Academic Calendar: More Changes for 1994-95

After consultation with student organizations, the Office of the Vice Provost for University Life has issued a further revised academic calendar for 1994-95 (left), in which the Penn Reading Project moves to the Sunday before Labor Day. Since Rosh Hashanah begins at sundown on Labor Day Monday, Hillel is planning Rosh Hashanah meals and Conservative, Orthodox and Reform services for observing students who arrive on campus before the Jewish New Year.

City & Regional Planning: Department Continues

Dean Patricia Conway of the Graduate School of Fine Arts has announced that “Admissions into the first-year Master of City Planning and Ph.D. programs of the City and Regional Planning Department are open. Both the Department of City and Regional Planning and the Graduate Group in City and Regional Planning are admitting applicants for Fall 1994.”

A proposal to close the department was debated last fall by the dean and members of the faculty (Almanac October 26, 1993, et seq.).

Returning to Physics: Deputy Provost Walter Wales

After twelve years in College Hall, including the past two as Deputy Provost, Dr. Walter D. Wales has announced that he will return to teaching. He plans to leave office no later than December 31, 1994, he said in a letter to Interim Provost Marvin Lazerson (see page 6 of this issue). A member of the faculty here since 1959, Dr. Wales is an Abrams Award-winning teacher who twice served as acting dean of SAS (1987-88 and 1990), and was also the School’s associate dean twice (1982-87 and 1988-92).

Leaving in May: Adrienne Riley of Human Resources

Adrienne Riley, who as assistant vice president for Human Resources heads Penn’s compensation and benefits programs, will leave next month for a similar post at the investment firm of Miller, Anderson, & Sherrerd in West Conshohocken. Ms. Riley joined Penn in 1983 as manager of compensation and at various times has led the departments of employment, records and information management. She helped implement “cafeteria” benefits (Pennflex) at the University, and has most recently been concerned with quality of worklife issues.

Ivy Day: Mayor Rendell

Philadelphia Mayor Edward G. Rendell has been chosen by the senior class as the 1994 Ivy Day speaker. Mayor Rendell, ’65, was vice president of his graduating class and a member of the Friars in his undergraduate days here. His address on Saturday, May 14, at 4 p.m. in Irvine Auditorium, leads up to the unveiling of the traditional Ivy Stone, to be set in a building not yet announced—the 12th Ivy stone since Penn’s move to the “new campus” in the 1780s.

Seventeen Ivy Day Awards will also be given at the ceremony, honoring 20 undergraduate men and women.
Salary Guidelines, 1994-95

As part of our budget planning for FY 1995, we have attempted to develop a salary policy that will enable deans and directors to provide increases that will help meet inflationary pressures as well as address issues of salary competitiveness. At the same time, we recognize that many schools and centers wish to make strategic investments that rely on the same resources needed to fund salary increases. This competition for resources requires all centers to achieve cost savings wherever possible in order to assure that their goals and objectives can be met.

The need to recognize the cost of the University’s obligation for post-retirement health benefits continues to affect salary policy. Although a plan to amortize this cost over a twenty-year period is in place, this obligation is a major factor in the increase in our full-time benefits rate—from 32.0 percent to 32.7 percent.

One important difference from previous years is that there will be no Provost’s Faculty Salary Reserve for FY 1995 to be used in conjunction with monies provided by schools and centers. Commonwealth support remains uncertain, there have been losses in other revenues, particularly from short term investments, and substantial new costs must be borne, including those for undergraduate financial aid and for renovations to College Hall, Logan Hall, and Franklin Field. The net effect is that there are insufficient undesignated subvention monies available for the Provost’s Faculty Salary Reserve.

Despite these constraints, it is our intent 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. Our guidelines recommend that salaries increase in the range of 2.0 percent to 5.0 percent for faculty and staff, based on performance. This, we feel, will allow for school-based salary policies that reward and encourage our most productive employees. At the same time, we expect that salary budgets will increase by 3.5 percent.

While individual faculty salary decisions are made at the school level based on guidelines issued by the dean, certain uniform standards pertain: salary increases to continuing faculty are to be based on general merit—extraordinary academic performance, including 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; rather increases are to be allocated on the basis of performance. There will, however, be a common academic base for assistant professors; for the coming year it will be $36,600.

For regular monthly- and weekly-paid classified staff (full-time administrative and clerical staff) the salary increase range also will be in the 2.0 percent to 5.0 percent range, again, based on merit. Salary increases may begin at 2.0 percent, reflecting satisfactory performance based on established job requirements. Salary increases outside of the established range must be documented with current job performance evaluations. For those individuals who have highly productive and meritorious performance, use of one-time payments that do not increase the individual’s base salary may be considered as part of the reward structure.

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

— Claire Fagin, Interim President
— Marvin Lazerson, Interim Provost
— Janet Hale, Executive Vice President

Capital Thoughts

The Campaign for Penn has raised over $1.2 billion for the University and we all appreciate the efforts made by trustees, alumni and friends of the University to build the University’s endowment. At the same time that we rejoice in the success of the campaign, we also note that there remain many important projects that are unfunded or underfunded. The list that follows is not meant to be exhaustive. It arises, in part, from various Senate and Council reports and is biased toward undergraduate needs and the non-health schools. In particular, I have focused on construction needs although I know that most, if not all, of the schools in the University are underendowed. I invite others to supplement my list. My intention is to begin to articulate the University’s needs so that President-elect Rodin and the trustees can establish priorities for fund raising in the decade to come.

Undergraduate Needs:

The report of the Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy that appears in this issue [pp. 3-5] presents a plan for enhancing the intellectual and social life of undergraduates. Fundamental to that plan is the renovation of the existing residential into smaller living/learning units and the construction of new facilities so that all freshmen and sophomores can live on campus. Estimated cost $200 million.

The University Council Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid has been discussing the need to continue need-blind admissions. More important, the cost of Financial Aid has been a drain on the resources of the schools with undergraduate programs. At peer universities much of the funding for undergraduate financial aid comes from endowment. The current campaign has a goal of $50 million for undergraduate financial aid. This is a beginning, but only a beginning. The amount of endowment needed for student aid is estimated to be $600 million.

Revlon Center: The need for a new Campus Center has been discussed elsewhere. Over $10 million has been raised toward construction. The estimated amount for completion is $30 million.

Relocation of the Bookstore: Estimated cost $10 million.

Diversifying Locust Walk: Estimated cost $7 million.

Library Endowment:

As reported by the Council Library Committee, our expenditures on the library rank well below those of the schools we think of as our peers. The average expenditure on library of the U.S. ARL libraries was 3.03% of the university budget. At Penn we spend 2.48% of the budget. The amount of endowment required to support an annual budget equal to 3.03% is estimated at $145 million.

Deferred Maintenance and Renovations:

Deferred maintenance: Estimated cost $120 million.

Interior Logan Hall renovations: Estimated cost $7.5 million.

Interior Bennett Hall renovations: Estimated cost $7.5 million.

Houston Hall interior renovations: Estimated cost $10 million.

Law School renovations: Estimated cost $9 million.

Engineering laboratory renovation including space for Cognitive Science: Estimated cost $2.5 million.

MBA Living/Learning Center: Estimated cost $20 million.

Research Infrastructure:

Institute for Advanced Science and Technology: Additional funding needed for construction: $50 million.

Psychology Office Building: $12 million.

Academic Development Center:

I wrote earlier of the need for a center to support innovative programs that transcend existing structures. To endow such a program and provide a building for the center will require $80 million.

I have focused on the non-health schools. Certainly there are prodigious needs in Medicine and the other health schools. I can not begin to estimate those costs and will leave it to others to supply the numbers.

Academic excellence does not come cheaply. To attract and retain the best students and faculty, we need first-rate learning, living and research facilities. The need for fund-raising will not go away. Now that we have demonstrated that we can raise substantial funds we can not rest on our laurels. It is not too early to set priorities for fundraising for the next decade to ensure that Penn will lead the way.

— Gerald J. Porter gjporter@math.upenn.edu
Enriching the Intellectual and Social Life of Penn Undergraduates

April 12, 1994

Introduction

A vibrant and intellectually engaging undergraduate life is central to the University’s mission. It is essential to attracting the very best students to Penn. It is also an essential condition for earning recognition as one of the preeminent universities in the country. Maintaining and enhancing the quality of undergraduate education must be a central and continuous goal of the University community. Towards this objective, this committee’s charge from the Chair of the Faculty Senate, Gerald J. Porter, is to investigate a broad set of issues pertaining to the integration of undergraduate academic and residential life, and to make recommendations concerning the proposals issued previously in two reports:

A Fifth Center. The Working Group on Undergraduate Education, chaired by David Brownlee, recommended the creation of a fifth center of intellectual life in the University, based on student residences, and an Inter-School Curricular Coordinating Committee, directed by the Council of Undergraduate Deans, to help define common interests and build curricular bridges linking the four undergraduate schools, with special responsibility for overseeing dual degrees, cross-school majors and minors, and internationalism of the curriculum (Almanac Supplement December 5, 1989).

A Virtual College. Building on the Brownlee report, the Vice Provost for University Life, Kim M. Morrission, proposed a detailed plan for expanding the college house program at Penn and creating a virtual college (Almanac Supplement December 1, 1992). Recently, the Commission on Strengthening the University Community, chaired by Gloria Twine Chisum, offered tentative recommendations in its preliminary report (Almanac Supplement February 1, 1994) that bear on these issues. We agree with that report when it states (8):

Integrated living/learning experiences, community service, community policing, and the creation of spaces where people can come together will help to foster this experience of living together in a complex and sometimes intimidating world. We can build on successful models that already exist at Penn. But some new thinking and new plans will also be required.

Basic Objectives. In this report we present twenty propositions recommending actions that we believe would contribute to the enrichment of the social and intellectual life of undergraduate students at the University of Pennsylvania. We offer these recommendations for consideration by a more inclusive body that includes representatives of the various stakeholders whose interests would be affected by the proposed reorganization of undergraduate life on campus. We divide the propositions into two categories. Propositions in the first set recommend a substantial increase in the role of college houses to be centers of both living and learning. Propositions in the second set recommend some complementary organizational changes that we think would facilitate the conduct of undergraduate education on campus. In our judgment, the proposed actions would create more intimate and diverse communities that foster intellectual interchange in the residential setting, reduce the psychological and social size of the University, help to overcome socioeconomic barriers to understanding and communication, contribute to the integration of the students’ curricular activities with their daily lives, and enhance the effectiveness of educational experiences offered by departments and interdisciplinary programs, primarily by improving the coordination of undergraduate education and increasing the interaction of students with faculty.

College Houses and Residential Living

The following propositions recommend a substantial increase in the role that college houses and living/learning centers play in undergraduate life at the University. Presently, more than 2400 first-year students, 1600 sophomores, and 1200 juniors/seniors (over 5300 of the 9300 Penn undergraduates) live in residences managed by the University. Of these, approximately 1200 students reside in college house programs that have faculty in residence—Hill (525), Modern Languages (80), Stouffer (123), Van Pelt (150), Ware (155), W.E.B. Du Bois (165)—and roughly 200 undergraduates reside in living-learning programs that have resident graduate fellows—Arts (50), Community Service (20), East Asia (35), International (60), Science and Technology (70). Our recommendations seek to build on the success of the college houses and living/learning programs. In stating these propositions we use the term college houses broadly to include living/learning centers. Indeed, we conceive college houses to be centers of both living and learning.

A Universal Experience

1. Each undergraduate student should be associated with a college house on admission to the University and should continue to affiliate with that or another college house through graduation.

2. Each college house should offer strong, integrative programs that engage students from diverse backgrounds in structured ways that provide tangible educational and experiential benefits. Such benefits represent the kinds of incentives that are necessary for students to continue to reach out to each other and to work together across the usual social boundaries created by race, religion, class, and often gender.

3. In most, if not all, cases, the college house should have a theme or several themes to provide an intellectual coherence to its activities.

4. Undergraduates residing in each house should include both first- and second-year students, and any upperclass students who choose to continue residing there, subject to the constraint that sufficiently many openings are reserved for first-year students.

5. Continued residence in a college house should be required through the end of the sophomore year.

Comment. We realize that this recommendation has implications for fraternities and sororities. To encourage active participation in the college house activities through the end of the sophomore year, we propose that fraternity and sorority rushes be delayed until the spring term of the sophomore year. Studies should be undertaken to discover ways in which any financial hardships on fraternities and sororities implied by this recommendation can be alleviated.

6. Students should be permitted to apply for transfer to another house after the first year; and such requests should be honored (via lottery if there are too few openings), subject to the constraint that sufficiently many places in each house must be reserved for first-year students.

7. The procedure used in assigning first-year students to each house should take into account the students’ preferences, but also should be expected to maintain a sufficient degree of social diversity. We propose that the first 50% of the places for first-year students in each house should be assigned based solely upon the students’ preferences, which they announce prior to matriculation, and that the second 50% of the openings should be assigned by a procedure that employs randomization but also pays some attention to the students’ preferences. One method that would accomplish...
this employs the following two-stage lottery. At each step in the first stage, select a student at random from those not yet selected and award a place in the college house that, among those that still have openings in their first 50%, stands highest in the student’s preferences. Repeat this procedure until the first 50% of the openings for first year students are filled in all college houses. Then, fill the second 50% of the openings using the second stage of the procedure, as follows: Assign each student who has not yet been placed by randomly selecting a house still having an opening and standing in the upper half of the student’s preference ordering. (If every house in the top half of the student’s ranking is filled, then assign the student to a house that, among those not yet filled, ranks highest in the student’s preferences.)

Comments: (1) An analogous procedure could be used in placing students who seek to transfer to another house after the first year.

(2) The following modification would permit a college house to participate in the selection of its members: Students could apply for admission to a particular house. The house then could award up to 50% of its openings to selected applicants. Any openings remaining under the first 50% cap would then be filled using the first stage of the procedure outlined above, and the second 50% would be selected in accordance with the second stage of that procedure.

(3) It is understood that the procedure and house facilities will have to make provision for students who have special needs (for example, those who observe kosher laws and may not use elevators on the Sabath), but this should be done in a way that maintains sufficient diversity in each house.

8. Efforts should be made to attract some students to continue residing in the house beyond the sophomore year, and to attract graduate students to reside in the house, in addition to the house staff. For example, as an incentive, assignments in the house for students beyond their first year should be based on seniority.

9. Efforts should be made to attract continued participation in house activities by members who no longer reside there. For example, incentives should be created to encourage members of the house who live off campus to eat frequently with students who currently reside in the house.

10. Incentives should be created to attract substantial faculty participation in the intellectual life of the house. Incentives for faculty who would reside in the house should include attractive living quarters and could be augmented, for example, by stipends or grants of discretionary funds to support faculty research. Incentives for participation by faculty not resident in the house could include, for example, subsidized meals or stipends.

11. The number of courses taught in the residences should be increased. (As per the Chism Commission’s final report, C.3, p. 7, Almanac Supplement April 5, 1994.)

12. Advising of first- and second-year students should be organized by college house, to supplement the advising of majors and prospective majors by departments and interdisciplinary programs. Advising of upperclass students should be organized by field of academic concentration.

Costs of Room and Board

13. The cost of room and board should be made commensurate across the houses, whether through close adjustment of financial aid or otherwise, so that the two-year mandatory residence and college house assignment process do not impose financial inequities. In particular, additional financial aid should be given to students in their first two years who, due to insufficient funds, would otherwise have to commute to the University.

14. The cost of living on campus should be made competitive with costs in the private housing market. In particular, as a matter of principle and via the general fee, each student, including those who live off campus, should contribute to the costs (now borne disproportionately by campus residents) incurred in the provision of campus security, access to the computer network, and any other services of the University that benefit all students. The costs associated with faculty participation in a college house should be charged as a general cost of education and should not be included in determining the price students pay for residing in the house.

College House Physical Facilities

15. Each house should have a lounge, at least one room adequate for classes and seminars, access to computer facilities, and, perhaps most crucially, dedicated dining. House residents should be encouraged to eat no fewer than a specified number of meals in the house’s dining room each week.

16. The size of each house should be established commensurate with the nature of its physical location. The house should be of a size that is sufficient to cover the costs of the house including faculty, students, and staff—ideally, at most 150-200 students in residence.

17. Each house should be located in an attractive facility. Any necessary repairs, modifications, and renovations of current facilities should be undertaken promptly both to increase their appeal and to minimize inequities that otherwise might result from the two-year residency requirement and assignment of first-year students.

Comments. To implement these recommendations, it will be necessary not only to renovate existing facilities substantially but also to create approximately 1000 additional housing units: 700 more units for sophomores, plus 300 units to replace those lost in transforming the cramped double rooms in Hill House to single occupancy and in realocating space to accommodate additional faculty apartments, dining facilities, and lounges.

Approximately $74 million are urgently needed to perform deferred maintenance of the residential facilities now in place. In addition, roughly $300 million would be needed for broad-based improvements to the facilities and to convert the existing facilities to college houses (including lounges, dining areas, and computer rooms). For the additional places, it is recommended that the construction of a “Hill Quadrangle” be considered seriously. Also, the University should consider purchasing real estate in West Philadelphia as sites for college houses, thereby reinventing the community (see proposal 10 on page 9 of “Priorities for Neighborhood Revitalization: Goals for the Year 2000,” Almanac October 26, 1993). Unfortunately, in our judgment, the high prices present serious obstacles to the development of successful college houses. It might be possible to create the appropriate environment if each college house in a high rise occupied just three floors with a dedicated dining facility on the middle floor. Conversions of the high rises would not only provide the requisite space; they account for the vast portion of the cost estimates cited above. An alternative, which is gaining popularity in many circles, is to convert the high rises to other purposes and to construct new facilities that are designed explicitly as college houses. It is crucial that the University raise the order of $200 million for capital improvements and new construction of college house facilities.

Organization of Undergraduate Education

The following propositions pertain more generally to matters concerning the organization of undergraduate education on campus.

18. An Undergraduate Education Committee should be created with broad oversight to facilitate the stimulation and coordination of undergraduate education across the University. This committee should include the four undergraduate deans, faculty representatives with special responsibilities in the undergraduate programs, such as chairs of undergraduate curriculum committees, student representatives, and the Director of Academic Programs in Residence. The committee should be charged with broad responsibilities to foster the undergraduate educational experience in the University, by coordinating curricula across the four undergraduate schools, facilitating the creation and conduct of interschool programs and majors, and fostering out-of-the-classroom learning experiences, including educational programs in the residences.

Comment. The proposal (“From the Chair: One College That Sees Undergraduate Life Whole,” Almanac March 15, 1994) to create one administrative structure for all undergraduates, headed by its own dean for undergraduate studies, is attractive to some of us, although some of us disagree. We do agree strongly, however, with the previous assessment of the Working Group on Organization of Undergraduate Education (Almanac Supplement December 1, 1992), chaired by David Brownlee, that the coordination of undergraduate education in the University should be improved. That Working Group proposed that an Undergraduate Curriculum Committee be formed to coordinate curricula across the four undergraduate schools. In our judgment, the committee should have oversight not only of curricula but also more generally of broader issues pertaining to stimulation and coordination of undergraduate studies and residential life. The title Undergraduate Education Committee reflects this larger role.

19. Steps should be taken to foster the creation and conduct of interdisciplinary programs, such as Biological Basis of Behavior and Cognitive Science, that involve faculty from more than one department or school, thus taking full advantage of the University’s special diversity. First, the current system of responsibility-center budgeting should be modified or replaced to eliminate financial disincentives to interdisciplinary programs. One possible model could provide a separate budget to fund interdisciplinary programs. Second, building on the experiences of BBB and Cognitive Science, an organizational model should be specified that can be adopted by faculty who seek to form new interdisciplinary programs. We recommend that, under the general oversight of the Undergraduate Education Committee, each interdisciplinary undergraduate major or field should be governed most proximally by an appropriately appointed Undergraduate Faculty Group, taking advantage of the model of Penn’s highly successful structural innovation, the Graduate Group.

20. Faculty should be encouraged to increase their informal exchanges with students outside the classroom. These opportunities can be fostered not only within college houses, but also within departments, schools, and...
interdisciplinary programs on campus. A number of approaches have engendered increased faculty-student interactions, including these:

- faculty invitations to students in their classes or to advisees to share a meal, e.g., brown-bag lunches, or potluck dinner at the faculty member’s home
- faculty-led weekly discussions for large lecture courses, which attract more students than do traditional office hours and increase the intellectual exchange between students and faculty
- quality circles in large courses
- student participation in faculty research
- a student advisory committee for each major that meets regularly with the program coordinator or undergraduate chair
- introducing topics from the faculty member’s own research in the classroom, student residence, or a brown-bag seminar
- departmental receptions to welcome new students or honor graduating students.

**Conclusion**

This report, as have other reports on undergraduate education at the University over the last thirty years, stresses the importance of creating a more exciting intellectual life for undergraduate students by integrating living and learning experiences, by increasing faculty participation in student experiences, and by taking full advantage of Penn’s hard-earned diversity through creating opportunities for different kinds of students to live, work, and learn together. This is an excellent moment in the history of the University to intensify our efforts towards this objective. This document proposes a strategy for doing so. In preparing to enter the twenty-first century, the University should assign the highest priority to enriching the educational experience of Penn undergraduates.

---

**OF RECORD**

**Rules Governing Final Examinations**

1. No student may be required to take more than two final examinations on any day during the period in which final examinations are scheduled.

2. No instructor may hold a final examination except during the period in which final examinations are scheduled, and, when necessary, during the period of postponed examinations. No final examinations may be scheduled during the last week of classes or on reading days.

3. Postponed examinations may be held only during the official periods: the first week of the spring and fall semesters. Students must obtain permission from their dean’s office to take a postponed exam. Instructors in all courses must be ready to offer a make-up examination to all students who were excused from the final examination.

4. No instructor may change the time or date of a final exam without permission from the appropriate dean or the Vice Provost for University Life.

5. No instructor may increase the time allowed for a final exam beyond the scheduled two hours without permission from the appropriate dean or the Vice Provost for University Life.

6. No classes covering new material may be held during the reading period. Review sessions may be held.

7. All students must be allowed to see their final examination. Access to graded final exams should be ensured for a period of one semester after the exam has been given.

In all matters relating to final exams, students with questions should first consult with their dean’s offices. We encourage professors to be as flexible as possible in accommodating students with conflicting schedules. Finally, at the request of the Council of Undergraduate Deans and SCUE, I particularly encourage instructors to see that all examinations are actively proctored.

— Marvin Lazerson, Interim Provost

---

**An Introduction to a Student Service, Second in a Series:**

**The University Reading and Study Improvement Service or URIS—A Unit of the Department of Academic Support Programs**

**Dear Colleagues:**

URIS is the source of a wonderful range of help for an equally wide range of students—undergraduate, graduate, and professional. Knowing more about its services and procedures may make you more ready to consult with its staff or to refer your students to them.

For many undergraduates, a number of whom have done well in high school through sheer intelligence and not through any understanding of the skills needed to digest complex material, college level work comes as a surprise or even a shock. This unexpected blow may strike sometime during freshman year, when grades on exams keep coming out distressingly low, but it may also be delayed even until the upper class years. URIS runs a series of workshops, called Mastering the Ivy League, whose session titles may give you a sense of the areas in which students often need help: “I’ll Stop Procrastinating...Tomorrow,” “Note This: Creating the Best Notes from a Lecture,” “Better Reading in Less Time,” “Writing Short Papers and Research Papers,” and “When to Stop Studying: How to Know that You Know It.” Issues of this sort are dealt with in workshops like these but also in one-on-one instruction as well as in a non-credit comprehensive study strategy course. This course focuses on time management, active learning, varieties of reading assignments, alternative note-taking methods, and planning for exams and papers. These are not the only areas in which URIS can be helpful. Students who know that they have learning disabilities can get appropriate help, and students who may have an undiagnosed disability may learn ways to overcome obstacles in their learning and build on their strengths. International students whose educational experiences are often different from other students at Penn can attend workshops or instructional sessions that help them build bridges between learning cultures. It is not uncommon for both undergraduate and graduate students to take advantage of these two services.

Graduate and professional students also have other concerns that belong to them alone. Students who have mastered the tasks required of undergraduate school—short papers and semester exams—may find that a dissertation or a comprehensive requires a new set of skills and URIS is prepared to help. For the older student, too, who is often called upon to find time not only for academics but also for employment and family, URIS has creative suggestions for time management.

Once a student calls URIS for an appointment (at 898-8434), he or she will be scheduled, usually within two days, for a meeting with one of the service’s thirteen instructors. At this meeting student and instructor together will explore the issues characterizing the problem at hand. A written checklist, on which the student identifies concerns covering reading, writing and studying, helps to focus the discussion. As the student’s needs become more clearly defined, the instructor can suggest strategies for solving the problem. Most often the student will work, in the weeks ahead, with the instructor with whom he or she first meets, but often, too, the particular skills of another staff member will be called upon to supplement the work. Though every instructor is able to work with students in all aspects of reading and study, most of the staff specialize in one or two areas of interest to URIS clients. These specialties include but are not limited to: cross-cultural learning, academic writing, studying for problem-solving courses, self-motivation for studying, completing projects and papers.

Currently, URIS is located on the A-level of the Graduate School of Education (although a change of scene is in the works—watch for an announcement). But it is also a traveling resource. Faculty or groups of students who wish the URIS staff to run a workshop for their particular needs (e.g., preparation for complex multiple-choice exams) may call upon them to arrange for a mutually convenient time. In short, for students with academic difficulties and for students who simply wish to refine their skills, URIS is a marvelous asset to the University.

Once again, I hope this message proves useful.

— Alice van Buren Kelley, Associate Professor of English and Faculty Liaison to Student Services

---

**ALMANAC April 19, 1994**
About the 1994 Honorary Degree Recipients

At Penn’s 238th Commencement on Thursday, May 19, the University will award five honorary degrees; as promised on page 1 of last week’s issue, some details of the five:

Denise Scott Brown, an architect and urban designer particularly renowned for integration of architecture, planning and urban design is a principal in Venturi, Scott Brown and Associates, headquartered in Manayunk. She came to Penn for a master of city planning in 1960 and a master of architecture in 1965; she served as an assistant professor at GSFA from 1960-65 and returned as a visiting professor in the ’eighties. Projects she has worked on at Penn include the renovation and restoration of the Fisher Fine Arts Library, the Master Plan for Locust Walk, and the proposed IAST building. She has also recently completed the Sainsbury Wing of the National Gallery in London.

Dr. Henry Cisneros, secretary of Housing and Urban Development, is responsible for administering fair housing activities as well as federally assisted housing and economic development programs throughout the nation. In addition to an M.A. in urban and regional planning from Texas A & M, and a M.A.P.A. from Harvard, he holds a Ph.D. from public administration from George Washington University. Dr. Cisneros served as mayor of San Antonio from 1981-1989; he was the first Hispanic mayor of a major U.S. city. He was confirmed for the HUD position in January 1993, less than a month after President Clinton nominated him.

Mary Ellen Mark, one of the foremost documentary photographers in the world, is particularly known for documenting what she calls the “unfamous”—the poor, homeless, sick and dying. Her subjects have included street teens in Seattle, London heroin addicts, the infirm at Mother Teresa’s Calcutta Mission, leprosy patients in Louisiana, and blind children in Kiev. She holds two Penn degrees: a B.F.A. and an M.A. in Communications. Her work has appeared in Life, The New York Times and London Times Sunday magazines, Paris Match, Stern, Rolling Stone, and National Geographic. She has published several books of her work and won the 1988 World Press Award given for “outstanding body of work throughout the years. Among her many exhibitions: a major retrospective in 1991 at the New York’s International Center of Photography, and a show at the Faculty Club.

Dr. Samuel O. Thier, president of Brandeis University, was on the faculty of the Department of Medicine at Penn from 1969-1974, and was his current post in 1985, a post he held until he assumed his current post in 1991. In June he will be leaving Brandeis to become president of Boston-based Partners Health Care System and president and CEO of Massachusetts General Hospital.

Dr. Philip Tobias, professor emeritus of anatomy and human biology at the University of the Witwatersrand and director of their Paleoanthropology Research Unit, is known for his research on the early evolution of man. He has led the excavation of some of the most important early hominid fossil sites in southern Africa and has been an outspoken advocate of equal rights in South Africa since the 1950s. Dr. Tobias has served as a visiting professor at Penn during the fall of 1992 and 1993 and will return in the fall of 1994.
Update

APRIL AT PENN

FITNESS/LEARNING

21 Jazzercise Open House: 5:30-6:30 p.m.; Child Guidance Center Gym: for information call 662-3293 (Medical Center).

SPECIAL EVENT

20 Wharton Evening School Alumni Society Annual Banquet; guest speaker: Warren V. Musser, Chairman of the Board and CEO, Safeguard Sciences Inc.; cocktails, 5:30 p.m.; annual meeting, 5:45 p.m.; banquet, 6:30 p.m.; Faculty Club; $35 per person; Info: 989-7811 (Alumni Relations).

About the Crime Report: Below are all Crimes Against Persons and Crimes Against Society listed in the campus report for the period April 11-17, 1994. Also reported for this period were Crimes Against Property including 39 thefts (including 6 burglaries, 2 of auto, 8 from auto, 4 of bicycles & parts); 1 incident of criminal mischief and vandalism and 2 of trespassing and loitering. The full reports are in Almanac on PennInfo.—Ed.

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 11, 1994, and April 17, 1994. 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: Simple assault—1, Threats & harassment—2
04/15/94 1:19 PM Johnson Pavilion Harassing phone calls received
04/16/94 2:00 AM 3800 Block Locust Complainant struck in face
04/17/94 12:28 PM Cleeman Dorm, Quad Swastika found on common door

38th to 41st/Market to Baltimore: Aggravated assault—1, Simple assaults—2,
Threats & harassment—4
04/11/94 5:39 PM 3800 Block Spruce Off-campus merchant threatened employee
04/12/94 4:17 PM 3900 Block Walnut Dispute between parking authority/car owner
04/15/94 12:28 PM High Rise North Threatening phone call received
04/15/94 12:52 AM Delta Kappa Epsilon Fight on highway
04/15/94 1:59 AM 300 Block 39th Male struck on head with glass bottle
04/15/94 3:35 AM High Rise North Threat received
04/16/94 12:23 AM 3900 Block Spruce Large group of males assaulted male

30th to 34th/Market to University: Simple assault—1
04/12/94 5:23 PM 33rd & Chestnut Driver struck other driver in head

Crimes Against Society

38th to 41st/Market to Baltimore: Alcohol & drug offense—1
04/17/94 1:36 AM 100 Block 39th Male Driving Under Influence

41st to 43rd/Market to Baltimore: Disorderly conduct—1
04/15/94 1:39 AM 4200 Block Walnut Male acted disorderly/arrest

30th to 34th/Market to University: Disorderly conduct—1
04/16/94 2:00 AM 200 Block 33rd Actor acting disorderly/arrest

18th District Crimes Against Persons

April 4 to 10, 1994
Schuylkill River to 49th Street, Market Street to Woodland Avenue
Totals: 8 incidents, 2 arrests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Incident</th>
<th>Arrest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/04/94</td>
<td>4:01 PM</td>
<td>3800 DeLancey</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/05/94</td>
<td>9:34 AM</td>
<td>4200 Baltimore</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/06/94</td>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td>4826 Woodland</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/07/94</td>
<td>2:28 PM</td>
<td>4700 Chester</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/09/94</td>
<td>9:59 PM</td>
<td>4100 Pine</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/08/94</td>
<td>10:07 AM</td>
<td>3400 Spruce</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/09/94</td>
<td>10:41 AM</td>
<td>200 S. 47th</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/94</td>
<td>12:40 AM</td>
<td>4606 Springfield</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TALKS

19 The Anti-Phospholipid Antibody Syndrome; Robert S. Schwartz, Harvard; Medical Grand Rounds; 8 a.m.; first floor, Maloney (Medicine).
20 GTP-Binding Regulatory Proteins as Mediators of Signal Transduction; David Manning, pharmacology; noon; Room 514, Chemistry Building (Pharmacology).

Transitions démocratiques en Afrique Française; Achille Mbembe, history; noon-1:30; Faculty Club.

The Holocaust in Israeli Literature; James Young, UMass/Amherst; Kutchin Seminar; 1:30-3 p.m.; Room 421, Williams (Jewish Studies).

The Art of Memory: Holocaust Memorials in History; James E. Young, UMass/Amherst; 5 p.m.; Gates Room, Van Pelt Library (Kutchin Faculty Seminar; Jewish Studies/Center for Cultural Studies).

22 Susceptibility of the Human Breast to Carcinogenesis; Jose Russo, Fox Chase Cancer Center; 2 p.m.; Grossman Auditorium, Wistar Institute (Wistar).

25 Muscle and Non-Muscle Genes That Control Muscle Morphogenesis in C. elegans; Elizabeth A. Buchen, cell and developmental biology; Pennsylvania Muscle Institute Working Seminar; 4 p.m.; Physiology Library, Richards Building (Pennsylvania Muscle Institute).

26 Russian Education: Significant Changes in Perspectives; Boris Gershunsky, Institute of Theoretical Pedagogics/International Research in Education, Moscow; noon-1:30 p.m.; National Center on Adult Literacy (NCAL/LRC).

Deadlines: For Summer at Penn: May 10. For the weekly update: every Monday, one week prior to the week of publication. Information can be sent via e-mail, campus mail, via fax or hand-carried.

PennInfo Kiosks on Campus

Benjamin Franklin Scholars Office
The Bookstore
College of General Studies Office
The College Office
Computing Resource Center*
Data Communications & Computing Services*
SEAS Undergraduate Education Office*
Faculty Club*
Greenfield Intercultural Center Library
Houston Hall Lobby
Office of International Programs
PennCard Center
Pennex Office
Student Employment Office
Student Financial Information Center
Student Health Lobby

* indicates kiosk uses point-and-click software.
The End Is the Beginning

History is a balancing act between the push of change and the pull of enduring patterns of human behavior. Whenever the equilibrium is thrown off balance, man’s wisdom falters. He turns to his peers and seeks guidance in collective thought. The tribal drums beat and the message goes out: let us sit down and share our ideas. Together we will find a way. From Nicea to Vatican II, from ancient councils to Rio ’92, it has ever been thus. In modern times the conference habit has become institutionalized. The academy, the professions, commerce and the state, the church and the arts—all are windswept with the conference fever. Some are annual rites, some global and urgent, like “Religion, Television and the Information Superhighway: A Search for a Middle Way,” April 22-23 at The Annenberg School for Communication.

Television in the last decade, American commercial television, has been rapidly sweeping the globe, by satellites and cable, challenging ancient religions that have endured for centuries. American programs, such as “Dallas” and “The Bold and the Beautiful,” soap operas, MTV, which cultivate materialistic values, are seen daily in cities and villages in India, Africa, and Third World countries, opening the eyes of people in insulated cultures to the technological marvels of the modern world, but also influencing them with powerful models of sex, violence, horror and acquisitive behavior antithetical to their spiritual traditions. We are in a clash of cultures with the outcome uncertain.

Now on the wings of this revolution, appears a new vision—the Information Superhighway—a world-encircling network of interactive, digital fiber optic channels, numbered in the hundreds, transforming the viewer from a passive receiver of monopolistic signals to a sovereign active consumer of news, sports, education, entertainment, shopping and endless streams of data, thus compounding the promise and the challenge of western consumerist-driven television, as historically we have known it. Will this compounded pressure on the major faiths of the world—Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism, Islam and Judaism—afford them new opportunities to cultivate non-materialistic values or will it stretch the limits of unacceptable behavior of individuals and nations?

Profit and power are the goals of commerce, and western consumerist television is oriented to the marketplace. Spirituality and service to God and man are the ideals of religions. Technology cannot be denied: the Information Superhighway will come—in five, ten or twenty years. What, if anything, can be done to make television along that highway socially responsible? Can a middle way be found between the search for profit and the preservation and deepening of spiritual values?

This was the impulse that motivated the Annenberg conference. Five representatives of the major faiths from India, Thailand, England and the United States will participate. Five top American media decision-makers will engage in dialogue with them, enriched by five deans of communication schools from three continents, including Australia and South America, who train media professionals.

But the conference will not proceed in a conventional way. Most conferences are usually characterized by prepared speeches, delivered by speakers who respond to questions and then depart, leaving behind ideas without consequences. This is to be different. The religious representatives, the media executives and the communication school deans will work in small groups to draft statements which will provide guidelines for profit-motivated yet socially responsible leaders in religion, media and communication schools—in the context of the coming “Information Superhighway.”

One of the conference goals will be to radite its influence as widely as possible. To this end, a group of 15 Invited Guests, all sophisticated and knowledgeable in religion, media and communication education, will act as a sounding board for the panelists. They will critique and help to refine the draft statements as they are progressively constructed; and they have one other important function—to offer suggestions on how the influence of the conference can be spread throughout the world. Thus, interaction, dialogue, is the key to this conference, as interactivity is the essence of the Information Superhighway. To further widen the dialogue, two public sessions will include an even broader cross-section of people concerned about the topic. A video documentary will also be made available for distribution, and a post-conference publication designed to stimulate other interested groups to organize similar conferences.

The post-conference publication will include statements sent in advance by all the participants giving their views of the relationship between western consumerist-driven television and global spiritual and cultural values. These statements reflect a rich variety of realistic, humanistic, philosophical and deeply felt testimonies of the contemporary pluralistic religious landscape.

To the best of my knowledge there has never been such an interaction among religious leaders, media executives and communication educators. Insightful believers in all the faiths have often wished they could dialogue with media leaders about the consequences of consumer-driven television. Media executives themselves, however deep their private religious convictions may be, despite periodic public relations polemics, have generally avoided responsibility for anything marginal to their primary profit objectives. Communication schools have, except in rare cases, abjured responsibility for the discussion of values.

But social attitudes are changing. Law, business and medical schools have introduced ethics into their curricula. More and more media professionals at the peak of their careers, intent on financial success and prestige, are nevertheless ambivalent about the spread of gratuitous violence, horror and sex in the mass media. In Bangkok I had a conversation with a social activist Buddhist who will be attending the conference. “What can be done about the problem?” I asked him. “We must talk to the producers,” he said. “They are human beings. They have consciences. They may not be happy with what they are doing. The important thing is to talk to them face to face.”

We will see whether interaction is a factor in producing results. We will learn how radiating the influence of the conference works out. But beyond this particular conference outcome are provocative implications for conference designers in universities. Think of interaction. Think of working assignments. Think of critiquing. Think of radiating the influence of your interaction. Think of including the public as an active participant in your proceedings.

Open the university to a more pluralistic landscape. Set forces in motion that will resonate beyond the conference. Universities thus might serve society better. Make the conference itself not the peak but the beginning of a dialogue. The end is the beginning.

— Robert Lewis Shayon, Emeritus Professor
The Annenberg School for Communication