty members to retire prior to their mandatory retirement dates. The end of mandatory retirement for tenured faculty members will make the legal status of this program questionable. Accordingly, the University, with the advice of counsel, has decided to end this program. The program will not be abruptly terminated, however, but will be phased out over the next three years.

Tenured faculty members who will be at least fifty-five years old by the date they wish to begin early retirement are eligible for the benefits of the program. Retirement may begin at any date prior to July 1. Tenured faculty members who contemplate early retirement during this period must provide formal notification of their intent by June 30, 1993, and must specify the date at which they intend to retire.

Most eligible faculty members have already received detailed information about this phase-out of the FVER program. Eligible faculty members who may have been omitted from this earlier distribution should contact their dean or the Benefits Office (Hilary Lopez, Ext. 8-1327) in Human Resources.

— Walter D. Wales, Deputy Provost

Council Steering Election

Four faculty members and two students were elected to the Steering Committee at the University Council meeting on Wednesday, May 5:

Dr. Peter Freyd, mathematics
Dr. Constance Carino, nursing
Dr. David B. Hackney, radiology/Med
Dr. Warren D. Seider, chemical engineering

GAPS's Allen Orst, Nursing
UA’s Kirsten L. Bartok, C ’94

A-1 Assembly Election

The new chair-elect of the A-1 Assembly is Drita Tariah, manager of administration and finance for the chemistry department. Also elected at the A-1 Assembly’s meeting Friday were Lily Wu, programmer analyst at UMIS, as vice-chair elect; and three new members-at-large for the Assembly executive committee: Debra Israel, assistant dean for administration in the SAS Graduate Division; Joann Mitchell, director of the Office of Affirmative Action; and Ira Winston, director of computing and educational technology services at SEAS.

Dr. Sheldon Hackney, making his last appearance as “Penn’s Number One A-1,” was presented with a wood sculpture and a standing ovation as he combined his farewell with a reminder that as Penn prepares to trim administrative costs by 15% over the next three to five years, the future “has a place in it for everyone who is committed to fundamental changes and willing to help bring them about.” He said the period under Interim President Dr. Claire Fagin and Interim Provost Marvin Lazerowitz “is not dead space” but an opportunity to be part of “an exciting time in which real change can continue.”

He introduced Senior Vice President Janet Hale, who jokingly asked for “a freshman year” in which to be new. Touching on Penn’s restructuring/reengineering, both she and the President said, “No” to talk that cutting costs 15% equals cutting 15% of jobs. Using new systems and technology to cut 25% of a workload, she said, might cut costs by freeing the person to do more.

1. Uncapping of retirement age

The first task of the subcommittee was to respond to the discontinuance of the voluntary early retirement plan. To supplement the announcement by the Provost, a letter from the Faculty Senate leadership was published in Almanac April 6, 1993 reminding the faculty of this discontinuance and that eligible faculty members could sign up now for the existing program without risk since they can revoke their decision anytime before June 30, 1995. A model letter for faculty to send to the dean was published in Almanac April 20, 1993.

A Retirement Transition Policy, to replace the existing Voluntary Early Retirement Policy, was developed by the Subcommittee on Retirement. The Senate Executive Committee agreed that this policy would be beneficial to the University and in large measure would meet faculty concerns.

The subcommittee also developed a questionnaire and distributed it to the faculty to explore faculty interest in “early retirement” options.

Both the proposed Retirement Transition Policy and the results of the questionnaire will act as a base for making recommendations to the administration. A report on the results will be published in Almanac later.

2. Containment of administrative costs

The committee considered the report of the Joint Faculty-Administration Committee on Cost Containment within the University and strongly endorsed its recommendations. In a communication to Almanac March 5, 1993 the committee pointed out the implications for the faculty of the data presented in that report.

3. Affirmative action

The committee responded to a proposal by Deputy Provost Walter Wales that some changes be made in the committee’s proposed mechanism for monitoring Affirmative Action. The changes were considered and approved both by the Committee on the Faculty and the Senate Executive Committee.

The Affirmative Action Office asked the committee to consider the issue of exit interviews for minority and women faculty members who leave the University. The purpose of the interviews would not be to make judgments or recommendations on particular cases but rather to determine if there is a possible pattern of discrimination or violation of guidelines in a school or department that should be brought to the attention of the Provost. Full confidentiality would be maintained and the results of exit interviews would be interpreted statistically. The committee recommended that the Senate Committee on Committees appoint twelve faculty members to conduct the interviews. The Senate Executive Committee agreed to this and the first interviewers have been named.

4. Clinician educators

The subcommittee on clinician educators is continuing examination of the number of clinician educators and transfers between the traditional tenure track and the clinical track. No recommendations have yet been formulated.

5. Academic Freedom and Governance in the School of Medicine

The Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility and the Committee on the Faculty have formed an ad hoc joint subcommittee to investigate allegations concerning academic freedom and governance in the School of Medicine. The committee has just begun its work and a report is not expected until Fall 1993.

The Subcommittee on Clinician Educators has not submitted any recommendations this year.

6. Clinical faculty

The Deputy Provost presented a proposed change in the Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators which would add the following sentence to the section on clinical faculty: “Appointment to the clinical faculty may also be used for academically qualified persons employed by the University for non-academic or administrative duties.” This would permit the School of Medicine to offer titles to individuals working for the School of Medicine but at non-HUP hospital locations. Under present policy, such individuals would be classified as adjunct faculty.

The committee opposed this change and recommended that another recruitment solution be sought. The origin of the opposition was the belief that professorial titles should be restricted to qualified people whose central activities are teaching and scholarship. An increase in the number of individuals holding professorial titles but whose main activities are practice, service or administration, is not in keeping with the fundamental academic mission of the professorate.

7. Ethical behavior in the electronic information environment

The committee endorsed the policy presented by the Vice Provost for Computing’s Advisory Committee and the University Council Committee on Communications. The policy was approved by the Senate Executive Committee.

Fay Ajzenberg-Selove (physics)
Louis A. Girifalco (materials science & eng), Chair
Peter J. Hand (animal biology)
Madeleine Joulié (chemistry)
Morris Mendelson (emeritus finance)
Michael H. Schill (law)
Vivian Seltzer (social work)

Reminder: June 30 Deadline

1992-93 Annual Report of the Senate Committee on the Faculty
April 30, 1993

This year, the Senate Committee on the Faculty considered the following issues:

The first task of the subcommittee was to respond to the discontinuance of the voluntary early retirement plan. To supplement the announcement by the Provost, a letter from the Faculty Senate leadership was published in Almanac April 6, 1993 reminding the faculty of this discontinuance and that eligible faculty members could sign up now for the existing program without risk since they can revoke their decision anytime before June 30, 1995. A model letter for faculty to send to the dean was published in Almanac April 20, 1993.

A Retirement Transition Policy, to replace the existing Voluntary Early Retirement Policy, was developed by the Subcommittee on Retirement. The Senate Executive Committee agreed that this policy would be beneficial to the University and in large measure would meet faculty concerns.

The subcommittee also developed a questionnaire and distributed it to the faculty to explore faculty interest in “early retirement” options.

Both the proposed Retirement Transition Policy and the results of the questionnaire will act as a base for making recommendations to the administration. A report on the results will be published in Almanac later.

2. Containment of administrative costs

The committee considered the report of the Joint Faculty-Administration Committee on Cost Containment within the University and strongly endorsed its recommendations. In a communication to Almanac March 5, 1993 the committee pointed out the implications for the faculty of the data presented in that report.

3. Affirmative action

The committee responded to a proposal by Deputy Provost Walter Wales that some changes be made in the committee’s proposed mechanism for monitoring Affirmative Action. The changes were considered and approved both by the Committee on the Faculty and the Senate Executive Committee.

The Affirmative Action Office asked the committee to consider the issue of exit interviews for minority and women faculty members who leave the University. The purpose of the interviews would not be to make judgments or recommendations on particular cases but rather to determine if there is a possible pattern of discrimination or violation of guidelines in a school or department that should be brought to the attention of the Provost. Full confidentiality would be maintained and the results of exit interviews would be interpreted statistically. The committee recommended that the Senate Committee on Committees appoint twelve faculty members to conduct the interviews. The Senate Executive Committee agreed to this and the first interviewers have been named.

4. Clinician educators

The subcommittee on clinician educators is continuing examination of the number of clinician educators and transfers between the traditional tenure track and the clinical track. No recommendations have yet been formulated.

5. Academic Freedom and Governance in the School of Medicine

The Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility and the Committee on the Faculty have formed an ad hoc joint subcommittee to investigate allegations concerning academic freedom and governance in the School of Medicine. The committee has just begun its work and a report is not expected until Fall 1993.

The Subcommittee on Clinician Educators has not submitted any recommendations this year.

6. Clinical faculty

The Deputy Provost presented a proposed change in the Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators which would add the following sentence to the section on clinical faculty: “Appointment to the clinical faculty may also be used for academically qualified persons employed by the University for non-academic or administrative duties.” This would permit the School of Medicine to offer titles to individuals working for the School of Medicine but at non-HUP hospital locations. Under present policy, such individuals would be classified as adjunct faculty.

The committee opposed this change and recommended that another recruitment solution be sought. The origin of the opposition was the belief that professorial titles should be restricted to qualified people whose central activities are teaching and scholarship. An increase in the number of individuals holding professorial titles but whose main activities are practice, service or administration, is not in keeping with the fundamental academic mission of the professorate.

7. Ethical behavior in the electronic information environment

The committee endorsed the policy presented by the Vice Provost for Computing’s Advisory Committee and the University Council Committee on Communications. The policy was approved by the Senate Executive Committee.

Fay Ajzenberg-Selove (physics)
Louis A. Girifalco (materials science & eng), Chair
Peter J. Hand (animal biology)
Madeleine Joulié (chemistry)
Morris Mendelson (emeritus finance)
Michael H. Schill (law)
Vivian Seltzer (social work)

ex officio:
David K. Hildebrand (statistics),
Faculty Senate Chair
Gerald J. Porter (mathematics),
Faculty Senate Chair-elect

Reminder: June 30 Deadline

AlmAnAc May 11, 1993
Investigating the April 15 Incident; Examining Public Safety Practices

Investigative Process for Resolving the Incident of 4/15/93

Charge to the Panel: Compare and evaluate the actions and behaviors of campus police officers, students and other University employees directly involved in the incident of April 15, 1993, to the expected standards of behavior and performance as outlined in the relevant University and Departmental policy and procedural documents.

This panel is responsible for providing written findings and recommendations; appropriate administrators will be responsible for acting on the findings and recommendations.

Composition: The panel will be chaired by Lt. George Cisby of Penn Public Safety. It will include a member of the University Human Resource Division; a member of the University Life Division, a University Police Chief from another agency; and a member of the University African-American Community. [See list below.]

Methodology: You are asked to review this incident, following the investigative process consistent with our established procedures for handling complaints against police and University administrators. All necessary and relevant materials will be shared with you, and the panel may seek additional information by gathering of additional statements or up to and including requesting to interview concerned parties. You will be asked to review the facts of the incident; to include the actions of the officers, the students, and other University employees. You will be asked to identify specific component parts of the incident; identify and evaluate the behaviors of involved persons at that moment against the standards to determine the appropriateness or inappropriateness of those behaviors.

— Officer actions to be based upon the dispatch information, and referenced against basic police procedure and specific departmental procedure and expectations.
— Student actions to be based upon their intent, and referenced against policies and procedures for students as noted in the Student Handbook/Policies and Procedures booklet.
— Other security and administrative personnel actions to be based upon reasonableness of any University person in their role.

Panel Findings: You are asked to identify appropriate and inappropriate behaviors for each person identified, with summary justification for your findings based upon applicable policies/procedures which you should identify; and you will be asked to make recommendations based upon your findings. The panel will submit their conclusions in writing to the Commissioner, the Vice Provost for University Life and to the appropriate managers for the other involved University employees.

The Commissioner, the Vice Provost and the identified managers will independently review the findings and decide on what further actions are appropriate based upon the findings and recommendations provided. The results of the findings and these actions will be shared with the community.

It is expected that this Panel will have its report completed within two weeks of its first meeting.

University Task Force on Public Safety Practices

Charge to the Task Force: To review and document the practices currently employed by the officers of the Division of Public Safety in the conduct of their duties with emphasis on the acts of detention, interview, interrogation, arrest, use of force, officer approach and resolution of complaints including the dissemination of disciplinary outcomes. This shall include an examination of written orders, instruction given during basic and on-going training sessions, and generally accepted practices within the campus police and security profession.

To analyze the appropriateness of Division of Public Safety practices with due consideration given to the rights and safety of all members of the University community as well as of the officers themselves; equality of application of public safety practices, and consistency with the Mission of the University and the Mission of the Di-vision of Public Safety;

To make recommendations on improving Public Safety practices, in line with our commitment to community policing, which balance the concerns over the rights and safety of community members and officers; which address the applicability of such recommendations considering the expectation that campus police will deal with a wide range of behaviors and activities; which assure the equitable application of such practices to all members of our community, and which are consistent with University and Public Safety Mission Statements.

To consider such additional factors as specific requirements of local and state law and of the Philadelphia Police in working with Public Safety; practices employed by Campus Public Safety agencies at other institutions, and other considerations as may be identified by the Executive Vice President, the Provost or members of the Task Force; and

To prepare a written compilation of Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations.

Composition: The Task Force will be comprised of four faculty members, one of whom will be requested to chair; three University staff members; four students—two graduate and two undergraduate, with one graduate and one undergraduate chosen through GAPSA and the Undergraduate Elections Committee respectively, and one graduate and one undergraduate chosen by the African-American student body; two police persons, one from the University of Pennsylvania and one campus chief from another campus; and two community members. [See list below.]

Findings: To prepare a written compilation of Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations that will be shared with the Community.

It is expected that the work of this Task Force will continue into the Fall Semester; therefore, the Task Force will provide the community with progress reports. By September 15, 1993, the Task Force will provide a progress report on the process of the Task Force. By October 15, 1993, a progress report specifically on the establishment of a Police/Community Advisory Board including the charge, role, responsibilities and composition will be issued. The Task Force will make every effort to have its full report completed by January 15, 1994, for release to the community.

Members of the Panel to Investigate Events of April 15, 1993

Penn Police: Lt. George Cisby, Public Safety
Human Resources: J. Bradley Williams, manager of compensation
Office of VPUL: Patricia Rose, director of Career Planning and Placement
Other Police: Chief Eugene Dooley, Rutgers—Camden Campus

Penn African-American Community:
Kenneth Shropshire, associate professor of legal studies, Wharton

Membership of the Task Force on Public Safety Practices

Faculty: Howard Arnold, associate professor of social work
Robert Gorman, professor of law
Phoebe Leboy, professor of biochemistry/Dent
Michael Useem, associate professor of sociology and management (chair)
Staff: Barbara Cassel, Assistant Vice Provost for University Life
Thomas Henry, manager of Animal Laboratory/Med
James M. Miller, director of Fire and Occupational Safety
Graduate Students: Lynne Edwards, GAS, and Allen Orsi, Nursing
Undergraduates: to be named

Penn Police: Lt. George Cisby, University of Pennsylvania Public Safety
Other Police: Chief Susan Reisling, University of Wisconsin
For the Community: Calvin Ogletree and David Rudovsky
In Progress: Consultation with the Committee on Open Expression and Removal of DPs

On April 20, Dr. Kim Morrison, Vice Provost for University Life, wrote to Dr. E. Ann Matter, chair of the Committee on Open Expression, requesting advice on the incident of April 15, 1993, involving “the removal of stacks of The Daily Pennsylvaniaian from their drop-off points on campus, resulting in limited distribution of The Daily Pennsylvaniaian that day.” Indicating her expectation that complaints would be filed with the JJO alleging that students who removed papers had violated the Guidelines on Open Expression, Dr. Morrison asked for advice on two points:

(1) A ruling from the Committee regarding “the interpretation of this action for the benefit of the Judicial Inquiry Officer and as guidance for future action of members of the University Community,” and

(2) A review of the policy on Confiscation of Campus Publications,* promulgated by the Office of the President “which was published in the Faculty/Staff Handbook only” (i.e., not in Policies and Procedures).

“This policy [on Confiscation] was promulgated after an administrator in one of the schools removed the DP from its distribution site in the school, in contravention of Article II.2.01 of the University’s contractual agreement* with the DP,” Dr. Morrison said in her letter to Dr. Matter. “I ask that the committee consider whether the confiscation policy applies to the instance of students removing The Daily Pennsylvaniaian or any other publication.”

Dr. Matter’s response appears at right.

---

* Ed Note: The policy on confiscation is reiterated in Almanac April 20, 1993. It initially appeared in Almanac July 18, 1989. The Separation Agreement between the University and The Daily Pennsylvaniaian appears as an insert in this issue of Almanac.

Letter from Open Expression to the VPUL 4/27/93

On Monday, April 26, the Committee on Open Expression met to discuss the removal of stacks of The Daily Pennsylvaniaian from drop-off points around the campus. As you requested in your letter of April 20, we considered the relationship between this action and the Guidelines on Open Expression from two points of view.

With regard to the interpretation of this action for the benefit of the Judicial Inquiry Officer, the Committee on Open Expression finds that the confiscation of The Daily Pennsylvaniaian on April 15 was done with the intent to impede the circulation of ideas by members of the University Community, is a violation of Article 1.A of the Guidelines on Open Expression, which protects “the freedom to hear, express, and debate various views.”

With regard to your request for guidance for future actions of members of the University Community, the Committee on Open Expression will hold open hearings in the Fall Semester of 1993 to initiate the process for the official inclusion of the statement “Confiscation of Publications on Campus,” promulgated by the Office of the President on September 9, 1987 and printed in the Faculty Handbook, in the Guidelines on Open Expression.

It is my personal hope that the discussion of this issue not be limited to the determination of guilt or innocence for students accused of a specific violation of the Guidelines on Open Expression. Instead, I hope that the free exchange of ideas on campus can be encouraged in a positive, rather than a punitive, atmosphere.

— E. Ann Matter, Chair, Committee on Open Expression

Letter of Clarification to the VPUL 5/10/93

In response to your request for clarification of my letter of April 27, let me say that the question of whether or not there is an implied “if” prefacing the clause beginning “done with intent to impede the circulation of ideas” was a subject of some discussion. In general, the Committee was of the opinion that the confiscation of publications constitutes a violation of open expression only if such confiscation has the intent to stop a voice from being heard. Otherwise (for example, should publications be thrown away inadvertently), even though such an action may violate the contract between the University and The Daily Pennsylvaniaian, it would not, strictly speaking, be a violation of the Guidelines on Open Expression.

The wording of our letter was left deliberately vague in order to allow maximum freedom of interpretation for the Judicial Inquiry Officer, whose job it is to determine the specifics of any alleged violation of University guidelines and policies.

I hope this is helpful to you.

— E. Ann Matter, Chair, Committee on Open Expression

Speaking Out

On Removal of DPs

The following was submitted under the title “Open Letter to President Hackney.”

The undersigned are members of the Law Faculty. We believe that the deliberate removal from circulation of 14,000 copies of The Daily Pennsylvaniaian calls for us to state three points with unequivocal clarity.

First, the removal of the newspaper because it published writings by one columnist which some students found offensive was a flagrant violation of freedom of thought and freedom of discussion. It was a direct denial of the principle which is most basic to the University’s mission. It was conduct which cannot be excused or tolerated.

Second, the fact that the newspapers were confiscated as an act of protest cannot excuse it or make it any less tolerable. Those who disagree are, of course, entitled to protest, but not by attempting to silence those with whom they disagree.

Third, the important University values of diversity and open discussion were not in conflict here. The offensive columns in no way prevented the University from carrying out its policy of diversity and its many programs to promote understanding. Removal of the newspapers struck at the heart of the most fundamental diversity which the University should foster—diversity of thought, views and expression. It may well be that the University has not done all that should be done to promote racial diversity. That must occupy a high place on the continuing agenda. But we disavow democratic values if, in our efforts to promote that diversity, we chill diversity of expression.

— Clyde W. Summers, Jefferson B. Fordham Professor Emeritus
— Stephen B. Burbank, Robert G. Fuller, Jr. Professor
— Colin S. Diver, Dean and Bernard G. Segal Professor
— William B. Ewald, Assistant Professor
— Michael A. Fitts, Professor
— Frank I. Goodman, Professor
— Robert A. Gorman, Kenneth W. Gemmill Professor
— John O. Honnold, William A. Schneider Professor
— Leo Katz, Professor
— Seth F. Kreimer, Professor
— A. Leo Levin, Leon Meltzer Professor Emeritus
— Richard G. Lonsdorf, Professor of Psychiatry and Law
— Charles W. Mooney, Jr., Professor
— Stephen J. Morse, Ferdinand Wakeman Hubbell Professor
— Edward B. Rock, Assistant Professor
— Edmund B. Spaeth, Jr., Senior Fellow

A Dissenting Opinion

The following letter was also addressed to the President.

While it is unlikely that you would confuse silence on my part with assent to the views expressed by my colleagues in their “open letter” to you [left], it seems appropriate and timely for me to offer a public dissent.

First. In their rush to judgment my colleagues have brushed aside troublesome issues raised by the relationship (or lack thereof) of The Daily Pennsylvaniaian to the University and by the absence of any evidence whatsoever that students had reason to be aware of the University’s single applicable rule promulgated after a University employee removed copies of the DP to prevent visitors to the school from reading an article deemed embarrassing. Moreover, in blatant disregard for whatever processes might follow, they have used the weight of their academic titles and status in the community to pass public judgment that the students involved engaged in “conduct which cannot be excused or tolerated.” Meanwhile, the expression—true or false—of the fact that students were chassed, arrested, handcuffed and assaulted speaks volumes about the regard in which they hold students of color.

Second. As others have done, the signers continued past insert
tories have proceeded on the assumption that the right to protest yields to other protected expression. While that position is consistent with the needs of extant regimes, it is by no means self-evident. I subscribe fully to the position taken by the African American Association [Almanac April 20]:

"We support the principle of non-violent protest, and we believe that targets and means are choices to be made by those aggrieved."

The right to protest injustice and oppression deserves no less protection than the right to publish. Just as those who defend the right to speech need not agree with its content or intent, we need not feel obliged to defend either the target or the form of protest.

Third. The assertion that “diversity of thought, views and expression” are “basic and fundamental” to the mission of the University will strike responsive chords across campus and throughout much of the community. As you hear from these people, you should consider how many stalwart defenders of diversity are those who by omission and commission have been implacable foes of every meaningful effort to make our canon and to include within the student body and faculty a critical mass of students, teachers and scholars whose thoughts, views and forms of expression will ensure genuine diversity.

— Ralph R. Smith,
Associate Professor of Law

Interpreting Racial Harassment

In its precise formulation and fundamental purposes, the University’s current Racial Harassment Policy is quite defensible on grounds of preserving the conditions of free inquiry, and I defended it as such on National Public Radio’s “Talk of the Nation” (May 6, 1993). But any interpretation of the rule which could put the “Water Buffalo” case before a judicial panel (scheduled for May 14) as a serious controversy does more to destroy the text and principles of this Policy than the assembling forces of the raging counter-orthodoxy against Political Correctness, with their challenge to the integrity of Free Speech.

At this late stage in the process, the proper institutional procedure for resolving the distortion of the Policy is a determination by the judicial panel that the alleged facts, even if proved, would not qualify as a violation under the rule as authentically interpreted. That is, the Judicial Inquiry Officer’s charge—not the accused student—should be tested and thrown out. In the Water Buffalo case, we would more appropriately focus our interpretive abilities on the meaning of the Policy than on the hidden philosophy of a Hebrew word for oxen. Any further assessment of the merits of the case under the charge will undermine the integrity of the meaning of the Policy itself.

Why is this so? An authentic interpretation must meet the central standard that it does mean what it says. And so, if the text commits to a number of apparently conflicting propositions, it will not do to pick just one of them and ignore the others. The interpretation must plausibly connect the propositions. At best it would show how their interplay achieves more a elaborate and substantial set of fundamental values—a more complex

whole whose multidimensionality is signaled by the apparent tension.

The current text of the University’s Racial Harassment Policy itself commits internally (a) to a number of propositions, which are laid out in its text, and (b) in the context of other policies, like that on Open Expression. It displaces (c) a previous text on the same subject (the 1988 version), overwriting it with different words, so that it can be contrasted with what it is not. And, because it is a rule backed by sanctions, it purports to be the authoritative expression of an institution’s (d) generic character (a university) and (e) particular identity (Penn), which it should not be presumed to be lying about.

Any interpretation of the Policy which does not accommodate these different dimensions of the text is not worthy of our respect, although there may be more than one plausible version of the interplay about which we can productively argue as a group of citizens consciously trying to comprehend the University as a distinct institution.

(a) At the very least, it is not enough to parse out the meaning of the three-part “definition” of racial harassment in the Policy, however finely wrought and conceptualized one may think it is. That definition is constrained by the language and principles of the preamble which launches it. The interpreter must first arrange the concepts of this text into a theory that explains the strategy of its parts. What it sets out is a larger theme that associates “maximum latitude” of the content and style of expression with an encompassing breadth of participation in the community of inquiry. Citizenship in the University is equated with this participation. What the Policy prohibits is the use of speech as violence to undermine the conditions for free inquiry.

The possibility that these two kinds of broadening of the rights may come into conflict requires the statement of additional principles. The Policy is clearly not aimed at curtailing what is “offensive,” for the University here commits itself to “protect the expression of ideas, opinions, information, and knowledge that may be debatable and insulting to some members of the community.” Nor is the Policy set out as a weapon to be used by one cultural interest group to gain advantage over another. An interpretation that has this effect would destroy the logic of the rule. And so the operational terms of the rule must be read narrowly in order to achieve the breadth of its animating principles. That means that the benefit of any doubt about its application in a fact situation should be resolved in favor of the accused. Otherwise, the use of the Policy will defeat its stated purposes.

(b) The Harassment Policy exists in a dependent interpretive relationship with the Guidelines on Open Expression, which specifically state that “the principles of the Guidelines shall take precedence” over other University policies. To the extent of the interpretation of the Harassment Policy would have a chilling effect on the range and vociferousness of open expression, it would conflict with these principles. A regime of free inquiry requires space, breathing room, its anti-mating theory is the right to make mistakes in thought and

proposition. The gravitational pull of the Guidelines on the Harassment Policy, then, has the influence of reinforcing the narrowness of the restriction. But, more importantly, because of the chilling effects on the latitude of speech, a case should not be brought at all if it does not fall within the core of the reasons for the restrictions.

It is quite possible that one could elaborate a strenuous account that using the epithet “Water Buffalo” in anger would implicate a few of the terms of the Racial Harassment Policy, but it would be difficult to show that the claims here reach to the core of the Policy’s commitments. And the necessary virtuosity of such an account should speak against it. Another argument for the quick, and overdue, dismissal of the case.

(c) If the substance of the Judicial Inquiry Officer’s argument that this is a case turns out to be based substantially more on the “hostile environment” theory of the 1988 Racial Harassment Policy than on the current version that in itself is a reason for dismissing it. Changing the words and concepts of a policy should transform its meaning even more dramatically in terms of the contrasts between the texts.

(d) and (e) Universities in general and this one in particular are intellectually dangerous places. Everything should be up for dispute, as long as the conditions for discourse are maintained. But no one should have to bear a disproportionate share of the burden of personal jeopardy to sustain the risky enterprise of being a university—especially if that burden is assigned on the basis of some highly salient characteristic like race. That is the logic of the Racial Harassment Policy. Pursuing the case of the Water Buffalo makes that logic into a false statement.

— Will Harris, Associate Professor of Political Science

Women on the Walk

Some 1500 signatures have been gathered by our coalition of women’s organizations, petitioning the University to make a place on Locust Walk for all women—students, faculty, employees and alumnae. Our petition is published both to inform the University community of this goal, and to invite men and women of all walks of University life to join in endorsing the idea that women have a place in the heart of the campus.

— Su Suh, ’95, for the Women on the Walk Committee

TEXT OF PETITION

We, the undersigned, women and men, petition the administration of the University of Pennsylvania to remedy the disproportionate ratio of men to women on Locust Walk. Recognizing the vacancy of 3643 Locust Walk, we demand the establishment of a Penn Women’s Community Center which would include the following: an expanded Penn Women’s Center; conference rooms, a lounge and other facilities accessible to all Penn women. The time has come for the University to provide a hospitable and nondiscriminatory environment in the center of campus for women, whether undergraduate or graduate, employee, administrator or alumna.

---
Summer Camps and Programs for Children: Stretching Bodies and Minds

To help parents plan ahead, here are camps, workshops and programs available at Penn this summer for children who enjoy sports, performing arts or academic challenges. For some CGS Discovery Programs, scholarships are available.

Sports Camps
Basketball: Team Youth Camp, June 11-14, 9 a.m.-3:30 p.m., at the Palestra, for girls ages 10-18. Fee: $100 (nonrefundable deposit of $50), University rate $80 (parent/guardian must be a full-time employee); special team rate for group of seven or more (Save $10 per camper). For brochure: Tina Costello, 898-5496.

Basketball: Quaker Basketball Camp, June 24-25 & June 28, 9 a.m.-3:30 p.m., at the Palestra, for boys nine and older. Camp fee: $125 (includes tuition, camp shirt and basketball), University rate $110. For brochure: Fran Dunphy, 898-6141.

Fencing: August 1-7, overnight camp, for both boys and girls, ages 14-17. Fee: $455 (includes housing, meals and program). Information: Dave Michalnik, 898-6116.

Gymnastics: June 21-25, June 28-July 2, July 5-9, July 12-16, June 21-25, 9 a.m.-5 p.m., Hutchinson Gym, for boys and girls ages 6-12. Camp fee: $150/week (nonrefundable deposit of $25). Information: Tom Kovac, 898-5316.

Tennis: June 14-18, June 21-25, June 28-July 2, July 5-9, July 12-16, July 19-23, July 26-30, August 2-6, August 9-13, August 16-20, 9 a.m.-3 p.m., at Levy Tennis Pavilion, for boys and girls ages 6-16. Fee: $198/week (includes lunch and swimming) (nonrefundable deposit of $100). For brochure: Hal Mackin, 898-4741.

Performing Arts Camps


Summer Performing Arts Camp: June 28-August 6 (two- or six-week sessions), 8:30 a.m.-5 p.m. (morning, afternoon options available) at the Gwendolyn Bye Dance Center, for boys and girls ages 8-14. Fee: $310 for two weeks; $810 for six. Brochure: Suellen Haag, 898-2881.

The Play’s The Thing: July 5-16, 9:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m., for grades 5-8; July 19-30, 9:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m., for grades 9-12. Fee: $225. Discovery Program, 898-6763.

Academic Challenges
All below are Discovery Programs: 898-6763.

Beyond Grammar: Skills of Expression: July 19-26, Monday through Thursday, 10 a.m.-noon, for grades 9-12. Fee: $120.

Breaking into Print: July 20-August 5, Tuesdays and Thursdays, 1-3 p.m., for grades 9-12. Fee: $150.

Creative Journal Writing: July 20 & 22, 10 a.m.-noon, for grades 8-12. Fee: $60.

Field Biology I: June 21-25, 9:30-11:30 a.m., for grades K-3. Fee: $95.

Field Biology II: June 21-25, 1-3:30 p.m., for grades 4-6. Fee: $100.

Getting It Together for College 101: Educational Planning: August 2-7, 9 a.m.-4 p.m., for grades 7-10. Fee: $40.


Introduction to the Stock Market: August 2-6, 9 a.m.-4 p.m., for grades 9-10. Fee: $230.

Invertebrates I: July 19-21, 3 days, 2 nights camping trip, for grades 8. Fee: $180.

Invertebrates II: July 22-24, 3 days, 2 nights camping trip, for grades 6-8. Fee: $180.

Philly Law: July 19-August 6, 1:30-4:30 p.m., for grades 7-10. Fee $400.

Short Story Workshop: June 28-July 16, Mondays and Thursdays, 10 a.m.-noon, for grades 8-10. Fee: $150.

The Seeds of Writing: July 5-15, Monday through Thursday, 1:30-3:30 p.m., for grades 11-12. Fee: $180.

The Wonders of Mathmagic: June 21-25, 10 a.m.-noon, for children up to grade 8. Fee: $110.

Time Management: July 13 and 15, 2-3:30 p.m., for grades 10-12. Fee: $50.

Thinking Sideways: Design, Vision, and Engineering: June 28-July 2, 1:30-3 p.m., for grades 3-5. Fee $90.

Voices in Modern American Drama: July 12-16, 10-11:30 a.m., for grades 9-12. Fee: $90.

Zoetropes II: June 28-July 2, 10 a.m.-11:30 a.m., for grades 3-5. Fee: $90.

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 May 3, 1993 and May 9, 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: Robberies (& attempts)—1, Simple assaults—1,

30th to 43rd/Market to Philadelphia: Threats & harassment—2

Outside 30th-43rd/Market to Baltimore: Threats & harassment—1

Crimes Against Property
34th to 38th/Market to Civic Center: Burglaries (& attempts)—4, Total thefts (& attempts)—24, thefts of bicycles & parts—3, Criminal mischief & vandalism—3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Incident</th>
<th>Arrest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/09/93</td>
<td>3:03 PM</td>
<td>300 Market</td>
<td>Cash taken after left on top of safe</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/09/93</td>
<td>8:28 AM</td>
<td>400 Block Delancy</td>
<td>Vehicle's convertible roof slashed</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/09/93</td>
<td>5:05 AM</td>
<td>400 Locust</td>
<td>Property taken from unattended van</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/09/93</td>
<td>3:15 PM</td>
<td>220 N 39th St.</td>
<td>Wallet taken</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/09/93</td>
<td>6:30 PM</td>
<td>230 N 39th St.</td>
<td>'_ '</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/11/93</td>
<td>5:00 PM</td>
<td>300 Market</td>
<td>Vehicle taken from lobby area</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/12/93</td>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
<td>4105 Locust</td>
<td>Bike taken from 1st floor</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/13/93</td>
<td>11:30 AM</td>
<td>123 S 39th St.</td>
<td>Items taken from auto</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/14/93</td>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td>220 S 40th St.</td>
<td>Wallet stolen while at theater</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/15/93</td>
<td>5:30 PM</td>
<td>400 Block Pine</td>
<td>Vehicle taken from location</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/16/93</td>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>300 Block Sansom</td>
<td>Car vent window broken/items taken</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/17/93</td>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td>220 S 40th St.</td>
<td>Wallet stolen while at theater</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/18/93</td>
<td>5:30 PM</td>
<td>318 S 42nd St.</td>
<td>Unattended box taken by unknown juveniles</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/19/93</td>
<td>10:00 PM</td>
<td>4105 Locust</td>
<td>Bike taken from 1st floor</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/20/93</td>
<td>3:35 AM</td>
<td>400 Block Pine</td>
<td>Vehicle taken from location</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/21/93</td>
<td>7:00 AM</td>
<td>300 Block Locust</td>
<td>Scratches found on vehicle</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/22/93</td>
<td>8:30 AM</td>
<td>400 Block Pine</td>
<td>Vehicle taken from location</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/23/93</td>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td>220 S 40th St.</td>
<td>Wallet stolen while at theater</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/24/93</td>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>4105 Locust</td>
<td>Bike taken from 1st floor</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/25/93</td>
<td>7:15 AM</td>
<td>318 S 42nd St.</td>
<td>Unattended box taken by unknown juveniles</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/26/93</td>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td>220 S 40th St.</td>
<td>Wallet stolen while at theater</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/27/93</td>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>220 S 40th St.</td>
<td>Wallet stolen while at theater</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/28/93</td>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td>4105 Locust</td>
<td>Bike taken from 1st floor</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/29/93</td>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>318 S 42nd St.</td>
<td>Unattended box taken by unknown juveniles</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**30th to 34th/Market to University:** (burglaries & attempts) - 4,

Theft (attempts) - 11, Thefts of bicycles & parts - 2,

**Criminal mischief & vandalism** - 4

**May 14 Dual Presentations: noon & 1 p.m.**

Program: Rochelle Fuller, A-3 Assembly Chair

A Representative from Credit Worthy Election Update
In preparation for the University Commencement, the gates open at 9 a.m. and the procession will enter the field at 9:30 a.m. The ceremony will begin at 10:15 a.m., concluding about noon. The ceremony is open to the entire University community, and no tickets are required for admission. Faculty/staff in the academic procession are reminded to report to the Annenberg Center Lobby at 8:45 a.m. for robing. The student procession will form at Superblock at 8:45 a.m. The Commencement will be held rain or shine.

In the event of heavy rain, however, the procession through campus will be canceled. The academic procession will then form at 9:45 a.m. in the Weightman Hall Gymnasium; the student procession will form at 9:30 a.m. under the arches of the North Stands of Franklin Field. The decision to call off the procession will be made only on the morning of Commencement and will be signaled by announcements on radio stations KYW (1060 AM) and WCAU (1210 AM) and the lowering of the flag atop College Hall to half-mast.

Ivy Day
Ivy Day Irene Auditorium, Saturday, May 15, 4 p.m.
Speaker: Andrea L. Mitchell, CW ’67, chief Congressional correspondent for NBC
Stone Unveiling: The Palestra, immediately following speech (approximately 5:30 p.m.)

Baccalaureate
Baccalaureate Irene Auditorium, Sunday, May 16
Concert: 3:30 p.m.
Ceremony: 4 p.m.
Speaker: George Weiss, W ’65, President, George Weiss Associates

University Commencement
Monday, May 17
Gates open: 9 a.m., Franklin Field
Procession: 9:30 a.m. from Superblock
Ceremony: 10:15 a.m., Franklin Field
Speaker: First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton

School Celebrations
Receptions immediately follow School Commencements, unless otherwise noted.

Annenberg School for Communication
Ceremony: Room 110, Annenberg School, Monday, May 17, 2 p.m.
Reception: Annenberg School Plaza Lobby
Speaker: Dr. Larry Gross, Professor of Communication

Biomedical Graduate Studies
Reception: Francis Wood Room, John Morgan Building, Monday, May 17, 12:30-2 p.m.
Speaker: Dr. Saul Winegrad, Director, BGS

College of Arts and Sciences
Arrival Time: Students assemble in Convention Hall basement at 6 p.m.
Ceremony: Convention Hall, Civic Center, Sunday, May 17, 7-9 p.m.
Speaker: Center Hall, Civic Center
Speaker: Bob Schieffer, CBS News

College of General Studies
Ceremony: Wistar Institute Courtyard, Monday, May 17, immediately following University Commencement
Speakers: Director and Associate Dean Richard Hendrix, and Vice Dean Katherine Pollak

School of Dental Medicine
Ceremony: Irvine Auditorium, Monday, May 17, 1 p.m.
Reception: School of Dental Medicine, 3 p.m.
Speaker: Dr. Audrey F. Manley, Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services

Graduate School of Education
Ceremony: Hopkinson Hall, International House, Monday, May 17, 2:30 p.m.
Reception: S. America Room, Int’l House
Speaker: Dean Marvin Lazerson, George and Diane Weiss Professor of Education and Interim Provost

School of Engineering and Applied Science
Ceremony: Palestra, Monday, May 17, immediately after University Commencement
Reception: West Lawn, Towne Building
Speakers: Associate Deans Jacob Abel, Dwight L. Jaggers and John D. Keenan; Dean Gregory Farrington

Graduate School of Fine Arts
Ceremony and Reception: Meyerson Plaza Monday, May 17, 12:30 p.m.
(replacement location: Room B1, Meyerson Hall)
Speaker: Susan Maxman, M.Arch ’77, of Susan Maxman Architects

Graduate Division, Arts & Sciences
Ceremony: Bodek Lounge, Houston Hall, Monday, May 17, 1 p.m.
Speaker: Donald Fitts, Dean for Graduate Studies, SAS

Law School
Ceremony: Academy of Music, Broad & Locust Streets, Monday, May 17, 2 p.m.
Reception: Academy of Music
Speaker: Barbara Arwine, Executive Director of Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law

School of Medicine
Ceremony: Irvine Auditorium, Monday, May 17, 1 p.m.
Reception: University Museum
Speaker: Dr. P. Roy Vagelos, C ’50, Chairman and C.E.O. of Merck & Co., Inc.

School of Nursing
Ceremony: Harrison Auditorium, University Museum, Monday, May 17, 2 p.m.
Reception: Nursing Ed. Building, May 17, immediately after University Commencement
Speaker: Jeanne Quint Benoletel, Emeritus Professor of Nursing, U. of Washington

School of Social Work
Ceremony: Harrison Auditorium, University Museum, Monday, May 17, 2 p.m.
Reception: Chinese Rotunda, Museum
Speaker: Jacqueline G. Wexler, H ’79, Chair of SSW Board of Overseers

School of Veterinary Medicine
Ceremony: Zellerbach Theatre, Annenberg Center, Monday, May 17, 2:30 p.m.
Reception: Zellerbach Theatre Lobby
Speaker: Dr. Robert A. Whitney, Jr., Deputy Surgeon General of the U.S.

Wharton School (Undergraduate) and Wharton Evening School
Ceremony: Convention Hall, Civic Center, Monday, May 17, 5-7 p.m.
Reception: Atrium, Steinberg Hall-Dietrich Hall, 1-3 p.m.
Speaker: Andrew K. Tsai, W ’93

Wharton Graduate Division
Ceremony: Convention Hall, Civic Center, Monday, May 17, 1-4 p.m.
Reception: 1920 Commons
Speaker: Louis Platt, W ’66, Chairman and CEO, Hewlett-Packard

Wharton Doctoral Division
Ceremony: Lower Egyptian Gallery, University Museum, Sunday, May 16, 5:30 - 7 p.m.
Dinner: Lower Egyptian Gallery
Speakers: Depute Dean, Anthony Santomero, Vice Dean David Schmittlein, and Dean Thomas P. Gerrity.

Update
MAY AT PENN

FITNESS/LEARNING

13 Sex Education in the Age of AIDS: Dr. Ernie Green, Human Sexuality, GSE; noon-1 p.m.; Bishop White Room, Houston Hall; Info: 8-0313. (Family Resource Center).

17 Loving Limits: Monthly Support Group; noon-1 p.m.; Bishop White Room, Houston Hall; Info: 8-0313. (Family Resource Center).

TALKS

12 Facing Reality in the Age of AIDS: 12:30-1:15 p.m.; TV Room, Newman Center; Info: 8-7575. (Life Preservers, Newman Center).

19 Readings: My Father’s Geography and other work; poet and playwright Michael S. Weaver, 6 p.m., ICA. (Institute of Contemporary Art).

Summer at Penn: Deadline is extended to May 14 for the pullout calendar covering events June 1 to early September—if sent by fax, e-mail or messenger (see phone number and addresses, inside back page). — K.C.G./M.F.M./M.S.