In her new role at the S.W. Mitchell School in West Philadelphia, onetime horticulturalist Davy Harwi, '95 Ed, works with kindergarteners Tamira Lewis, center, and Teressia Natson. © Photograph by Jenny Friesenhahn
The following statement is published in accordance with the Senate Rules. Among other purposes, the publication of SEC actions is intended to stimulate discussion between the constituencies and their representatives. Please communicate your comments to Senate Chair William Kissick or Executive Assistant Carolyn Burdon, 15 College Hall/6303, 898-6943 or burdon@pobox.upenn.edu.

**Actions Taken by the Senate Executive Committee**

**Wednesday, February 7, 1996**

1. **Academic Planning and Budget Committee and Capital Council.** Past Senate Chair David Hildebrand reported that the overriding activity of the Academic Planning and Budget Committee continues to be the evolution of the University Strategic Plan. The president met with the committee to discuss the trustees’ reaction, which was favorable, and the next steps. It is hoped that school plans will be developed by the end of the academic year and ready for publication in the Fall. The president noted with regret that some in Arts and Sciences have misread the plan as a threat to the well-being of that school. The president noted that one major component of the plan is fundraising at a level almost to that of another development campaign, and that Arts and Sciences has the opportunity to improve its financial status with some good ideas.

   The committee spent two meetings discussing the plan of the Engineering School. The plan is to make the special areas of strength of the school clearly at or near the top and to develop some of the core areas of engineering to keep them competitive.

   The committee heard from the dean of the Medical School on that school’s plans. The medical complex is in the middle of a substantial shift to a more inclusive health system approach, which has implications for staffing and for curriculum. There has been considerable growth in the number of clinicians—practicing physicians with offices at Penn and substantial teaching duties along with clinical practices—and clinical associates—physicians located elsewhere who also do some educational work. Also, the school is beginning the process of a major revamping of its curriculum.

   Capital Council approved completion of the ResNet program, wiring the various student housing units for computing networks, cable TV, and so on. The Council also approved the final phase of the Franklin Field renovation which included moving the University Archives within the complex.

2. **Senate Committee on Committees.** Nominations were made for the seven-member committee; the Faculty Senate Chair and Chair-elect are non-voting ex-officio members. A mail ballot will be circulated to SEC members. This committee nominates candidates for all committees to which the Executive Committee makes appointments except the Senate Nominating Committee and the Senate Committee on Committees.

3. **Arts and Sciences Proposed Lecturer and Senior Lecturer in Foreign Languages.** Professor Sheila Murnaghan, chair of the Senate Committee on the Faculty, presented the committee’s statement in which they recommended SEC approval of the SAS proposal as it adds some stability to the existing positions and addresses the need to teach an increasing number of students basic foreign language proficiency. The committee recommended support of it with reservation and a request to reinforce the limit on numbers of people in these positions in each department and to limit them to teaching introductory and intermediate courses.

   Extended discussion followed that included: (1) whether teaching foreign languages presents a unique need and whether that differs from special teaching needs in other courses; (2) protection of the concept of tenure and of the standing of the standing faculty; (3) concern that such proposals may be economically driven; (4) the suggestion to reallocate resources to hire additional standing faculty to teach these courses and to change expectations; (5) concern about exploitation of language lecturers and increasing student contact with non-faculty; (6) how, where, and in which languages to draw the line between language lecturers teaching only introductory and intermediate level courses and standing faculty teaching the upper level literature courses; and (7) whether language teaching specialists or standing faculty are better at teaching the introductory and intermediate level courses.

   It was also suggested that the language departments be polled.

   SEC referred the matter back to the Senate Committee on the Faculty to: (a) determine the numbers of courses taught by language lecturers; (b) determine the total number of courses taught by non-standing faculty upon completion of degree work; (c) provide reasons why language teaching is appropriate for these lecturers; (d) see how other universities handle this issue; (e) learn what other approaches were considered by SAS; and (f) present alternative solutions to the SAS proposal under consideration.

4. **Informal discussion with the President and Provost on the relationship between the Strategic Plan and the 21st Century Undergraduate Education effort.** President Rodin pointed out that the first phase item in the Strategic Plan comments on undergraduate and graduate education. There will be a separate focus on training and research interests for undergraduates and graduate students. Recreational athletics is very important to undergraduates and an endowment will be raised for it. Provost Chodorow said that advising will improve with the fresh approach that will be undertaken; that is, to develop advising at appropriate stages and to look at group, professional and electronic advising. The President noted that advisors should be able to explain all the implications and variations of choices made. The Provost went on to say he has been working on quality of teaching in the Provost’s Staff Conference as well as in the undergraduate education project. He will invite the faculty from all the schools to submit proposals for new interdisciplinary courses. Structural impediments to such courses are also being reviewed.

---

**BULLETINS**

**To the Jury**

Testimony ended Friday in the trial of the last two of five young men charged in the death of Moez Alimohamed. After attorneys gave their closing statements Saturday, the 12-member jury began deliberating Sunday morning. Anthony Archer, 16, is charged with murder in the first degree and Gregory Pennington, 17, with second-degree murder. Dr. Wolfgang Ziller of the math department continues to post his coverage of the trial on the Penn Web at http://www.math.upenn.edu/~wziller/moez.html.

**Humanities Proposals: May 1**

Each year the Humanities Coordinating Committee of the School of Arts and Sciences dispenses funds to make possible Faculty Seminars in the Humanities. Funding requests for 1996-97 are now invited. Preference will be given to University of Pennsylvania-based faculty seminars and groups that do not have access to other sources of funding. These funds are not meant to replace or supplement normal budgets for departmental colloquia.

To qualify, each application should include:

1. a description of the seminar’s purpose and how it is both interdisciplinary and humanistic;
2. a list of faculty participants;
3. a detailed outline of the proposed program for 1996-97;
4. a statement on any other funding sources (and amounts) available to the seminar;
5. a detailed outline of the seminar budget

Please note: a detailed budget proposal is required. The available funds will be divided evenly among those seminars that are approved. Judging from past years, allocations are anticipated to fall in the range of $800 to $900 per seminar. Funds are normally for payment of honoraria and travel expenses for outside speakers, refreshments following lectures, and related publicity costs. Proposals should be received in 16 College Hall/6378 (Graduate Division of Arts and Sciences) by Wednesday, May 1, 1996. For more information call: Tracey Cheek, 898-7156.

**Corrections**

On the front page of the February 6 issue, the SEAS student identified as James Au is James Tua, and the photograph is by Stuart Watson.

On page 8, under Updating Your Record, the procedure begins with choosing Update Your Record, not “Add Yourself to the...Database.”

On the back cover: the le Ricolais exhibition goes to Lausanne, not Lucerne; and a typographical error in the last paragraph awarded the Cret chair to Professor twenty years early: He became the Cret Professor in 1974, not 1954. Almanac regrets the errors. —K.C.G.
On the agenda for discussion at Council on January 17 was the graduate education at the University. Speakers focused on two broad issues: the application of common rules in a decentralized structure, and suggested ways to frame Penn’s response to growing constraints on the tradition that academic graduate education is primarily an apprenticeship for professional careers. Following are highlights taken from a lengthy transcript.—Ed.

Council: Tensions in Graduate Education Today

Provost Stanley Chodorow delivered the opening remarks in a scheduled discussion of graduate education at the January Council meeting, noting that the Vice Provost for Graduate Education, Dr. Janice Madden, was away on University business.

He began by distinguishing “academic graduate education,” from professional education—the latter highly structured, and controlled jointly by strong professional-school faculties and the accreditation agencies which certify or license the graduate to practice the profession. While there is a long-standing tension between the basically conservative professional organizations and the faculties of the professional schools—especially the best ones, where the faculty have a tendency to want to expand and innovate—this “is a tension which is generally managed and plays out around accreditation visits to the schools,” he said.

In graduate education, the tensions are different because the educational process is different, and more decentralized. At Penn, not only the School of Arts and Sciences but also all of the professional schools have academic graduate programs (Ph.D., M.A. and in some instances an academic M.S.). In fact, only 45% of the Ph.D. students on campus are in SAS, making its graduate student body the largest but leaving the majority distributed all over campus.

“Academic graduate education is really fundamentally different from professional education or undergraduate education,” he said. “It is not hierarchically organized, on the whole. Students do take courses, but what is critical to the programs is not so much the coursework but the general examinations—which are general in the sense that they go to the whole field—and the dissertation. The key to the program is that you can succeed in your courses and fail your general exams—it is very common to do so—and you can succeed in your general exams and fail to write a dissertation that is acceptable.” To get a Ph.D. degree, the student must make an “original contribution to knowledge, and that doesn’t mean a contribution to a person who doesn’t know anything about the field, to whom any contribution is a contribution, but to those who are the absolute leaders of the field,” he continued.

“It is the most personal form of education that we offer in the University,” the Provost emphasized. In contrast to professional school students, who may have a number of faculty to turn to for guidance, the graduate student ultimately ends up in a mentorship, hard to maintain from the center. “One of the things that the Vice Provost for Graduate Education spends a great deal of her time doing is trying to provide an avenue of appeal or of advice, or just an ear to complain to, in the inevitable cases in which things start to break down. But the fact is that these are, in essence, personal relationships and are hard to manage in any real way.”

The Provost also related Penn’s decentralization to issues in planning and containment of enrollment. “Since 1991—just taking Fall enrollment figures as for comparison—the number of graduate students has fallen from 4500 to about 4000, a little more than 10% overall. This is a response, in part, to the fact that the market for graduate education has been declining. Most people who observe this and who look at the numbers would say that our graduate programs and those of other institutions like us are not reducing their size fast enough, given the market. In part, that is because of the need for graduate students for research purposes and for teaching purposes. Graduate students play a large role in the teaching program of the University, a very important role in the education of the undergraduates—at all research universities. They are, after all, apprentice faculty in many cases, and that’s appropriate. And while undergraduates will complain from time to time about a graduate student assistant, they probably complain less about them than they do about faculty; they will relate to graduate students in ways that they don’t generally relate to faculty, for obvious generational reasons.”

Reviews on the Agenda

Penn’s schools do manage their programs very actively, he said, citing professional schools that have, as a result of the review process, intentionally reduced the size of their Ph.D. programs and emerged with stronger ones. “Part of the Agenda for Excellence is an emphasis on improvement across the board in all aspects of the University. And you cannot improve unless you know what is necessary to do it—what’s wrong, what could be better—and that requires evaluation.

“One of the key elements of the strategic plan is the development of a comprehensive, frequent, regular review of our schools and our departments and our programs, and that includes, of course, the graduate programs. You will see over time even an increase in the number of management issues which are engaged in by members of the faculty in these graduate groups. We do this by graduate groups, as many of you know, to develop the programs, to improve them, and to correct any problems which may arise in them....

“On the whole if you look at our programs, most of them have been improving in their
Response: ‘Follow Through’

Opening the discussion period, Surya Ghosh of GAPSA called for attention to coordination and follow-through on those common rules and guidelines that have already been developed, if the Agenda for Excellence is to work. Citing instances where the student groups would propose and transmit guidelines only to find them already on the books, he said, “I would say that a very important thing that needs to be put into the process is follow-up from above.”

The Provost agreed. “Let me say that there are some rules that the Vice-Provost enforces, but she has to know about violations in order to enforce them, and generally speaking it’s graduate students who have to bring those issues to her attention. The second thing to say is that if we are designing an evaluation procedure which among other questions asks the extent to which graduate students follow University regulations in managing their graduate programs, and of course in the way in which they deal with their students.” Reviews are usually done under the authority of the Graduate Council of the Faculties, and it is “up to them to say what are we going to do about the problems that were found,” the Provost added. The Vice Provost convenes that Council and the Council of Graduate Deans.

“It’s a function of the Vice Provost, along with the relevant deans in those cases in which a program is really embedded in a school, to ensure that the program in fact carries out a reform if reform is necessary, or corrects practices if that’s necessary. So we are in fact very much aware of the need to come back and make sure that these things are done.”

Mr. Ghosh suggested as a further improvement to collect input from the graduate students themselves. “What I really wish is that various departments in, for instance, the School of Arts and Sciences or the Engineering School, have different knowledge of what the rules are. So it’s hard

for graduate students to say that there’s a violation of a rule when they don’t really know that these rules even exist. When the dean or the grad chair says something, that’s what we accept as the rules.

Oversupply and Sizing

Dr. Larry Gross expressed to the Provost a concern that research universities—this one as much as any other—have not thoroughly thought through “the degree to which they are, if you like, continuing to produce a product that is in oversupply. Ingrained in everything we do with graduate students, or in most things we do with doctoral students, is the expectation that of course one is there for is, as you said, to be an apprentice faculty member. [But when] we look around at our own university or any other, we realize that in most cases that is not realistic.

“At the same time, we’re reluctant to cut down on the number of graduate students for all the reasons that you enumerated and others, particularly in research grant-dependent situations. I don’t know that there’s an answer to this and it varies enormously across fields, but I think that there may be some importance to centrally motivated discussion, consideration, thoughtfulness, about how we face this—for example, to try and help redefine the Ph.D. as other than ‘the degree you get to become an assistant professor in a tenure track job.’

“If we don’t do that,” Dr. Gross continued, “then we’re continuing to mislead people whom we attract and train because, you know, those jobs aren’t there.” Citing the end of mandatory retirement as one cause of changing projections for graduate students’ careers, he said that some responses may tend to be area-specific—expanded postdoctoral opportunities are routine in some fields, scarce in others—but that the decentralization the Provost talked about makes it less likely that there will be University-wide attention to the problems.

“The councils that you refer to...are very much taken up with business, reviewing procedures, reviewing programs, dealing with various kinds of business. They are not necessarily, and not typically, forums for this kind of discussion. I think that is something that might be useful, particularly if it involves students to a greater degree than their representation on the Graduate Council of Faculties, which is, you know, two or three people who represent an entire body.”

Again the Provost agreed with the speaker. Although Penn is more decentralized than most institutions, he said, “Janice and I talk a lot about this, and I talk a lot about this with the deans, and some deans are in a position to do something about it and some are not, or at least not yet. But this is becoming an issue which, while it’s not strident, is there all the time for us. Some programs are really cutting back and others are not, and I think that we will begin to put more and more pressure on programs to cut back in order to size their programs appropriately. One of the only tools that we have is the graduate funding that we give out from the center, and we are trying to use that as effectively as we can, both to improve support for the graduate students we bring in, and to reduce the size of the graduate programs.

Dr. Gross responded: “Reducing the size is one important component to consider, but one other thing is, I think, to think creatively—

which is not to say people aren’t doing it—about ways to redefine doctoral education so that realistic job opportunities or career opportunities are viable; so that not ending up as an assistant professor somewhere is not a failure that destroys the investment of years—but thinking about the kinds of job possibilities that are possible. Many of our [Annenberg School] graduates work in universities of them prefer other kinds of options. And I think there are many fields in which the faculties have neither been required nor particularly been encouraged to think about anything except the next generation of Shakespeare scholars, or whatever the current faculty profile is. And that may not be the way to do it. If universities want to be in the business of being Ph.D.-producing machinery of which they certainly seem to, then I think they need to give some thoughts to what those produced Ph.D.s might do, besides compete for a shrinking pool of tenure track jobs.”

Some of the Schools are beginning to think very creatively about that, the Provost replied. “There’s an interesting issue here, and that is that the Ph.D. degree is a research degree—a product of the research program. When we start talking about other uses, one of the questions we ask is what are other uses of the research capacity—or are we talking about something else, in which case we may want to create a different kind of degree and reduce the size of the Ph.D. programs to preserve their purity. These are issues that I’ve had to deal with, both here and at my previous university, and in fact in the accreditation process. One of the issues that was raised is psychology, where the ‘Psy.D.’ is raised as an alternative to the Ph.D.—in most cases it is a professional degree and not a research degree, and doesn’t look anything like a Ph.D. degree. It’s a really interesting set of issues.”

‘Empty Semesters’

Graduate Student Alex Welte, confirming that most graduate students have a sense of those difficulties, “of understanding how all this nice exercise we get here really fits into life after leave,” linked the Provost’s comments on the quality and attractiveness of the faculty to the proposals students have made in Council to have student input into the faculty tenure process.

Mr. Welte also brought up questions about the concept of “20 or so courses you must complete to get a Ph.D. in the physics department, and probably in others too, you should not be spending 20 courses—that takes 3 courses a semester over 7 semesters, and you really should not be spending 7 semesters doing courses in a Ph.D. program.”

“What in fact happens,” he continued “is that many people I know take a lot of so-called independent study, which is simply working on their thesis without having it written so in their registration. But that means that they pay three times the fees per semester, in exchange for which you do not get course instruction. This places a burden on the individual to have to pay the tab...”; he applied the term “empty semesters” to this. “I know a lot of students don’t get anything for at least the last three or four courses that they take, so I wonder if this very rigid requirement cannot be made more flexible, so that people pay for what they get and are not forced, perhaps as an alternative, to take courses
which are essentially irrelevant and don’t contribute to getting on with doing the thesis.”

Dr. David Hildebrand said in response to Mr. Welte: “Bravo, huzzah, and amen!”

**Teaching to Teach**

Bryan Huey of GAPSA said in connection with faculty involvement in the process of getting “more jobs down the road” for those getting Ph.D.’s, “I hope that you don’t consider creating more post-doctoral opportunities as an excellent option there. At least for those of us in the sciences, those are valuable times in our lives to be a post-doc, but the opportunity to do several of those in a row is more a case of indentured servitude, from my perspective.”

“More importantly, though, certainly it is the case that a good fraction of the doctoral students from a university such as Penn will become teachers, hopefully at other classy universities. As a result, it is important for the departments, our advisors, and the school itself, to make sure that we are good teachers when we come out of here. I don’t know the extent of programs that are available throughout the University to improve upon our teaching skills. It seems to me at this point, that is left up to the individual advisors and maybe the departments.

The Provost said that to a very large extent this too, is a graduate group issue: “While there are common elements to good teaching and good practice, it is to a very large extent discipline-specific, and you need to learn how to teach this as opposed to that, and you do that within your graduate group. Some graduate groups are really terrific, and others are not engaging in that at all.”

“One of the things we’ve done,” he added, “with GAPSA and the Vice Provost for Graduate Education, is [to start work on] a ‘teaching resource center’ to help graduate students who need help and aren’t getting it at home, so to speak.”

“The only other way that we can deal with this is the review process. It becomes one of the values that you have to ask about when you ask a committee to look at a program: to what extent are they doing a good job bringing students along as teachers, and what programs do they have in place. Some of them are really terrific; I know of a couple where students are getting really good—much better than I got—instruction in that. Those of us around the table who are in this business will tell you that learning to teach graduate students is something that some of us do very well, and some of us not so well. It is also something we can learn something about.

“But we will certainly be setting up a teaching resource center as part of that. Graduate students will be more than welcome in that program, which will deal with technological issues. There are so many new things you can do in a classroom—or outside of a classroom—to teach, that we want to develop and want to disseminate information about, in addition to the more traditional aspects of helping people teaching better by teaching the techniques. So we’re very sympathetic to this issue. It’s not one that we have direct control over most of the time, but it’s something we can stimulate and we’re going to try to do that.”

Brian Ray of GSAC commended the Vice Provost’s Office and Dr. Janice Madden, noting particularly that she is “trying to get graduate groups to actually implement the University policy of having some kind of written agreement for TAs and RAs.” But he said there are other issues related to ‘TAing’ and ‘RAing,’ for which policy might be appropriately set from the center, as opposed to within specific schools. One is teacher-to-student ratio, and another the orderly scheduling of assignments. Citing conversations with Dr. Walter Licht of SAS, he acknowledged complexities when course enrollment changes trigger changes in the need for TAs, but suggested “there might be some issues for which some sort of general policy could be set up and maybe incorporated into the review process to determine whether those issues are being addressed or not at a department level.”

**Where to Explore Alternatives**

Dr. Anthony Tomazinis returned to the issue of alternatives for graduate students, and how to approach the issues. “I would like to take two minutes to strengthen the voice of Professor Gross, and pose the question as to whether we have a machinery that permits us to capitalize on new ideas which may be circulating around campus and the country.”

“I don’t think the Graduate Council of the Faculties is there to explore initiatives or innovations; it is there to be guardian of the quality of what we have. It may be that perhaps the Provost needs to initiate some kind of machinery, some kind of organizational group to explore variations,” Dr. Tomazinis proposed.

“I have the experience of a number of groups who have been discussing alternative degrees, but there is nowhere for them to discuss it seriously, and produce something. And because the country has been following a similar course of action, of defending what they have, Penn may find an opportunity to innovate on a national scale on new degrees or programs, which are not really teaching-oriented.

Provost Chodorow replied: “I agree with you; I think one of our great advantages is the graduate group, which is much more flexible than the traditional departmental structure at most institutions. But it too, like all institutional structures, has a way of getting hardened arteries, building walls, and becoming defensive in certain respects.” He said his office’s newly announced program of supporting interdisciplinary graduate student/faculty seminars could lead to “new configurations, new programs, new ideas; they will naturally not only produce new research opportunities and activities, but also new degree opportunities. In regard to the size of Penn this is a modest program, but I hope that it will grow and we can raise some money for it and that we’ll be able to stimulate that kind of interdisciplinary, inter-school activity that will produce just what Professor Tomazinis is talking about.”

Erick Santos, a Medical School representative to GAPSA, discussed disparities in assignments of research assistants from one school or department to another, asking something similar to the TA contract to guard against the potential for abuse. He was advised from the floor that there is such a contract, with a written agreement—though the terms of the agreement may be local. “I’m glad to hear it,” the Provost said. “I think it’s the right thing,” adding that the Vice Provost would seek to enforce this policy as well as the policy on TA agreements.

—K.C.G.

---

**AWFA Awards: by March 1**

With a deadline of March 1, the Association of Women Faculty and Administrators is soliciting nominations for the following awards:

The Leonore Rowe Williams Award, named in honor of the wife of former provost Edwin B. Williams, given to a distinguished female scholar or leader whose contributions extend within and beyond our campus.

The Alice Paul Awards, named for the suffragist leader and SSW alumna who founded the National Women’s Party and authored the Equal Rights Amendment, awarded to students, regardless of gender, who have demonstrated outstanding service to women in the Penn community.

The Robert E. Davies Award, named for the late feminist and distinguished Penn scholar, recognizes any individual(s) for their work for social change.

**Nominations should be sent to me [Dr. Yvonne Paterson, professor of microbiology, 1033 Blockley Hall|6076] by March 1. Letters should include:**

1. Nominee’s name, school, position, address and telephone number.
2. The nature of the nominee’s achievement and why it is extraordinary.
3. Your name, position, campus address and telephone number.

The award will be announced at the annual AWFA breakfast in April.

—Yvonne Paterson, President, Association of Women Faculty and Administrators

---

**NOMINATION CALLS**

**University Council:**

by February 26

The University Council’s Committee on Committees issues this week its annual call for volunteers and nominations to serve on key all-University Committees of Council and some Independent Committees of the University.

Nominations are requested by February 26.

On page 15 of this issue is a detailed description of each of the committees for which volunteers or nominations are in order.

**Women of Color: Now**

A Reminder to the Penn Community: Please submit your nominations for the Women of Color Awards Luncheon, which will be held on Friday, March 1, 1996. For further information regarding nominations, please contact Sharon Smith at 898-1446.

Tickets are available for the Women of Color Awards Luncheon. Call Melvis Williams at 898-6993 to purchase your tickets.

—Delores Magobet, Chair, Women of Color Planning Committee

---
Penn Researcher Is Making Waves

By Esaúl Sánchez

For more than 80 years, scientists have been trying to solve a Bermuda Triangle type of mystery involving sound waves: Do they really disappear while traveling through seemingly impenetrable kinds of matter? But now the clues are beginning to roll in. And if the pieces of the puzzle all come together, scientists may be able to develop improved diagnostic tools.

Until recently, physicists hypothesized that the waves in some media were destroyed, lost forever in the matter through which they passed. But researchers from Penn, the University of Manitoba in Canada and the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology have proven this presumption incorrect. Their results were published in the Feb. 2nd issue of Science, the journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

These scientists managed to capture surviving traces of a wave on the other side of a "wall." "Actually it’s a fish tank filled with water and a wall made from glass beads the size of the sound’s wavelength," said David Weitz, professor of physics, who came to Penn in January from Exxon Research and Engineering, where he was a research physicist.

Not only have the researchers recovered traces, they also have found that the tiny surviving wave is loaded with information about the wall’s interior. "The wave is so diminished that it becomes extremely hard to pick it up unless you use highly sophisticated instrumentation and look in the right place at the right time," Dr. Weitz explained. But "if you know the frequency of a wave and how fast it travels from one place to another, you know everything you need to know about the wave and how it flows through the medium."

From past experiences researchers know that a good wave is a terrible thing to waste. This is because waves, in one form or another, are one of mankind’s favorite ways of exploring or distant places—from the womb to far-off galaxies. A wave can encounter a material that is indifferent to its frequency and lets it go through unmolested. But a different material might bounce it back to its starting point, while a third material might swallow it up and—moments later—spew it in all directions like exploded fireworks. Scientists call this last process "scattering."

“People just didn’t know how to describe the passage of a wave through a highly scattering media,” said Dr. Weitz. “It’s too messy. Previously, they would say, ‘Let’s forget about the wave and concentrate on the fact that some energy goes through. ’ Nobody had a solid clue about what happened to the distressed wave."

A breakthrough in understanding scattered waves occurred during the last decade, after researchers used laser light and appropriate statistical methods and found that scattered light had a method to its madness.

"Scattered light, considered for the longest time to be useless and annoying, turned out to be a gold mine of information about the inside of the medium producing the scattering," Dr. Weitz noted.

Two years ago, Dr. Weitz and his colleagues dove into the mystery of the vanishing wave. They wondered whether science and technology had advanced to the point where it would be possible to filter out scattered waves and then search for traces of unscattered waves.

“Our best bet,” he said, “was to do the experiments using sound rather than light. Sound oscillates slower than light, and electronic instruments can follow its oscillations better. With sound, we would be able to observe the whole field and see its profile, whereas with light we can only measure an intensity profile.”

The scientists built the equivalent of a wall that does not let sound go through or reflect it back. Instead, it scatters the wave... random directions.

“When we passed sound through the fish tank, we rescued a coherent signal out of the garbled noise of the scattered sound at the other side,” Dr. Weitz recalled. “Of course, it was a teeny-weeny little surviving wave. The truth is we weren’t surprised when we found it. We just said, ‘Oh, there it is,’ as we thought all along it would be. After measuring the time it took for it to go through, we were shocked. Even though the wave was traveling through glass, where its velocity is very large compared to water, the surviving wave was traveling through the wall even slower than a wave traveling through plain water.”

“We had to go back to the drawing table and see if we could find a mathematical model that would predict the observed delay and help us visualize what was going on inside the medium,” said Ping Sheng from the Hong Kong University. “Following a hunch, we applied a mathematical technique that had never been used in this type of problem and were able to predict the correct time delay. The model tells us that the surviving wave will not get scattered but will be slowed down because of all the scattering that is going on around it. The time delay is directly related to what the wave ‘sees and suffers’ collectively inside the medium.”

In other words, when the scattering is strong, the dispersion of scatterers appears to the wave as an almost uniform medium whose property is neither that of the scattering particles’ material nor of the material between the particles. Instead, the “new” medium carries the imprint of the scattering—the wave itself becomes the medium property through all those scatterings. In the jargon of physics, the medium property becomes “renormalized.”

Now the researchers are trying to use the speed of these surviving waves to reconstruct images of the scattering wall. “People have been using sound to locate objects hidden under the surface of materials for quite a while,” said John Page of the University of Manitoba, “and our results may help extend the application of such techniques to much more difficult situations.”
From Varied Career Paths, They Switch to Teaching

By Jon Carolis

Davy Harwi has been a horticulturist, an art historian and has worked at the Reading Terminal Market. But nothing has been as challenging and rewarding as teaching.

“I didn’t know I’d be doing aerobics,” said Ms. Harwi. The hustle and bustle of teaching, watching, coaching, coaxing, disciplining and consoling children requires immense physical and emotional stamina, she has discovered.

After graduating from Penn’s Graduate School of Education, Ms. Harwi is in her first year at Mitchell Elementary School in West Philadelphia.

“I looked in the mirror one day, and I saw a woman in her 40s with two kids and no real security,” said Ms. Harwi. “I had no way of building anything for the future and said, ‘This is nuts. What can I do with the rest of my life that’s meaningful?’

An administrator at a Philadelphia private school asked if she had ever thought about teaching and could she afford to attend school full-time?

“He had several people from Penn doing student teaching at his school, and he thought I might like it,” she recalled.

For graduate students in GSE’s elementary-education division, a program called START (Student Teachers As Researching Teachers), was created by Associate Professor Marilyn Cochran-Smith for elementary-education majors. START is based on classwork and student teaching. Students compile a portfolio of papers, observations and lesson plans. Several papers by students have been published.

For START students with freshly minted undergraduate degrees, the routines of writing papers, reading voluminous amounts of texts and student teaching are familiar territory. But for students like Ms. Harwi, who have been away from college for years, the load can be overwhelming.

To address this issue, Meg Harkins, GSE’s director of admissions, created a program called CHANGE (Career Help for Adults New to Graduate Education) to support “nontraditional” students returning to school. These students are often married and with children. They have mortgages to pay, household duties to share and responsibilities to their kids—and that’s before they are assigned papers and research topics.

Ms. Harkins holds coffee hours and dinners with CHANGE students to let them share war stories and gain encouragement from each other. She also conducts special orientation sessions dealing with time management, returning to school, balancing two lives, and campus resources.

Another START graduate, Keith Jones, began college with the intention of becoming a history teacher, but he wound up studying business and became an accountant for Price Waterhouse. He also worked for the Securities and Exchange Commission in Washington, D.C., and was an executive with Comcast Cable for 10 years.

When he reached 40, he said he had a “mid-life crisis.” He realized that his type of accounting was very specialized and he didn’t have much opportunity for additional growth within that field.

He decided to return to school and become a teacher, even though it meant giving up a good salary. Some co-workers “thought I was crazy, but others came to me and said, ‘I wish I could do it.’

“The first semester was hard, I didn’t realize how much more work there was to do,” added Mr. Jones, now a teacher at Gladwyne Elementary School.

After six years working for a state agency, John McKinstry joined a Philadelphia law firm. He quickly realized the corporate-law life-style wasn’t for him.

“I was always interested in teaching, and looking to have more time with my family. And money was getting better for teachers,” said Mr. McKinstry, now an elementary-school teacher at the William Penn Charter School in Philadelphia. “It was a lot of fun,” he said. “I like writing papers and doing research.”

What took some getting used to, Mr. McKinstry said, was being home in the day. That was alien, although it was fun to be with my kids.”

Joanna Balter-Thompson is finding out how alien the life of a student/teacher/parent is. “It’s hard, hard. My house is a mess,” she said, laughing.

Ms. Balter-Thompson worked for 13 years in publishing and fund-raising.

“Always trying to do good—that sounds Pollyannaish, doesn’t it?” she said. But teaching combines a love of books, learning and a desire to “do good.”

Ms. Balter-Thompson has been student-teaching five days a week since October at the Franklin Learning Center and hopes to become an English teacher when she graduates this spring.

“I have empathy for my students, being a student myself,” she explained. And as an avid reader, she has found that reading for knowledge and reading for pleasure are distinctly different tasks. “I’ve learned to read with a more critical eye,” she said, “to figure out what’s important.”

One way she copes with the workload is having a life outside the classroom. “If I were a younger student and living in the dorms, I’d go crazy,” she said. “It’s nice to have a family and other responsibilities. That helps me keep a balance.”

A crucial part of the teacher education program is the experience of being in a classroom. Penn students are assigned to a school and teach at least twice a week in the first semester, and five days a week in the second semester. Students are also assigned to a supervisor from Penn and a teacher at (continued on page 8)
Computing: Better, Faster, Smarter

Think of Penn’s current campus computing services as a large office full of 486 PCs (or Quadras, for you Mac admirers). The best of their kind when new, the computers have been tweaked and upgraded, networked and accessorized over time as we, the users, demanded more from them. And nobody worried much about the bill for these upgrades, because “they”—whoever they were—were taking care of all that, and we insisted that we needed better performance and needed it now. And we got it, using whatever components were available.

Now the University is facing the same situation organizationally and has decided that this is the moment to take a more strategic approach to computing. To that end, a University-wide task force was formed last semester by the provost and executive vice president and is developing a new model for computing services with the goal of making the services better for the people who use them. President Rodin has called for ways to deploy new technologies in the “Agenda for Excellence,” her strategic plan for the University.

“Computing has become ‘mission-critical’ at Penn,” said James O’Donnell, professor of classical studies and co-chair of the Task Force on Computing Services. “It’s time to take our computing support to the next level, so that it becomes integral to our overall decision-making.”

The model proposed by the task force seeks to build on the strengths of Penn’s existing computing-support system, clear up aspects of it that leave some users confused, spend money more effectively, give administrators the information they need to make wise computing decisions, and prepare for new initiatives that call for more cooperative efforts across Penn’s schools and administrative units.

Penn’s 12 schools are currently responsible for looking after the computing needs of their students, faculty and staff, with central support offices such as Information Systems and Computing (ISC) providing backup and higher-level support services. Because the resources devoted to computing support vary from school to school, and the cost of most central support services is simply divided among Penn’s administrative units, many Penn users are unsure whom to turn to first for support. In a number of offices, the problem is solved through an informal support system—what Vice Provost for Information Systems and Computing and task force co-chair Peter Patton referred to as a “‘Hey, Joe’ model of computing support,” where “Joe” is the person at the next desk who is supposed to know these sorts of things.

One goal of the task force’s proposal is to make sure that every user on campus has a clear source of primary support close at hand. As Dr. Patton put it, “We want to get to the point where everyone has the name, phone number, and e-mail address of their support person.”

In the task force’s model, schools and departments could provide these people directly or secure their services on contract from ISC. This represents a shift from the current system, in which the cost of ISC support service is largely allocated among the various responsibility centers.

The model also proposes running Penn’s network as a regulated public utility with significant consumer input. It also moves some services to a market basis where competition will be the norm.

A goal is to provide better information to academic and administrative offices so they can spend their computing dollars wisely. “The cost-containment contribution will not lie so much in reduction of current levels of expenditure as in creating a mechanism by which future decisions about computing will be made in the most cost-effective and reality-based way possible,” said Dr. O’Donnell.

Another major initiative the task force recommends is the creation of “process teams” that would bring together people from across campus to devise ways to better incorporate computing support with the ways and places in which students, faculty and staff actually use computers in their work.

One of those process teams will involve itself in creating new kinds of “learning spaces”—classrooms flexible enough to function as computing labs when needed. Another will work on moving student computing support to the residence halls where students live, and a third will connect campus help desks to track problems and solutions better. Dr. O’Donnell said that all these initiatives share a common goal: “the coordination and transparent delivery of services to the user.” Some, such as the “learning spaces” and student-support projects, will ultimately tie in with the new residential colleges and classroom-management systems being implemented as part of the Provost’s 21st Century Project for the Undergraduate Experience.

How will these changes affect the typical Penn computer user? Users in schools such as Wharton and Engineering, which already have strong internal computing support, and offices that have good support should notice no difference at all, Dr. Patton said, but “for schools that are currently not well-served, we hope these changes will make them feel as well-supported” as the others.

Dr. O’Donnell hopes that with these proposed improvements, Penn will arrive at the point where it does not have to think consciously about computing as something apart from its academic mission. “Unlike automobiles, the computer is ‘unnatural’ enough that we still pay attention to it,” he said. “But the purpose of this technology is not the technology itself, but to make our day jobs better.”

Switching to Teaching (continued from page 7)

the school where they practice-teach.

Peggy Stone is a supervisor who taught in Philadelphia’s public schools and hosted several Penn students while they did their student teaching in her classes. After retiring, she realized she “did it too soon,” and asked Penn if she could help.

One of the first things would-be teachers need to learn, Ms. Stone believes, is how to observe. They need “to record what they see, to observe the behavior of children,” she said, in order to discover “what their interests are, and if there’s a lack of interest, why. It’s very important to understand the child.”

That’s a lesson Davy Harwi has learned well. She said Ms. Stone was a great help during her student-teaching days. In turn, Ms. Stone added, “I spent a lot of time with her, and it was a wonderful experience.”
A Playwright, a Producer and a Director in the Spotlight

Penn recently played host to three prominent players in the performing arts. As guest of the Steinberg Symposium, Pulitzer-winning playwright Tom Stoppard (far left with English Professor Robert Lucid) was on campus for three days last week. With Dean Kathleen Hall Jamieson, Duncan Kenworthy (top left), producer of “Four Weddings and a Funeral” and “Gulliver’s Travels,” returned to the Annenberg School where he earned a masters’ degree two decades ago. He showed a 27-minute documentary about the making of “Gulliver.” Threat Theatre, the student alternate film society, screened “Leaving Las Vegas.” Director Mike Figgis (bottom left) discussed the film at International House last Monday.

HERS Helps Women Advance in Higher Education

By Jerry Russo (C’99)

For the last 20 summers, women in higher education have gathered on the leafy campus of Bryn Mawr College to attend classes geared toward professional advancement and improving the status of women in university administration. Over the years, Penn has sponsored a number of faculty members and administrators for the Summer Institute for Women in Higher Education Administration. The opportunity will be offered again this summer.

Laurie Cousart, one of last summer’s participants and director of telecommunications, found the program to be both “personally and professionally wonderful,” because it allowed her to think about “what I do and what I want to do.”

Another 1995 attendee, Denice Stewart, director of Dental Care Systems, Quality Assurance, and an assistant professor in the School of Dental Medicine, described the experience as “extremely valuable for both information content and networking.”

The Summer Institute provides training in the management and governance of colleges and universities; information and strategies on teaching, research, and service in the 1990s; the opportunity to promote the individual woman’s career; and a network of peers and mentors.

The residential program is jointly sponsored by Bryn Mawr College and HERS (Higher Education Resource Services, Mid-America), currently situated at the University of Denver, but founded at Penn in 1975.

Provost Stanley Chodorow hailed the program for its quality teaching staff and curriculum, as well as for giving participants the knowledge and tools needed to manage effectively as they enter the new millennium.

“In order to meet the demands of our changing society, we’ve developed some very ambitious strategic goals to carry us into the 21st century,” the provost said recently. “These goals require all of us to remain flexible and open to learning new techniques for how to manage most effectively. ... We have a long-standing commitment to professional development at Penn. I’m pleased that we continue the tradition of sponsoring participation in this excellent program.”

Executive Vice President John Fry also endorses the program. In commenting on the importance of supporting the Summer Institute, he referred to the recently published “Agenda for Excellence.”

“Professional training such as that provided by the HERS Summer Institute is the kind of investment which meets the strategic goal of providing administrative employees with greater opportunities to improve their skills, grow professionally and enhance their careers within the University,” Mr. Fry said.

The program runs from June 23 through July 19, 1996. To provide prospective applicants with more information and an opportunity to speak with HERS graduates, a meeting will be held Thursday, Feb. 15, from 3 to 4:30 p.m. in Room 2 of the Faculty Club. For further information or an application, call Judy Zumast, Human Resources/Training and Organization Development, at 898-8387.
OPPORTUNITIES at PENN

Listed below are the job opportunities at the University of Pennsylvania. To apply please visit:

University of Pennsylvania Job Application Center
Funderburg Information Center, 3401 Walnut Street, Ground Floor
Phone: 215-898-7285

Application Hours: Monday through Friday, 9 a.m.-1 p.m.
Positions are posted on a daily basis, Monday through Friday, at the following locations:
Application Center—Funderburg Center, 3401 Walnut St. (Ground level) 9 a.m.-1 p.m.
Blockley Hall—418 Guardian Drive (1st Floor and 2nd Floor)
Dental School—40th & Spruce St. (Basement-across from B-30)
Houston Hall—34th & Spruce St. (Basement-near the elevators)
Wharton—Steinberg Hall-Dietrich Hall (next to Room 303)

Job opportunities and daily postings can also be accessed through the Human Resources Home Page (http://www.upenn.edu/hr/). A position must be posted for seven (7) calendar days before an offer can be made. The Job Opportunities Hotline is a 24-hour interactive telephone system. By dialing 898-J-O-B-S and following the instructions, you can hear descriptions for positions posted during the last three weeks. You must, however, have a push-button phone to use this line.

The University of Pennsylvania is an equal opportunity employer and does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, sex, sexual or affectional preference, age, religion, national or ethnic origin, disability or veteran status.

WHERE THE QUALIFICATIONS FOR A POSITION ARE DESCRIBED IN TERMS OF

FORMAL EDUCATION OR TRAINING, PRIOR EXPERIENCE IN THE SAME FIELD MAY BE SUBSTITUTED. POSITIONS WITH FULL DESCRIPTIONS ARE THOSE MOST RECENTLY POSTED.

ARTS AND SCIENCES

Specialist: Nancy Salvatore

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR III/IV (0165NS) Responsible for personnel/payroll for the Department/all financial grant funding; monitor & prepare budgets, reports; financial administration of Center & programs; supervise & train staff, assign duties & oversee office workflow; assist in preparation of research proposal; assist in preparation of dossiers for all appointments; schedule personnel visits; oversee course scheduling, preparation of graduate & undergraduate materials, follow through with student related problems; purchase equipment & supplies; payment of invoices & faculty reimbursements; assist the chairman with assigned duties; building administrator for Sitterle Hall. Qualifications: BA/BS preferably in accounting, business or equivalent; knowledge & experience with computerized accounting & managerial administration; thorough knowledge of area/department & University policies & procedures (University accounting system & Human Resources policies & procedures) preferred. BAIL: at least three yrs. experience in accounting, business administration or equivalent. Grade: P4/P5; Range: $26,200-34,100/$28,800-37,600 1-29-96 Psychological Science

SECRETARY IV (0181NS) Serve as department secretary; use of Word or WordPerfect in a Windows environment to compose, edit, type & proofread; proficiency in Windows environment to compose, edit, type & proofread; use of Word or WordPerfect in a Windows environment to compose, edit, type & proofread; documentation & general office duties. Qualifications: H.S. grad with two to four yrs. exp. in clinical secretarial exp.; type at least 55 wpm; must be comfortable with computerized accounting & managerial administration; ability to handle multiple tasks simultaneously & work well under pressure. Grade: G9; Range: $17,100-21,400 2-2-96 Folklore & Folklife

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR III/IV (0153NS) P4/P5; $26,200-34,100 1-29-96 Physical Plant

COORDINATOR I (1266NS) (Ongoing contingent upon funding) 1 P1; $19,700-25,700 1-8-96 English Language Program

COORDINATOR I (MEDIA COORD.) (0109NS) P3; $23,900-31,000 1-11-96 SAS Computing

INFO. MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST I (11589NS) P4; $26,200-34,100 11-24-95 SAS Computing

INFORMATION SYSTEM SPECIALIST I (11548NS) P3; $23,900-31,000 11-8-95 SAS Computing

PROGRAMMER ANALYST I (09318NS) P6; $31,900-40,600 9-12-95 IRIS

ADMINISTRANT II/III (0110NS) (0101NS) G10/G11; $18,700-23,300 $19,900-25,300 1-12-96 Music

ADMINISTRANT II/III (0101NS) (0101NS) G10; $19,900-25,300 1-23-96 Romance Languages

LAB ASSISTANT II (10514NS) G8; $15,700-19,600 10-31-95 Chemistry

SECRETARY IV (0121NS) G10; $18,700-23,300 1-15-96 Office of the Dean

ENGINEERING/APPLIED SCIENCE

Specialist: Clyde Peterson

SECRETARY IV (0176CP) Receive and register patients; make appointments; receive and record patients payments; maintain patient records; answer phones & take messages; maintain calendars for some faculty members; handle written & verbal inquiries about the department & graduate program. Qualifications: High school graduate or equivalent; some college preferred; at least two yrs. secretarial experience; ability to type at least 55 wpm.; proficiency in Windows environment; demonstrated ability to communicate effectively, handle multiple tasks simultaneously & work well under pressure. Grade: G9; Range: $17,100-21,400 2-2-96 Physical Plant

COORDINATOR III (MEDIA COORD.) (0109NS) P3; $23,900-31,000 1-11-96 SAS Computing

COORDINATOR III (0183NS) P3; $23,900-31,000 1-11-96 SAS Computing

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

Specialist: Nancy Salvatore/Susan Curran

DIRECTOR, CENTER TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER (0285NS) Manage the marketing & licensing of Intellectual Property cases with an emphasis on physical science discoveries; develop & negotiate related license & sponsored research agreements; provide guidance & technical assistance to fellow technology managers during the evaluation of inventions; work with the Managing Director & fellow technology managers to develop the overall strategy for managing the intellectual assets of the University. Qualifications: Advanced degree in physical science; five yrs. experience in new business development, new product development, technology management; expertise in contract negotiation, particularly with license & sponsored research agreements; excellent oral communication skills; requires an independent self-starter who can work well with others. Grade/Range: Blank 2-2-96 Center for Technology Transfer

DIRECTOR, CENTER TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER (0286NS) Manage the marketing & licensing of Intellectual Property cases with an emphasis on life science; develop & negotiate related license & sponsored research agreements; provide guidance & technical assistance to fellow technology managers during the evaluation of inventions; external relationships with potential licensees & internal relationships with the faculty; provide guidance & technical assistance to fellow technology managers during evaluation of inventions. Qualifications: Advanced degree in life science preferred; extensive experience in new business development & development of new product involving pre-clinical & clinical research; five yrs. technology management & contract negotiation, particularly with license & sponsored research agreements; excellent written oral communication skills; requires an independent self-starter who can work well with others. Grade/Range: Blank 2-2-96 Center for Technology Transfer

MANAGER, MARKETING & ADMINISTRATION (0287NS) Responsible for administrative support to facilitate operations & coordination of internal & external marketing activities in the Center; assist the Managing Director for Technology Transfer by overseeing the daily administrative activities; oversee & participate in special projects; coordinate marketing activities of the Center; present data for various marketing programs; prepare non-confidential summaries & confidential information packets. Qualifications: BA/BS or equivalent work experience; minimum seven yrs. high level office administrative experience; two yrs. supervisory experience; three yrs. directly related experience in a marketing environment; ability of work on multiple projects concurrently; word processing & spreadsheet skills; excellent written & oral communication skills; good organizational skills. Grade: P8; Range: $38,500-48,100 2-2-96 Center for Technology Transfer

PLUMBER (0170NS) Installation of copper tubing & sweat copper fittings; install soil pipes rough-in for plumbing fixtures; wipe lead joints; cut & thread steel pipe & do chrome finish work. Qualifications: High school graduate; completion of approved apprentice program; five yrs. experience as a journeyman plumber; current license by City of Philadelphia; valid driver’s license preferred. Grade/Range: Union 1-30-96 Physical Plant

ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, INFORMATION SYSTEM (1160NS) P11; $54,500-68,200 11-29-95 Internal Audit

AUDITOR, SR. INFORMATION SYSTEMS (1263NS) P8; $38,500-48,100 12-7-95 Internal Audit

AUDITOR, SR. INFORMATION SYSTEMS (1264NS) P8; $38,500-48,100 12-11-95 Internal Audit

AUDIT SPECIALIST (1050NS) P9; $42,300-52,900 10-27-95 Internal Audit

COORDINATOR III (0134NS) P3; $23,900-31,000 1-16-96 Public Safety

DIRECTOR, FINANCE & INFORMATION SYSTEMS (1146NS) P8; $38,500-48,100 11-9-95 Internal Audit

DIRECTOR, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY (1267NS) P11; $54,500-68,200 1-5-96 Center for Technology Transfer

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT
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DIRECTOR START-UP BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT (12674NS) P10;$47,400-59,200 1-5-96 Ctr. for Tech. Transfer
MANAGER ACCOUNTING OPERATIONS (11609NS) P6;$38,500-48,100 11-29-95 comptroller’s office
PROGRAMMER ANALYST II (11561SC) P6;$31,900-40,600 11-15-95 HRIM
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT III (40 HR) (0934NS) P7;$22,745-28,914 12-4-95 executive vice president
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT III (37.5 HR) (01325NS) G11; $21,321-27,107 1-15-96 Business Services
FINANCIAL SERVICES ASSISTANT II (11615NS) G10; $18,700-23,300 12-1-95 student fin. Services
TEACHER, CHILDREN’S CENTER (01333NS) Work schedule: variable, 7:30 a.m.-6 p.m. Children’s center hours; G11; $19,900-25,300 1-15-96 Penn’s Children Center

OPPORTUNITIES AT PENN

GRAD SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Specialist: Clyde Peterson
SECRETARY IV (0174CP) Under the direction of library & instruction coordinator, secretary will serve as office receptionist; maintenance of laboratory. (ongoing)
COORDINATOR, ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES II (12683CP) P3; $35,000-43,700 12-1-95 Ophthalmology

GRAD SCHOOL OF FINE ARTS

Specialist: Clyde Peterson
PART-TIME (OFFICE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT II) (24 HR) (12631CP) (End date: 6-30-96) G9; $9,396-11,758 12-7-95 Architecture

LAW SCHOOL

Specialist: Clyde Peterson
ANNUAL GIVING OFFICER II (11582CP) P5; $28,800-37,600 11-22-95 Law Development
FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATOR II (0124CP) P4; $26,200-34,100 1-19-96 Dev./Alumni Relations
PART-TIME (ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT II) (28 HR) (05057JZ) (ongoing contingent on funding) G10; $10,275-12,802 6-8-95 institute for Law & Economics

MEDICAL SCHOOL

Specialist: Ronald Story/Janet Zinsner
RESEARCH SPECIALIST II (0156RS) Assist residents & participate in surgical experiments; prepare for daily surgery; assist in publication; related technical concepts & order supplies & equipment; conduct library searches; input computer data. Qualifications: BA/BS in science or related field; background in physiology helpful; one-three yrs. experience; experience on extracorporeal perfusion desirable. (ongoing)
RESEARCH SPECIALIST III (40 HR) (05017JZ) Assist in conducting experiments in cell culture; molecular biology assays, small animal surgeries, isotopic kinetic studies & biochemical assays; maintain lab equipment & supplies; assist in writing & preparing professional section in publication & grant application and assist with drafting protocols; perform library bibliographic search; keep logs & write lab reports; input computer data; demonstrate technical skills; attend & participate in general lab meetings & library searches; organize & maintain zebrafish mutant stocks; raise and maintain related supplies; perform general lab duties & library searches. (ongoing)

SPECIAL ADVERTISING SECTION

For more information, call 215-417-4665. Tickets are $20 for the public.

Note: Classifieds are accepted and compiled at the offices of The Compass. Call 989-8721 for rates and procedures.
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with speed/accuracy; ability to communicate effectively orally & in writing; strong PR skills; willingness to work extra hours during peak times; PC compatible skills.

**OFFICE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I (0114CP)**
Process requisition for accounts payable, including travel advances, reconciliations & reimbursements; perform invoices for Photo Studio and Photo Archives; monitor & process other departmental deposits; maintain petty cash fund; review monthly budget summaries; operate computer to extract budgetary information. ACE: Flexable payroll duties in absence of other business office personnel. Qualifications: High school graduate; some college preferred; one-two yrs. office experience; ability to type with speed & accuracy; computer familiarity; excellent communication skills. Grade: G9; Range: $17,100-21,400 2-1-96 Museum.

**ASSISTANT COACH (07132CP)**: $23,900-31,000 7-28-95 DRIA

**CHAIR (08247CP)**: Ungraded 8-23-95 Provost’s Office.

**COORDINATOR VI (0151CP)**: $28,800-37,600 1-25-96 Provost’s Office.

**INFORMATION SYSTEMS SPECIALIST I (12659CP)**
May involve some evenings or weekends. HRS: $23,900-31,000 12-19-95 CRC.

**JUDICIAL INQUIRY OFFICER II (12665CP)**: $38,500-48,100 12-21-95 Provost’s Office.

**PROGRAMMER ANALYST II (09356CP)**: $36,100-40,600 9-21-95 URIE.

**RESEARCH SPECIALIST IV (08303CP)**: $36,100-40,600 9-7-95 LRSM.

**SYSTEMS ANALYST II (11558CP)**: $35,000-43,700 11-10-95 UMS.

**SYSTEMS PROGRAMMER IV (12636CP)**: $42,500-52,900 12-7-95 DCCS.

**TECHNOLOGY TRAINING SPECIALIST (06805CP)**: $52,800-67,600 6-21-95 Technology Learning Services.

**VICE PROVOST/FOR RESEARCH (08248CP)**: Ungraded 8-25-95 Provost’s Office.

**PART-TIME LIBRARIAN III (0141CP)**: (20 HRS) P5; $16,453-21,486 1-26-96 University Libraries.

**ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT III (11611CP)**: G11; $19,900-25,300 11-29-95 University Libraries/Reference.

**EDITORIAL ASSISTANT I (10461CP)**: G10; $18,700-23,300 10-16-95 University Press.

**SECRETARY IV (11606CP)**: G9; $17,100-21,400 12-6-95& 3-2-98 Audit & Dispute Resolution Center/Judicial Inquiry Office.

**TECH. ELECTRONIC III (03006CP)**: G11; $19,900-25,300 3-3-95 DCCS.

**TECH. VI (11627CP)**: Work schedule: 7-30-4:30 PM, may include weekends, holidays & overtime. Grade: G10; Range: $21,371-26,629 12-21-95 ULAR.

**PART-TIME ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I (20 HRS)**: MASON.

**SECRETARY V (11615CP)**: P7; $23,900-31,000 12-19-95 Department of Aademic Support.

**ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I (1139CP)**: G9; $17,100-21,400 1-2-96 Greenfield Intercultural Center.

**MASON (11306CP)** Union 1-22-96 Residential Maintenance.

**OFFICE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT III (0137CP)**: G11; $19,900-25,300 1-16-96 International Programs.

**STEAMFITTER (0136CP)** Union 1-22-96 Residential Maintenance.

---

**VETERINARY SCHOOL**

**Specialist: Nancy Salvatore**

**LARGE ANIMAL ATTENDANT I (40 HRS)**: ($016ENS)
Perform variety of duties involving care & feeding of large animals & the cleaning & general upkeep of stall facilities. Provide general housekeeping & grounds keeping; moves animals to/from surgery area and/or recovery room; assist in monitoring general health condition; position/assist with patients in operating room; use variety of equipment including forklift, dump truck, compacto & tractor. Grade: G10; $17,100-21,400 2-19-96 DRIA.

**ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR II (01801Z)** Coordinate & oversee all activities of Wharton Center for Quantitative Finance; serve as primary contact for Center; responsibility for budgeting, personnel management, & center reporting; plan & execute Center conferences & activities; manage membership activities; perform administrative duties, including typing, filing, data entry, & calendar tracking; coordinate Winter Conference or management training programs &/or administrative support at the senior executive level; excellent oral & written communication skills; PC experience with WordPerfect & Windows; excellent organizational & analytical skills. Grade: P3; Range: $23,900-31,000 2-1-96 Aestirey Institute.

**OPERATOR, DUP MACHINES** (10529Z): Perform all routine functions of the Xerox Network Publishing System including image merge, cut and paste, crop, rotate and mask images for reproduction and release network orders using the Novell and Xerox servers; perform all routine functions of the Xerox 5775 Network Color laser printer; Kodak 2110 Duplicator and other bindery equipment contained within Wharton Reprographics; perform routine maintenance of the DocuTech Publishing System and successful completion of the DocuTech training program; highly proficient in Math and English; computer experience with MS Windows 3.1 including the DocuTech operating system & program manager; knowledge of desktop publishing, preferably Aldus PageMaker, Adobe Photoshop or Adobe Illustrator; ability to lift up to fifty pounds (No vacation will be approved during August, September, December, and January) (20 HRS) Range: $5.00 -1.00 a.m. (Grade: G10; Range: $17,100-21,400 1-22-96 Large Animal Hospital.

---

**WHARTON SCHOOL**

Specialist: Janet Zinser

**ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR I (0101Z)** Coordinate & oversee all activities of Wharton Center for Quantitative Finance; serve as primary contact for Center; responsibility for budgeting, personnel management, & center reporting; plan & execute Center conferences & activities; manage membership activities; perform administrative duties, including typing, filing, data entry, & calendar tracking; coordinate Winter Conference or management training programs &/or administrative support at the senior executive level; excellent oral & written communication skills; PC experience with WordPerfect & Windows; excellent organizational & analytical skills.
Call for Volunteers for 1996-97 Committee Service: Deadline February 26

TO: University Faculty, Penn Professional Staff Assembly and A-3 Members

FROM: 1995-96 University Council Committee on Committees

RE: Volunteers Needed for Committee Service

Please seriously consider taking advantage of this opportunity to have input into how the University community functions! The Committee on Committees invites you to nominate yourself or others for service on University Council Committees. These 14 committees serve as advisory bodies in shaping academic/administrative policy, in the administration of honorary degrees and long-term disability, and in assisting the administration of operations such as the bookstore and libraries.

We invite individuals who have previously served to volunteer again. We also encourage faculty and staff who have not previously participated to volunteer so that we may have an appropriate blend of new ideas and experience.

To have an idea of a particular committee's work, you may review the annual reports printed in Almanac on the following dates: Community Relations, April 18, 1995; Committee on Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics, April 25, 1995; Safety and Security, May 9, 1995; Bookstore, Library, International Programs and Research, September 26, 1995; Personnel Benefits, October 31, 1995.

Except where noted, all of the committees listed here are open to both faculty and staff. Please submit nominations by February 26, 1996 by using the form at right.

1995-96 University Council Committee on Committees
Chair: Vivian Seltzer (social work)
Faculty:
   Daniel Perlmutter (chemical engineering)
   Martin Pring (physiology/medicine)
   David Reibstein (marketing)
   Henry Teune (political science)
Administration:
   Lois A. MacNamara (GSE student activities)
A-3: Shelton Mercer (telecommunications)
Students: Diane Casteel (Col '98)
One graduate/professional student to be named
Ex-Officio:
   Faculty Senate Chair-elect
   Peter J. Kuriloff (education)
Secretary: Constance C. Goodman (office of the secretary)

Committees and Their Work:
Admissions and Financial Aid Committee considers matters of undergraduate and graduate/professional recruiting, admissions, and financial aid that concern the University as a whole or those that are not the specific responsibility of individual faculties.
Bookstore Committee considers the purposes of a university bookstore and advises the director on policies, developments, and operations.
Communications Committee has cognizance over the University’s electronic and physical communications and public relations activities.
Community Relations Committee has responsibility of the University to the surrounding community.
* Disability Board continually evaluates the disability plan, monitors its operation, and oversees the processing of applications for benefits and the review of existing disability cases.
Facilities Committee keeps under review the planning and operation of the University’s physical plant and all associated services.
Honorary Degrees Committee does most of its work, intensively, during the fall term; solicits recommendations for honorary degrees from faculty and students and submits nominations to the Trustees.
International Programs Committee is advisory to the director of international programs in such areas as international student services, foreign fellowships and studies abroad, exchange programs, and cooperative undertakings with foreign universities.
Library Committee is advisory to the directors of libraries on policies, development and operations.
Personnel Benefits Committee deals with the benefits programs for all University personnel. Special expertise in personnel, insurance, taxes or law is often helpful.
Pluralism Committee advises on ways to develop and maintain a supportive atmosphere for all members of the University community.
Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics Committee has cognizance of all programs in recreation, intramural and club sports, and intercollegiate athletics; advises the athletic director on operations and recommends changes in policy when appropriate.
Safety and Security Committee considers and recommends the means to improve safety and security on the campus.
Student Affairs Committee has cognizance of the conditions and rules of undergraduate and graduate student life on campus.
Student Fulbright Awards Committee evaluates applications from graduating seniors and graduates and makes recommendations to the Institute of International Education, which awards Fulbright grants on behalf of the State Department; all of its work is done intensively, in October.
* Open to faculty only; one or more administrators serve as liaison to most.

Note: Faculty who wish to serve on the Research Committee or Committee on Open Expression should not use the form below, but forward names to Carolyn P. Burdon, Faculty Senate Office, Box 12 College Hall/6303, telephone 898-6943; fax 898-0974; e-mail burdon@pobox.upenn.edu.

For Faculty volunteers, mail to: Carolyn P. Burdon, Faculty Senate Office, Box 12 College Hall/6303

For Penn Professional Staff Assembly volunteers, mail to: Ira Winston, 557 MB/6389

For A-3 volunteers, mail to: Karen Wheeler, 133 S. 36th St., 5th Fl/3246

Committee(s) of interest: ____________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Candidate: __________________________________________________________

Title or Position: __________________________________________________________

Campus Phone and e-mail: _______________________________________________________

Campus Address: _____________________________________________________________

Please specify if you think that you are especially qualified for a particular committee.
**FEBRUARY AT PENN**

**CHANGE**

19 The Dark Room Collective: “part reading series, part poetry slam” explores cultural frameworks in Black writing; book signing follows; Mosaic of Black Writing Program (Afro-American Studies). Originally scheduled for 4 p.m. in Room 111, Annenberg School; has been changed to 4:30 p.m. in Room 109, Annenberg School.

**FILMS**

14 Safer Sex Awareness Month Event—Safer Sex Films by Women: The Match that Started My Fire and Diana’s Hair Ego; 7-8 p.m.; B-6, Stittler Hall (Student Health; Women’s Studies; Penn Women’s Center).

SPEC Film Society

Film screenings at 7 and 9:30 p.m.; Irvine Auditorium; $3, $2/with PennCard.

**TALKS**

14 Crossstalk Between Signalling Pathways; Judith Meinkoth, pharmacology; noon; Agnew Griese Auditorium, Dulles Bldg. (Center for Research on Reproduction and Women’s Health).

15 Yoshiwara’s Dual Role in the Intellectual Game of “Mitate” (ParODY); Cecilia Segawa Setgle, Asian and Middle Eastern Studies; 5 p.m.; Rm. 111, Williams Hall (Center for East Asian Studies).

Post-Marketing Surveillance of Drug Use in Pregnancy; Jeannine Manson, Merck Research Labs; 9-10 a.m.; Rm. 701, Blockley Hall (UPMC Clinical Epidemiology Health Services).

Scientific Narratives and the Naturalization of Race and Class in the Latin American Cholera Epidemic; Charles Briggs, UC San Diego; 4 p.m.; Smith-Penniman Room, Houston Hall (Latin American Cultures Program; H & SS; Folklore & Folklife; Anthropology).

16 Health Care Costs, Health Insurance & Job Mobility; John R. Penrod, University of Michigan; 4:30-6 p.m.; Auditorium, CPC (Health Care Systems).

**FITNESS/LEARNING**

14 Free introductory tutoring in English grammar and conversation for International students; Wednesdays 3-4 p.m., Christian Association (English Tutoring Center of America).

The University of Pennsylvania Police Department

**Community Crime Report**

About the Crime Report: Below are all Crimes Against Persons and Crimes Against Society listed in the campus report for January 29, 1996 through February 4, 1996. Also reported were Crimes Against Property, including 40 thefts (including 4 thefts of autos, 6 thefts from autos, 6 of bicycles and parts); 4 incidents of criminal mischief and vandalism; 2 incidents of trespassing and loitering. Full crime reports are in this issue of Almanac on the Web (http://www.upenn.edu/almanac/v42/n20/crimes.html). —Ed.

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 January 29, 1996 and February 4, 1996. 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 898-4482.

**Crimes Against Persons**

34th to 38th/Market to Civic Center: Robberies (& attempts)—1; Threats & harassment—4

01/31/96  9:55 AM  200 Blk. 38th Unknown male harassing complainant

01/31/96  9:23 PM  3700 Blk. Chestnut Money demanded/complained had none/led area

02/01/96  9:10 AM  3508 Market St. Harassing phone call to HUP empl. in bldg.

02/02/96  2:55 AM  Quad Office Complainant harassed by person on highway

02/04/96  9:47 PM  Nichols House Complaint report being harassed

38th to 41st/Market to Baltimore: Robberies (& attempts)—3; Threats & harassment—3

01/29/96  12:05 AM  41st. & Locust Susp. attempted to rob compl./nothing taken

01/29/96  1:07 AM  Dental Care Ctr. Threats received

01/29/96  3:49 AM  1925 House Unwanted phone calls received

01/29/96  7:41 AM  4000 Blk. Sansom Complainant’s sneakers taken by unk. person

02/01/96  11:27 AM  3900 Blk. Sansom Compl. robbed by susp. w/gun/led in auto

02/03/96  1:34 AM  Harrison House Complaint report of ethnic remarks received

41st to 43rd/Market to Baltimore: Robberies (& attempts)—2

01/31/96  10:56 PM  4100 Blk. Walnut Cash taken by susp./simulated weapon

01/31/96  11:35 PM  42nd & Osage Cash taken by susp./simulated weapon

30th to 34th/Market to University: Robberies (& attempts)—1

01/30/96  8:48 AM  3300 Blk. Chestnut Unknown suspect attempted to take money

Outdoors 30th to 34th/Market to Baltimore: Robberies (& attempts)—1; Sexual assaults—1; Threats & harassment—2

01/29/96  10:44 AM  48 Larchwood Compl. robbed by susp./simulated weapon

01/30/96  10:52 AM  Off Campus Complaint reports being harassed

02/01/96  4:14 AM  Off Campus Confidential report

02/01/96  5:06 AM  300 Blk. S. 44th Wallet and contents taken

02/02/96  10:42 AM  Off Campus Confidential report

02/02/96  2:45 PM  48th Larchwood Wallet/contents taken

02/03/96  12:02 AM  4311 Spruce St. Compl. robbed by susp. with simulated weapon

19 African American Educational Inequality: Dilemma or Design; Walter R. Allen, UCLA; 3-4:30 p.m.; D44, GSE (Search Committee for the Constance E. Clayton Chair in Education).

**Herbalism Class at the Arboretum**

The Morris Arboretum is offering a two-day class entitled Ethnobotanical Approaches to Maintaining Health and Preventing Disease. Taught by T. Lorenzo Moore, a public health educator at the Foundations of Health Center, the class will discuss the impact plants can have on conditions affecting health, including various cycles, the environment, and nutrition. It will also explore the uses of medicinal plants in cultures around the world. The class meets Wednesday, March 6, 7-8:30 p.m. and Saturday, March 9, 10-11:30 a.m. The cost is $22 for Arboretum members and $25 for non-members.

The class is part of the Arboretum’s ongoing program, Healing Plants: Medicine Across Time and Culture, including an outdoor exhibition and related events.

A class on Making Your Own Herbal Cosmetics will be offered Saturday, March 2. For more information and to register, call (215) 247-5777, Ext. 156.
Key ENIAC Events on February 14

Since the publication of the February at Penn calendar (Almanac January 30), a number of additions and changes have been made in the schedule of events commemorating the birth of ENIAC fifty years ago February 14.

Below is a revised schedule of events on campus and off, open to the University community and friends, and, as befits the birthday of computing, some useful Web sites to browse.

On Campus

*John W. Mauchly and the Development of the ENIAC Computer,* a new exhibition provides an overview and assessment of the life and career of John Mauchly—from his childhood and early education through his work on ENIAC and beyond, at the Rosenwald Gallery, Van Pelt-Dietrich Library, open 9 a.m.-4:45 p.m. There will be a brief program at 10 a.m. February 14 on the sixth floor, led by Nancy Shawcross, manuscript curator for special collections. The exhibit will remain at the Library until March 25 and may also be viewed online at [http://www.library.upenn.edu/special/exh/mauchly/mauchlyintro.html](http://www.library.upenn.edu/special/exh/mauchly/mauchlyintro.html)

*Educational Technology Showcase;* student- and faculty-led interactive demonstrations of new educational technologies being developed at Penn, 9:30 a.m.-11:30 a.m. and 1:30 p.m.-4 p.m., Bodek Lounge, Houston Hall, open to the public.

*ENIAC 50th Speech by Vice President of the United States Albert Gore, Jr.,* on ENIAC’s legacy and the future impact of technology on society, 11:50 a.m.-12:30 p.m., Irvine Auditorium. For those who did not get tickets through the Connaissance raffle announced in The Daily Pennsylvanian, there will be a remote video feed to the Alumni Hall, in the Maloney Building; Rooms 109 and 110, in the Annenberg School.

*ENIAC Reenactment and Press Conference;* Vice President Gore, University President Judith Rodin, Philadelphia Mayor Ed Rendell, and UNISYS Chairman and CEO James Unruh will commemorate ENIAC’s 50th anniversary by restarting one of ENIAC’s original decade counters 50 years after it was first introduced to the public. Vice President Gore will throw the switch between 1 and 1:30 p.m. There will be remote video feed to Irvine Auditorium; Alumni Hall in the Maloney Building; Rooms 109 and 110, in the Annenberg School and other campus locations that receive Channel 24 of the Penn Video Network.

Off Campus

*ACM History Retrospective Sessions;* 1-4:30 p.m., Philadelphia Marriott Hotel, shuttle bus service from Irvine to the Marriott will leave at 1:30 p.m. and 1:45 p.m.

The first session, *ENIAC in Context,* historians Paul Ceruzzi and Michael Williams, along with Mitchell Marcus, chair of CIS department at Penn, will discuss the social, cultural and intellectual environment surrounding the development of ENIAC and the importance of ENIAC on the development of computing.

The second session, *ENIAC’s Legacies,* computer historian Michael Mahoney will present an historical interpretation of the development of computer technology over the last 50 years.

*ENIAC 50th Celebration Dinner,* 6:30-10 p.m., Philadelphia Marriott Hotel. Advance reservations necessary, 898-8724.

On the World Wide Web

For the latest updates consult the ENIAC 50th Celebration web site: [http://www.upenn.edu/eniac](http://www.upenn.edu/eniac)

On the Penn Video Network

The ResNet Movie Channel (channel 11 on the Penn Video Network) is presenting a series of seven films featuring Hollywood representations of computers and computing. These movies will air each night of the ENIAC anniversary week, February 11-17 beginning at 10 p.m. In honor of the 50th anniversary of ENIAC the following films will be shown in the series

**Binary Analogues: Computers on the Silver Screen.**

- February 11: *Desk Set* (1957)
- February 14: *War Games* (1983)
- February 16: *The Lawnmower Man* (1992)
Proposed Code of Academic Integrity

In September (Almanac, September 19, 1995), I published for comment by the University community a “Proposed Charter of the University of Pennsylvania Student Disciplinary System” and a “Proposed Code of Academic Integrity.” As noted then, these documents were the product of more than two years of extensive examination and discussion of the University’s student disciplinary and academic integrity policies and procedures.

Since September, I have received extensive comments on the proposed Charter, which also has been discussed at length in University Council and with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. I wish to express my deep appreciation to all those who took the time to participate in this important process.

The documents below incorporate numerous and substantial changes prompted by the many thoughtful and constructive comments I received. As revised, these documents reflect my best judgment as to the character and details of a Student Disciplinary System and a Code of Academic Integrity that will serve Penn well in the years ahead, and I am forwarding them to, and recommending them for adoption by, the individual Schools and Faculties during the spring term. It is my hope that final action by the Schools and Faculties will be completed in time to put both documents into effect on July 1, 1996, at which time they will, of course, be published again “Of Record” in Almanac.

— Stanley Chodorow, Provost

Proposed Code of Academic Integrity

Since the University is an academic community, its fundamental purpose is the pursuit of knowledge. Essential to the success of this educational mission is a commitment to the principles of academic integrity. Every member of the University community is responsible for upholding the highest standards of honesty at all times. Students, as members of the community, are also responsible for adhering to the principles and spirit of the following Code of Academic Integrity.

Academic Dishonesty Definitions

Activities, that have the effect or intention of interfering with education, pursuit of knowledge, or fair evaluation of a student’s performance are prohibited. Examples of such activities include but are not limited to the following definitions:

A. Cheating: using or attempting to use unauthorized assistance, material, or study aids in examinations or other academic work or preventing, or attempting to prevent, another from using authorized assistance, material, or study aids.

Example: using a cheat sheet in a quiz or exam, altering a graded exam and resubmitting it for a better grade, etc.

B. Plagiarism: using the ideas, data, or language of another without specific or proper acknowledgment.

Example: copying another person’s paper, article, or computer work and submitting it for an assignment, cloning someone else’s ideas without attribution, failing to use quotation marks where appropriate, etc.

C. Fabrication: submitting contrived or altered information in any academic exercise.

Example: making up data for an experiment, fudging data, citing nonexistent articles, contriving sources, etc.

D. Multiple submission: submitting, without prior permission, any work submitted to fulfill another academic requirement.

E. Misrepresentation of academic records: misrepresenting or tampering with or attempting to tamper with any portion of a student’s transcripts or academic record, either before or after coming to the University of Pennsylvania.

Example: forging a change of grade slip, tampering with computer records, falsifying academic information on one’s resume, etc.

F. Facilitating academic dishonesty: knowingly helping or attempting to help another violate any provision of the Code.

Example: working together on a take-home exam, etc.

G. Unfair advantage: attempting to gain unauthorized advantage over fellow students in an academic exercise.

Example: gaining or providing unauthorized access to examination materials, obstructing or interfering with another student’s efforts in an academic exercise, lying about a need for an extension for an exam or paper, continuing to write even when time is up during an exam, destroying or keeping library materials for one’s own use, etc.

* If a student is unsure whether his action(s) constitute a violation of the Code of Academic Integrity, then it is that student’s responsibility to consult with the instructor to clarify any ambiguities.
Proposed Charter of the University of Pennsylvania Student Disciplinary System

Introduction

The Charter of the Student Disciplinary System sets forth the procedures under which alleged violations of the University’s Code of Student Conduct, Code of Academic Integrity, and other policies, rules, and regulations are resolved.

The Code of Student Conduct sets forth the responsibility of all students at the University of Pennsylvania to exhibit responsible behavior regardless of time or place. This responsibility includes, but is not limited to, the obligation to comply with all provisions of the Code of Student Conduct; with all other policies and regulations of the University, its Schools, and its Departments; and with local, state, and federal laws.

The Code of Academic Integrity, and similar codes adopted by some of the University’s Schools, set forth the standards of integrity and honesty that should be adhered to in all student academic activities at the University of Pennsylvania.

Violations of the Code of Academic Integrity or School regulations are also violations of the University’s Code of Student Conduct. Further, violations of local, state, and federal laws may be violations of the Code of Student Conduct. Therefore, throughout the Charter references to violation(s) or alleged violation(s) of the Code of Student Conduct include violations of these other policies and laws.

The University disciplinary process at Penn may involve the following stages:

1. Bringing a Complaint to the Office of Student Conduct
2. Resolving a Complaint by Mediation
3. Investigating a Complaint
4. Filing Charges by the University Against a Student
5. Resolving Charges by Voluntary Agreement to Sanctions
6. Resolving Charges by Disciplinary Hearing
7. Appealing the Decision of a Hearing Panel
8. Imposing Sanctions on a Student
9. Fulfilling Sanctions Imposed by the University

Under the University’s Student Disciplinary System, charges are brought on behalf of the University, not on behalf of the complainant(s) who brought the matter to the Office of Student Conduct (OSC) or the party(ies) who may have been directly or indirectly harmed by the alleged violation of University regulations. Therefore, complainants who wish to maintain greater control over the investigation and resolution of their complaints, such as is sometimes appropriate in cases of sexual offenses or in cases involving serious cultural or communicative differences, or those who wish merely to create a record of their complaint without necessarily beginning a formal disciplinary process, may wish to bring their complaint to other University resource offices, particularly the Office of the Ombudsman, which are equipped to handle cases in this manner. Such offices may, when appropriate and helpful in an individual case, consult with relevant campus communities or other resource offices in the process of investigating and resolving a complaint and are able to work closely with both complainants and respondents in resolving such matters. If such efforts fail to arrive at a satisfactory resolution, the complainant still has the option of bringing a complaint to the OSC.

Through the University Conduct Council and the University Honor Council, students play a major role in the Student Disciplinary System by advising the Director of the Office of Student Conduct and the Provost on matters of policy and the operation of the System, and by sitting as members of disciplinary hearing panels. Students also serve as advisors and mediators within the System.

The System places great emphasis on the mediation of disputes, as is appropriate in a University community.

I. The Student Disciplinary System

A. Statement of Purpose

The purpose of the Student Disciplinary System is to further the educational mission of the University of Pennsylvania by providing a fair and effective mechanism for investigating and resolving disputes involving students and alleged violations by students of the University’s rules, regulations, and policies.

B. Jurisdiction of the Student Disciplinary System

1. Through the Office of Student Conduct (OSC), the Student Disciplinary System handles complaints from members of the University community about alleged violations of the Code of Student Conduct, the Code of Academic Integrity, or other University policies.

2. Except as provided below, the Student Disciplinary System has jurisdiction in all disciplinary matters arising under the regulations of the University against registered students, whether they be undergraduates, graduate or professional students, or others, including students who are on unexpired leaves of absence. Approved or unapproved absence from the University is not a bar to the conduct or completion of disciplinary proceedings under this Charter.

3. In general, a student is any individual who has been admitted, matriculated, enrolled, or registered in any academic program or other educational activity provided by the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania.

4. The Student Disciplinary System does not handle complaints against graduate and professional students when such cases lie within the jurisdiction of a hearing board or other disciplinary body established by the School of the University in which the student is enrolled. When such a School-based disciplinary procedure exists, it should be the recourse of first resort for the resolution of an alleged violation of University or School regulations, unless the OSC decides, in consultation with the Provost, that it is appropriate in light of the circumstances for the Student Disciplinary System to handle the matter. Schools with such procedures are encouraged to refer disciplinary matters (excluding academic integrity matters) to the University Mediation Program whenever appropriate. When an
alleged violation of University regulations by a graduate or professional student is not within the jurisdiction of a disciplinary system established by the student’s School, the Student Disciplinary System will have jurisdiction over the matter.

5. The Student Disciplinary System does not handle alleged violations of the University’s parking regulations.

6. Alleged violations of the University’s Residential Living policies and contracts are ordinarily handled under the procedures of the Department of Residential Living but, if serious enough to warrant sanctions beyond those which the Department of Residential Living is authorized to impose, may be referred by the Director of Residential Living to the OSC. The fact that proceedings have been held and sanctions imposed under Residential Living policies does not preclude proceedings under this Charter.

7. The Director of the Office of Student Conduct decides all questions of jurisdiction of the Student Disciplinary System arising under this Charter, consulting with the Provost (or designee) and with the University’s General Counsel when necessary. When appropriate, the OSC may refer a complaint to another University office or disciplinary process.

C. General Principles of the Disciplinary System

1. The University’s Student Disciplinary System is not a legal system, and University disciplinary proceedings are not civil or criminal litigation. Thus, they operate under different rules, standards, and procedures, and seek to achieve ends different from criminal or civil proceedings.

2. Any member of the University community may bring a complaint about student conduct or academic integrity to the attention of the Office of Student Conduct. Doing so in no way limits a complainant(s)’ rights or obligations to bring such matters to the attention of other University offices, officers, or resources, including the Office of the Ombudsman and appropriate Deans, or to seek recourse outside the University through civil or criminal legal proceedings.

3. In all cases, the University reserves the right to determine how to process a disciplinary complaint. Once a complaint is brought to the attention of the Office of Student Conduct, the OSC, on behalf of the University, will decide how the complaint will be handled, including whether disciplinary charges should be brought against a student.

4. It is expected that most matters brought to the OSC can and should be resolved through mediation and will not result in charges or disciplinary hearings. However, because of their seriousness within an academic community, alleged violations of the Code of Academic Integrity will not be referred for mediation. Thus, except in academic integrity matters and matters that warrant treatment as serious violations of the Code of Student Conduct or other University policies, the initial response by the OSC may be to refer the complainant and respondent to the University’s Mediation Program. Only if mediation fails or is inappropriate will the OSC begin the more formal disciplinary processes outlined in this Charter.

5. All members of the University community are required to cooperate with the Student Disciplinary System. Those individuals who may be interviewed or called as witnesses in a disciplinary matter (including respondents and complainants) are obligated to provide honest and complete statements to the OSC and to the Hearing Panel. While in some circumstances a respondent may choose not to answer questions or provide information because of pending civil claims or criminal charges arising out of the same or other events, the respondent’s decision not to answer questions or provide information will not be a reason to delay or defer an investigation or proceedings under this Charter. A student who fails, without good cause, to appear for a hearing after receiving notice, or to cooperate with the investigation conducted by the OSC, may be charged with a violation of the Code of Student Conduct. Repeated disruption of disciplinary hearings or the disciplinary process by a student or the student’s advisor may result in charges against the student of non-cooperation with the Student Disciplinary System or exclusion of the student or advisor from disciplinary proceedings, including disciplinary hearings. Such exclusion is not a bar to the completion of disciplinary proceedings involving that student.

D. Organization of the Disciplinary System

1. Office of Student Conduct

The Office of Student Conduct is the central office responsible for resolving alleged violations of University policies by students. The duties of the OSC include determining whether complaints warrant action by the OSC, referring complaints for mediation or resolution by other University offices, investigating complaints, determining whether to charge a student with violations of University policies, resolving complaints by voluntary agreements to sanctions, bringing charges of violations to a disciplinary hearing, presenting evidence at hearings, monitoring and enforcing the fulfillment of sanctions imposed pursuant to voluntary agreements or after disciplinary hearings, maintaining records of all disciplinary matters, providing administrative support for all aspects of the disciplinary process (including hearings), and preparing reports and compiling statistics.

2. University Mediation Program

The University Mediation Program (UMP) recruits, screens, and trains members of the University community to serve as mediators. The UMP uses the volunteer services of faculty, students, and staff members who have been trained in mediation and dispute resolution and may also use resources available in the University’s Law School, in University resource offices such as the Office of the Ombudsman, or outside the University.

3. University Conduct Council

a. The University Conduct Council (UCC) provides independent advice to the Provost and the OSC regarding the operation of the Student Disciplinary System in the area of student conduct, the general handling of conduct violations, appropriate sanctions for various types of conduct violations, and the effectiveness and implementation of the University’s Code of Student Conduct. Members of the UCC also sit on Disciplinary Hearing Panels in conduct cases. The UCC meets regularly with the Director of the Office of Student Conduct and may also discuss conduct issues with appropriate administrators and student, faculty, or administrative groups or committees. In addition, the UCC initiates and participates in educational programs about student conduct, works to help students understand and respect the behavioral standards of the University community, and may periodically report to the University community on the state of student conduct and the effectiveness of the Student Disciplinary System in conduct matters.

b. The UCC consists of a minimum of 13 undergraduate students, recommended by the Nominations and Election Committee (NEC) and appointed by the Provost for renewable terms of one year. The NEC is encouraged to ensure that nominees represent a broad cross-section of the student body. The UCC selects a chair from among its members by a majority vote of the current members. Faculty members and graduate students designated by the Faculty Senate or Graduate and Professional Students Assembly (GAPSA) to sit on Disciplinary Hearing Panels may participate in the work of the UCC if the UCC so desires.

4. University Honor Council

a. The University Honor Council (UHC) provides independent advice to the Provost and the OSC regarding the operation of the Student Disciplinary System in the area of academic integrity, the general handling of academic integrity violations, appropriate sanctions for various types of academic integrity violations, and the effectiveness and implementation of the University’s Code of Academic Integrity. Members of the UHC also sit on Disciplinary Hearing Panels in cases of alleged violations of the Code of Academic Integrity. The UHC meets regularly with the Director of the Office of Student Conduct and may also discuss academic integrity issues with appropriate administrators, faculty committees, or student groups. In addition, the UHC initiates and participates in educational programs about academic integrity, works to help students and faculty understand and
The UCC consists of a minimum of 13 undergraduate students, recommended by the Nominations and Elections Committee (NEC) and appointed by the Provost for renewable terms of one year. The NEC is encouraged to ensure that nominees represent a broad cross-section of the undergraduate student body. The UHC selects a chair from among its members by a majority vote of the current members. Faculty members and graduate students designated by the Faculty Senate or GAPSA to sit on Disciplinary Hearing Panels may participate in the work of the UHC if the UHC so desires.

5. Disciplinary Hearing Officer

Every two years, the Provost, after consultation with the UCC, the UHC, and the chairs of the Faculty Senate, will appoint a tenured member of the Standing Faculty of the University of Pennsylvania as Disciplinary Hearing Officer (DHO), preferably from among those faculty who have experience with the Student Disciplinary System. The DHO selects members to serve on Disciplinary Hearing Panels; determines the time, location, etc., of hearings; and presides over all disciplinary hearings held under this Charter. The DHO is responsible for overseeing the procedural integrity of disciplinary hearings. The DHO will, for example: consider and resolve pre-hearing challenges to the authority or procedures of a Disciplinary Hearing Panel; rule on all disqualification requests and objections to individual panel members; assist parties to adhere to the basic principles of fairness prior to, during, and subsequent to disciplinary proceedings; and may consult at any time with students, faculty members, the University’s General Counsel, or others about procedural issues. The DHO also participates in the training of prospective faculty and student members of Disciplinary Hearing Panels. The DHO serves and may be reappointed at the discretion of the Provost, but his or her removal or reappointment may not occur without prior consultation with the chairs of the Faculty Senate.

6. Disciplinary Appellate Officer

Every two years, the Provost, after consultation with the UCC, the UHC, and the chairs of the Faculty Senate, will appoint a tenured member of the Standing Faculty of the University of Pennsylvania as a Disciplinary Appellate Officer (DAO), preferably from among those faculty who have experience with the Student Disciplinary System. The DAO decides appeals of findings and recommended sanctions made by Disciplinary Hearing Panels based on the record of such proceedings and written submissions from the relevant parties. The DAO serves and may be reappointed at the discretion of the Provost, but his or her removal or reappointment may not occur without prior consultation with the chairs of the Faculty Senate.

7. Disciplinary Hearing Panels

a. Disciplinary matters are heard by Disciplinary Hearing Panels of five members each. The Disciplinary Hearing Officer randomly selects the undergraduate members of Disciplinary Hearing Panels from the membership of the University Conduct Council for conduct violations and from the University Honor Council for academic integrity violations. The Disciplinary Hearing Officer randomly selects the graduate and professional student members of Hearing Panels from lists of 13 or more graduate and professional students provided annually to the DHO by GAPSA. The Disciplinary Hearing Officer randomly selects the faculty members of Hearing Panels from lists of 13 or more faculty provided annually to the DHO by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. GAPSA and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee are encouraged to ensure that nominees represent a broad cross-section of graduate and professional students and faculty, respectively.

b. In all disciplinary matters, except those involving alleged violations of the Code of Academic Integrity, the Disciplinary Hearing Panel is composed of two faculty members and three students of the same category (undergraduate or graduate) as the respondent. If a disciplinary matter involves both undergraduate and graduate respondents, the panel will include at least one undergraduate and at least one graduate student and two faculty members; the fifth panel member will be an undergraduate or graduate student selected by the DHO.

c. In disciplinary matters involving alleged violations of the Code of Academic Integrity, the Disciplinary Hearing Panel is composed of three faculty members and two students of the same category (undergraduate or graduate) as the respondent. If a disciplinary matter involves both undergraduate and graduate respondents, the panel will consist of one undergraduate student, one graduate student, and three faculty members.

d. Except for participation on the University Conduct Council or the University Honor Council, no one designated to serve on Disciplinary Hearing Panels may serve simultaneously in any other capacity within the Student Disciplinary System.

e. If any nominating body chooses fewer than 13 members to serve on Disciplinary Hearing Panels or cannot make additional members available when needed, the Provost will make the necessary appointments to fill the complement of the appropriate group. If any member is unable to serve for any reason, a replacement is selected in the same manner that the original member was chosen.

f. Student members of Disciplinary Hearing Panels must be in good academic and disciplinary standing, as defined by their Schools. The UCC or UHC, as appropriate, by a vote of two-thirds of its members, may remove a member who fails to perform his or her duties. When a member ceases to be in good standing or is removed by the UHC or UCC, a replacement from the same category will be chosen in the same manner that the original member was chosen.

8. Advisors

a. Advisors help students involved in disciplinary proceedings to understand the disciplinary process, respect and comply with the provisions of this Charter, and deal with all aspects of the process. Any University faculty member, staff member, or student in good academic and disciplinary standing may serve as an advisor. The OSC maintains lists of individuals who are willing to serve as advisors and who have received training in the operation of the Student Disciplinary System.

b. Upon receiving notice of a complaint and the accompanying list of trained advisors, a respondent may select an advisor from this list or choose any other University faculty member, staff member, or student in good academic and disciplinary standing to advise the respondent during the disciplinary process. If criminal charges are pending against a respondent or, in the judgment of the Office of the University’s General Counsel, are reasonably in prospect, the respondent’s advisor may be an attorney who is not a member of the University community. In such instances, the attorney will be expected to observe the procedures of this Charter and comply fully and promptly with decisions of the DHO or other University officials or bodies charged with the administration of this Charter in the same manner expected of members of the University community.

c. An advisor may accompany any complainant, witness, or respondent, and may participate in any meeting regarding a disciplinary complaint. Advisors also may accompany complainants, respondents, and witnesses to hearings, but generally may not participate directly in such hearings (except as provided in section II.F.4.f below). Advisors to respondents may, however, quietly advise the respondent(s) during the hearing and may also make a brief statement at the conclusion of the hearing, before the panel begins its deliberations.

d. Any advisor who fails to observe the procedures of this Charter or comply fully and promptly with decisions of the DHO may, after appropriate warning, be disqualified by the DHO from continuing to serve. In the event of such disqualification, the hearing may proceed whether or not a replacement advisor is available or it may be rescheduled, at the sole discretion of the DHO. Any person disqualified from serving as an advisor will be ineligible to serve as an advisor for a period of two years. Repeated disruption of disciplinary hearings or the disciplinary process by an advisor may result in charges against the advisee of non-cooperation with the Student Disciplinary System. If the advisor is a member of the student body, faculty, or staff of the University, disciplinary charges may be brought against the advisor in the appropriate forum.
II. The Disciplinary Process

A. Bringing a Complaint to the Office of Student Conduct

1. Any student, faculty or staff member who believes that a student has violated University rules, regulations or policies may file a complaint, which must be in writing, with the OSC. A complaint asks the OSC to consider the matter for possible referral or investigation. Students, faculty, or staff members also may consult informally with the OSC staff to determine whether they wish to file a complaint. Complaints made to other University offices or personnel also may be referred to the OSC.

2. The OSC promptly evaluates each complaint it receives to determine whether the University’s Code of Student Conduct, Code of Academic Integrity, or other applicable rules, regulations, or policies may have been violated. When the OSC determines that no such violation may have occurred, it may dismiss the matter without further investigation, or it may refer the parties to the University Mediation Program or elsewhere to resolve their dispute. When the OSC determines that a violation may have occurred, it may refer the matter for mediation or undertake an investigation that may lead to the filing of formal charges against a student or students.

3. A complaint is not a charge that a student has violated University regulations. Charges against a student are only made by the University (not by complainants) following an investigation. Until there is a determination to the contrary by voluntary agreement to sanctions or by a Disciplinary Hearing Panel, there is a presumption that an accused student has not violated University rules, regulations, or policies.

4. When a complaint is filed, the OSC promptly gives written notice of the complaint and its allegations to the student(s) alleged to have violated University rules. A copy of the Charter will be included with the notice, as well as a list of potential advisors who have received training from the OSC.

B. Resolving a Complaint by Mediation

1. The University encourages informal mediation whenever practical and appropriate. If the parties agree, at any time the OSC may refer any disciplinary matter other than an alleged violation of the Code of Academic Integrity to the University Mediation Program (UMP) or other resources for mediation. Members of the University community may also contact the University Mediation Program directly.

2. It is within the sole discretion of the OSC to determine whether a disciplinary complaint is suitable for mediation. If mediation fails or new information comes to light about an unresolved matter then in mediation, the OSC may proceed with an investigation and the filing of disciplinary charges. The OSC may also set a date after which it will begin to investigate the original complaint or file charges if a matter has not been successfully mediated.

3. If the OSC refers a complaint for mediation and both parties to the dispute agree to participate, the UMP will assign a trained mediator and advise the complainant(s) and respondent(s) in advance of the date, time and place set for mediation. In order to resolve a disciplinary matter by mediation, both the complainant and the respondent must agree, first, to participate in the mediation and, second, to the proposed resolution.

4. If a student fails to comply with the terms of a mediation agreement, the OSC may take steps to enforce the agreement (including use of a Disciplinary Hold or the filing of new charges under the Code of Student Conduct) or may investigate the original complaint and bring disciplinary charges under this Charter.

C. Investigating a Complaint

1. If, after a preliminary evaluation of a complaint, the OSC determines that a violation of the Code of Student Conduct may have occurred and if the complaint is inappropriate for mediation or mediation fails, the OSC then will investigate the complaint and determine whether to bring charges of a violation.

2. In the course of its investigation, the OSC may interview any witnesses, including the respondent(s) or potential respondent(s). The OSC will inform each witness that anything they say in such interviews may be introduced as evidence at a hearing.

D. Filing Charges by the University Against a Student

In light of its investigation of a complaint, the OSC may file charges against a student(s) of a violation(s) of the University’s Code of Student Conduct, Code of Academic Integrity, or other University rules, regulations, or policies. The OSC also may add charges beyond the scope of the original complaint, may add additional students as respondents, or may dismiss the original complaint as unfounded. If the OSC decides to charge a student with a violation of University rules, regulations, or policies, the OSC must inform the student in writing, identifying the University rules, regulations, or policies alleged to have been violated. The OSC will inform both respondent(s) and complainant(s) whether charges have been filed.

E. Resolving Charges by Voluntary Agreement to Sanctions

1. Following the notice that charges have been filed against a student, the OSC may discuss with the respondent and the respondent’s advisor what disciplinary sanction(s) would be appropriate to resolve the matter by voluntary agreement to sanctions. The respondent may accept, reject, or propose an alternative to the proposed sanction(s), and may be accompanied and assisted by an advisor, who may participate in these discussions. Statements made during discussions about whether a respondent will enter into a voluntary agreement to sanctions may not be introduced as evidence at any subsequent hearing, but may provide a basis for further investigation by the OSC.

2. A resolution by voluntary agreement to sanctions may be entered into by written agreement at any time after a complaint has been filed and prior to a disciplinary hearing. All sanctions allowed under this Charter are available to the OSC as part of a resolution by voluntary agreement to sanctions. By agreeing to such a resolution, a respondent waives further proceedings under this Charter.

3. Complaints and complainants’ advisors are not parties to voluntary agreements to sanctions.

4. If, in the judgment of the OSC, a voluntary agreement to sanctions is not reasonably in prospect, or if the respondent(s) reject a proposed sanction, the OSC may bring the disciplinary matter to a hearing.

F. Resolving Charges by Disciplinary Hearing

1. Scheduling Disciplinary Hearings

a. If disciplinary charges are not resolved by a voluntary agreement to sanctions, the Disciplinary Hearing Officer promptly begins the process of scheduling a Disciplinary Hearing, with due regard for the time required for all parties to prepare for the hearing. The DHO will provide reasonable advance notice in writing to the complainant(s), respondent(s), and witnesses of the date, time, and place of the hearing and of the names of the panel members assigned to hear the disciplinary matter.

b. Hearings normally take place as soon as possible after the filing of charges. Upon a showing of good cause by the OSC or the respondent(s), the DHO may grant a reasonable extension of any time limit set forth in this Charter.

c. The DHO may expedite a Disciplinary Hearing in appropriate circumstances, including disciplinary matters involving students who have been placed on mandatory temporary leave of absence or conditional attendance, graduating students, or students who are about to take a leave of absence or to leave campus to study elsewhere.
2. Disqualification of Hearing Panel Members
   a. Members of the Hearing Panel selected by the DHO should disqualify themselves from hearing a disciplinary matter if they believe in good faith that their capacity for making an objective judgment in the disciplinary matter is, or may reasonably appear to be, impaired. Members should not disqualify themselves for any other reason.
   b. The respondent(s) or the OSC may object for specific cause to any panel member selected by the DHO. The objection must be in writing and must be received by the DHO at least 48 hours in advance of the date and time set for the hearing.
   c. The DHO will rule upon all disqualification requests and objections to panel members. If the DHO decides that a challenge is valid, or if there is a voluntary disqualification, the DHO, after notifying the respondent(s) and the OSC, will replace the disqualified member with another panel member randomly selected from the same category.

3. Pre-Hearing Exchanges and Testimony
   a. Before the hearing, the OSC and the respondent(s) will exchange among themselves and with the DHO copies of all exhibits to be presented, the names of witnesses to be called, and a brief summary of the substance of testimony expected to be presented to the Hearing Panel.
   b. When the DHO believes that it will contribute to the expedition and fairness of a Disciplinary Hearing, he or she may (but need not) ask the OSC to prepare a written statement of its case against the respondent(s) and provide a reasonable opportunity to prepare a written response. The OSC and respondent(s) may submit statements at their own initiative. The statements and any accompanying exhibits may be considered by the Hearing Panel, in addition to testimony, arguments, or evidence presented at the actual hearing.
   c. In exceptional circumstances, when a witness or exhibit does not become known or available until immediately before the hearing, the DHO may, at her or his discretion, permit the evidence to be presented or may reschedule the hearing to a later time.
   d. If a respondent or the OSC anticipates that a key witness will be unavailable for a hearing, they may ask the DHO to preserve the testimony of the witness on tape and present it as evidence at the hearing. The DHO and the respondent(s) must be notified in advance of the date, time and place of the tapping. All parties who would be permitted to question such a witness at a hearing may question the witness at the tapping.

4. Conduct of Hearings
   a. Disciplinary hearings are not trials, and they are not constrained by technical rules of procedure, evidence, or judicial formality. They are designed to encourage open discussion among the participants that promotes the hearing panel’s understanding of the facts, the individuals involved, the circumstances under which the incident occurred, the nature of the conduct, and the attitudes and experience of those involved. The rules of evidence applicable to legal proceedings do not apply to disciplinary hearings. Information, including hearsay evidence, may be considered if it is relevant, not unduly repetitious, and the sort of information on which responsible persons are accustomed to rely in the conduct of serious affairs.
   b. The DHO presides over all hearings and decides all questions about the admissibility of evidence and the conduct of hearings. While the DHO may be present for the Hearing Panel’s discussions to answer procedural questions, the DHO does not deliberate or vote with the Panel regarding its findings or its recommendation of sanctions.
   c. Disciplinary hearings are held in private unless the respondent(s), the complainant(s), the OSC, and the DHO agree to an open hearing. The DHO is not required to accede to a request to open a disciplinary hearing. The DHO may also limit attendance at a hearing to ensure fair and orderly proceedings.
   d. Upon a showing that the required notice was provided, the hearing against a respondent(s) may proceed in her or his absence.
   e. At the hearing, the OSC presents the results of the OSC’s investigation of the complaint, calls witnesses to testify and presents the University’s evidence against the student(s). Members of the Hearing Panel may also call witnesses to testify and may question any witness appearing before it. Respondents may also call witnesses to testify and ask questions of all witnesses.
   f. A respondent is responsible for presenting his or her own case before the Hearing Panel. However, at the discretion of the DHO, in extraordinary cases, the respondent’s advisor may be permitted to question witnesses on behalf of a respondent or to address the Hearing Panel. The DHO’s exercise of discretion in this matter will be guided by the principles that govern disciplinary hearings, specifically, fairness, the need for orderly procedures, and the Hearing Panel’s duty to understand the facts and parties in the disciplinary matter.
   g. Complainants may attend the hearing, testify if they wish to do so, and may be accompanied by an advisor. Neither complainants nor their advisors may call witnesses or present evidence or arguments.
   h. At the conclusion of the hearing the OSC and the respondent(s) or their advisor(s) may make brief statements. At the discretion of the Disciplinary Hearing Officer, the complainant(s) or their advisor(s) may be permitted to make a brief statement. The time allowed for such statements will be set by the DHO.
   i. The OSC will arrange for a verbatim transcript or recording to be made of all disciplinary hearings. The transcript or recording is the property of the University of Pennsylvania and becomes part of the record of the disciplinary proceedings.

5. Findings and Recommendations of the Hearing Panel
   a. Only evidence presented at the hearing will be considered by the Hearing Panel. The Hearing Panel will presume a respondent innocent unless proven responsible for a violation by clear and convincing evidence. All decisions of the Hearing Panel require a majority vote.
   b. Following the hearing, the members of the Hearing Panel meet in private to discuss their findings, which consist of two parts: 1) a determination of whether the respondent is responsible for any violation; and 2) if so, a recommendation of sanction(s).
   c. The OSC may recommend to the Hearing Panel a sanction to be imposed if the Hearing Panel finds the respondent(s) responsible for a violation. The respondent(s) may respond to the OSC’s proposed sanction(s). Before the Panel makes its recommendation on sanctions, it will review any previous disciplinary offenses by and sanctions against the respondent(s).
   d. If the Hearing Panel determines that the respondent(s) is not responsible for a violation, no sanction may be recommended against the respondent(s) and the respondent may not be subject to further proceedings under this Charter on the same charge(s).
   e. If the Hearing Panel finds that a student is responsible for a violation of University rules or regulations, it will recommend to the Provost appropriate sanctions. Only the Provost (or designee), acting on behalf of the University, may actually impose a sanction on a student. The Provost (or designee) will not impose a sanction until after any appeal of the Hearing Panel’s decision has been decided by the DAO.

6. Notice of Hearing Panel Decision
   The Hearing Panel will promptly transmit its decision, including its findings and recommendation regarding sanctions, in writing to the DHO, the OSC, the respondent(s) and the Provost as soon as possible after the end of the hearing.

G. Appealing a Hearing Panel’s Decision
   1. The Disciplinary Appellate Officer (DAO) has exclusive jurisdiction to decide appeals. Appeals are based solely on the record of the disciplinary hearing and the written submissions and responses of the respondent(s) and the OSC.
   2. Only respondent(s) may appeal the Hearing Panel’s findings of responsibility except where applicable laws or regulations may extend this right to complainants. Both the respondent(s) and the OSC may appeal the Hearing Panel’s recommendation of sanction(s). An appellant must submit any appeal to the DAO in writing within 10 days after the Hearing Panel has rendered its opinion. The appeal must state in detail the specific grounds upon which it is based and must be sent to the OSC or respondent(s), as appropriate.
3. When the appeal is received, the OSC provides the Disciplinary Appellate Officer with a copy of the respondent’s charge letter, a copy of the Hearing Panel’s findings, a verbatim transcript or tape recording of the Disciplinary Hearing, and any exhibits considered by the panel in reaching its recommendations. The respondent and the OSC have 10 days from the date of the appeal to submit to the DAO a written response to the appeal.

4. Appellate review is limited to allegations of material and prejudicial procedural error in the conduct of hearings, error in the interpretation or application of relevant University regulations, consideration of new evidence sufficient to alter the Hearing Panel’s findings or severity of the recommended sanctions. If the DAO finds sufficient basis, he or she may reverse or modify the Hearing Panel’s findings or proposed sanctions, or may remand the disciplinary matter for further investigation by the OSC or a new hearing before a new Hearing Panel. However, the DAO may not recommend a more severe sanction(s) unless the OSC has appealed the sanction(s) recommended by the Hearing Panel.

5. After considering an appeal, the Disciplinary Appellate Officer will promptly issue his or her decision in writing and will provide copies to the OSC, the DHO, the Provost, and the respondent(s).

H. Imposing Sanctions on a Student

1. The Disciplinary Hearing Panel or the DAO may recommend, and the Provost may impose, any reasonable sanction(s) against a respondent, including, but not limited to the following:

   • Warning
     A Warning is a written admonition given by the OSC on behalf of the University in instances of minor misconduct.
   • Reprimand
     A Reprimand is a written censure for violation of the University’s rules, regulations, or policies, given by the OSC on behalf of the University, which includes notice to the student that continued or repeated conduct violations will result in the imposition of more serious sanctions.
   • Fine
     A monetary Fine may be levied as a disciplinary sanction and is payable to the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania.
   • Restitution
     Restitution is reimbursement for the damage, loss, or misappropriation of University, private, or public property or compensation for injury to individuals. Restitution may take the form of monetary payment, property, or appropriate service.
   • Disciplinary Probation
     Disciplinary Probation may be imposed for a specified period or indefinitely (i.e., for as long as and whenever a student is a full- or part-time student at the University of Pennsylvania). Probation may be imposed for a single instance of misconduct or for repeated minor misconduct. Any future conduct or academic integrity violation by a student on Disciplinary Probation, found to have occurred during the probationary period, may be grounds for suspension or, in especially serious instances, expulsion from the University.
   • Withdrawal of Privileges
     Withdrawal of Privileges is the denial of specified privileges or the ability to participate in specified activities for a designated period of time.
   • Suspension
     Suspension is the termination of student status and separation from the University until a specified date. Suspension means the loss of all rights and privileges normally accompanying student status. While on disciplinary suspension, students may not obtain academic credit at Penn or elsewhere toward completion of a University of Pennsylvania degree. Students are eligible to return to the University after the specified suspension term has elapsed. Suspension is imposed in instances of serious misconduct; it is generally the minimum sanction imposed for a violation of the Code of Academic Integrity.
   • Indefinite Suspension
     An Indefinite Suspension is termination of student status and separation from the University for an unspecified period, without an automatic right of return to the University as a student (though specific conditions for return as a student may be specified). When the conditions of an Indefinite Suspension have been fulfilled, the student must make a formal request, as specified in the conditions, to return to student status. Indefinite suspension is imposed in instances of extremely serious misconduct or in instances of continued serious misconduct following the imposition of probation or suspension for a specified period.
   • Expulsion
     Expulsion is a permanent termination of student status and permanent separation from the University of Pennsylvania. Expulsion is imposed in instances of the most serious misconduct or in instances of continued serious misconduct following the imposition of probation or suspension.

2. In addition to the sanctions defined above, students may be required to perform a designated number of hours of community service or to utilize University or other educational or counseling services related to the nature of the misconduct.

3. Sanctions may be imposed alone or in combination with other sanctions. The Disciplinary Hearing Panel or the DAO may recommend whether the sanctions should appear on the transcript of a respondent, and, if so, for how long.

4. After the imposition of sanctions, a faculty member involved in an academic integrity matter will be informed of the outcome of the disciplinary proceedings. The faculty member may or may not then decide to alter the grade he or she originally gave to the student. If the student has been found not to be responsible for an academic integrity violation, the instructor should assign a grade (which may differ from the grade originally assigned) based on the student’s academic performance in the course. If the student has been found responsible for an academic integrity violation, the instructor may assign any grade the instructor deems appropriate. In the event that the student believes the final grade is unfair or fails to take account of the outcome of the disciplinary proceeding, the student may appeal the grade through the existing academic grievance procedure for the evaluation of academic work established by each School and academic department.

I. Fulfilling Sanctions Imposed by the University

1. Under the Code of Student Conduct, students are required to comply with all disciplinary sanctions. Failure to do so constitutes a violation of the Code and is itself subject to disciplinary proceedings by the OSC.

2. The OSC monitors the implementation and fulfillment of sanctions. In performing this duty, the OSC will have the cooperation of the Division of University Life, the respondent(s)’s Dean, and other appropriate University offices. No sanction will be enforced while an appeal is pending.

II. Additional Matters

A. Administration of The Disciplinary System

1. The Provost is responsible for implementation of this Charter, administrative oversight of the Student Disciplinary System, including the OSC, and ensuring that the Student Disciplinary System functions fairly and in furtherance of the educational mission of the University. The Provost may instruct the OSC regarding the handling of specific cases, but he or she may not so instruct the DHO, the DAO, or the members of Disciplinary Hearing Panels.

2. When circumstances warrant, the OSC may take such administrative steps as may be necessary and feasible to effect the prompt resolution of a disciplinary matter, including, but not limited to, tape recording the testimony of witnesses who may be unavailable at the time of hearing; making special arrangements to ensure the attendance of complainants, respondents, witnesses, or other participants at a hearing; and scheduling hearings outside of the normal academic year.

3. In any disciplinary matter in which a member of the Student Disciplinary System cannot perform her or his duties under this
Charter, an alternate may be designated by the Provost using the procedures appropriate to that individual’s position in the system. In addition, when the Provost determines that circumstances warrant, such a person (but not limited to) when a conflict of interest or a particularly complex or controversial disciplinary matter arises, the Provost may appoint a special OSC staff member, a special Disciplinary Hearing Officer, or a special Disciplinary Appellate Officer using the procedures appropriate to the position.

B. Reports to the University Community
1. Subject to the limitations imposed by law and the University’s policies on the confidentiality of student records and information, the OSC, in consultation with the Provost, the University Conduct Council, and the University Honor Council, will make periodic reports to inform the University community about the character and extent of the work of the Disciplinary System, including the nature of violations of University rules and regulations and the sanctions imposed. The reports of the OSC will deal both with disciplinary matters that go to hearing and with disciplinary matters that are resolved before hearing, and will include such information as the total number of disciplinary matters handled during the preceding year broken down by type of resolution (e.g., mediation, voluntary agreement to sanctions, hearing, etc.), by type of violation, by type of sanction(s) imposed, by whether or not the respondent(s) were found responsible for a violation, and so forth.

2. With the approval of the Provost, the OSC may also make extraordinary reports to the University community concerning the outcome of certain exceptional disciplinary matters, subject to the limitations imposed by law and the University’s policies on the confidentiality of student records and information.

C. Disciplinary Holds
At any time after the filing of a complaint, the OSC, after consulting with the student’s academic dean, may place a “Disciplinary Hold” on the academic and/or financial records of any student for the purpose of preserving the status quo pending the outcome of proceedings, enforcing a disciplinary sanction, or ensuring cooperation with the Student Disciplinary System. A Disciplinary Hold may prevent, among other things, registration, the release of transcripts, and the awarding of a degree.

D. Mandatory Leave of Absence and Conditional Attendance
In extraordinary circumstances, when a student’s presence on campus is deemed by the University to be a threat to order, health, safety, or the conduct of the University’s educational mission, the Provost (or designee), in consultation with the student’s Dean or Associate Dean, may place the student on a mandatory temporary leave of absence or impose conditions upon the student’s continued attendance, pending a hearing of disciplinary charges. When reasonably possible, the student will be provided with an opportunity to be heard before a decision is made by the Provost (or designee) to impose a mandatory temporary leave of absence or conditions on the student’s continued attendance. At the respondent’s request, and where feasible, the OSC may expedite the investigation of a complaint and the disciplinary hearing against a student placed on a mandatory temporary leave of absence or conditional attendance.

E. Civil or Criminal Proceedings
The University may proceed with disciplinary proceedings against a student under this Charter regardless of possible or pending civil claims or criminal charges arising out of the same or other events. The OSC, with the concurrence of the Provost and after consultation with the University’s General Counsel, will determine whether to proceed with charges against a student who also faces related charges in a civil or criminal tribunal. If the University defers proceeding with disciplinary charges against a student in light of related charges in a civil or criminal tribunal, the University may at any subsequent time proceed with disciplinary proceedings against that student under this Charter irrespective of the time provisions set forth in this Charter.

F. Disciplinary Records
1. Maintenance of Records
Except as may be otherwise provided by applicable law, records of all complaints, disciplinary proceedings, mediations, and voluntary agreements to sanctions are maintained by the OSC in accordance with the University’s Protocols for the University Archives and Records Center and University policies on the confidentiality and maintenance of student records.

2. Confidentiality
Except as may be otherwise provided by applicable law, all disciplinary proceedings, the identity of individuals involved in particular disciplinary matters, and all disciplinary files, testimony, and findings are confidential, in accordance with University policies and federal law concerning the confidentiality of student records. No member of the University community (including complainants, respondents, witnesses, advisors, OSC staff members, members of the UHC or UCC, and Hearing Panel members) may disclose or cause to be disclosed or participate in the disclosure of confidential disciplinary matters in violation of this Charter or University policies on confidentiality. However, no provision of this Charter or the University’s policies on confidentiality shall be interpreted as preventing a student from seeking legal advice.

3. Violation of Confidentiality
Failure to observe the requirement of confidentiality by any member of the University community constitutes a violation of University rules and may subject the individual to the appropriate procedures for dealing with such violations. If the confidentiality of disciplinary proceedings is broken by any member of the University community by disclosing, causing to be disclosed, or participating in the disclosure of information that is confidential, any person whose character or integrity might reasonably be questioned as a result of such disclosure shall have the right to respond in an appropriate forum, limited to the subject matter of the initial disclosure.

G. Release of Information on Disciplinary Proceedings
1. To provide students involved in disciplinary matters with appropriate liaison with their School offices in regard to their academic work, the Dean or appropriate Associate Dean of the School(s) of the respondent(s) will be confidentially informed when a complaint is filed, when a sanction is imposed, or when a disciplinary complaint is otherwise resolved by the Student Disciplinary System. When a sanction is imposed, the Director of Career Planning and Placement may be informed by the OSC if the sanction(s) is reportable outside the University. When a transcript notation is required as part of a sanction, the University Registrar is also informed and required to implement the sanction as directed by the OSC on behalf of the Provost.

2. As required by law, in disciplinary matters involving allegations of sexual offenses, the complainant(s) will be informed of the outcome of disciplinary proceedings, including voluntary agreements to sanctions.

H. Reportability of Sanctions
1. Subject to applicable law and the University’s policies on the confidentiality of student records and information, any disciplinary sanction may be reportable outside the University of Pennsylvania, subject to specific policies governing the reporting of sanctions adopted by the Council of Undergraduate Deans for undergraduate students and the Council of Graduate Deans for graduate and professional students.

2. Resolution of disciplinary charges by voluntary agreement to sanctions is treated like a finding of responsibility and is reportable in the same manner as sanctions imposed following a Disciplinary Hearing.

I. Amendment of the Charter
Amendments to this Charter may be recommended by the UCC, UHC, OSC, University Council, Faculty Senate Executive Committee, or other appropriate members of the University community and proposed by the Provost. Amendments take effect upon the approval of the Council of Deans, except that the Council of Deans may at its discretion refer proposed amendments to the Deans and faculties of the individual Schools for approval.