“If you are lucky enough to have lived in Paris as a young man, then wherever you go for the rest of your life, it stays with you, for Paris is a moveable feast,” said Hemingway to a friend in 1950. Almost fifteen years after that, Scribners issued the book that will be read by Penn’s incoming freshman class and discussed in small groups on the weekend they arrive on campus. To participate, please see page 2.
Law's Harvey Levin Award: Dr. Bruce Mann

This year’s recipient of the Penn Law School’s teaching prize, the Harvey Levin Memorial Award, is Dr. Bruce H. Mann (right), professor of law and history. Dr. Mann has taught at Penn since 1987, specializing in legal history, property, trusts and estates. He is a Phi Beta Kappa alumnus of Brown who took his J.D. and M. Phil. from Yale in 1975, and earned his Ph.D. there in 1977.

The Levin Award was established by the Philadelphia law firm of Schnader Harrison Segal and Lewis in 1978, to be awarded annually to a faculty member in recognition of teaching excellence. Each year’s recipient is selected by a majority vote of students earning the J.D. that year. The law firm donates funds for books selected by each year’s winner relating to his or her area of interest, to be placed in the Law School Library.

A New Chair at Wharton Honors the Asian Tie

Through a gift of $1.6 million, the Wharton School has established the Liem Sioe Liong/First Pacific Company Professorship, “symbolic not only of the growing internationalization of the Wharton School, but also the global nature of today’s successful businesses,” said Dean Thomas P. Gerrity.

The chair was given by Anthony Salim, president and CEO of the Salim Group, one of the largest Indonesian conglomerates, and its associated Hong Kong based First Pacific Company, whose managing director, Manuel V. Pangilinan, took his MBA at Wharton in 1968.

It is named for Mr. Salim’s father, Liem Sioe Liong—whom the Dean called “a legend in Southeast Asia,” and for the First Pacific Company, a $5.2 billion conglomerate involved in manufacturing, telecommunications, integrated property services, and banking, primarily in Asia. The Salim Group is one of the largest business groups in Indonesia and Southeast Asia, employing over 200,000 in eleven divisions which include agribusiness, chemicals, financial services and other enterprises. The Salim family is a significant shareholder in First Pacific Company as well. The establishment of the new professorship is “one of several initiatives linking Wharton to the Asian business community,” the Dean said. The School has offices in Tokyo, Bangkok, Seoul and Taipei, and runs executive education programs throughout Asia. There is now an active Asian Advisory Board comprised of 30 business leaders from ten Asian countries.

On the Cover

The Council of Undergraduate Deans has signed off on this year’s book for the Penn Reading Project, and paperbacks will go out soon to the incoming freshmen of the Class of 2000. As outlined by Dr. Robert F. Lucid:

Ernest Hemingway’s A Moveable Feast is a narrative about artists and travelers in Paris in the 1920s, particularly Americans, by one of the most famous of them. Recollected some quarter century after the time, Hemingway’s scene invokes the things that still matter to young people who are just starting out: the experience of new learning and the initiation that goes with it, along with the discovery of new community, new friends, new love and new loneliness. As a text it offers us the opportunity to draw together the great range of experience and of learning commanded by our faculty, and address the way a city can symbolize the whole of education for those who come to it for the first time. First published in 1964, the book is widely identified as perhaps the most important work of one of the world’s most distinguished story-tellers.

Those interested in leading a Penn Reading Project discussion with Penn’s newest undergraduates on Sunday afternoon, September 1, are asked to contact:

Christopher Dennis
Academic Programs in Residence
3901 Locust Walk, suite 112
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6180
dennis@pobox.upenn.edu

Law’s Harvey Levin Award: Dr. Bruce Mann

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 Peter Kurillo or Executive Assistant Carolyn Burdon, Box 12 College Hall/6303, 898-6943 or burdon@pobox.upenn.edu.

Actions Taken by the Senate Executive Committee

May 1, 1996

1. Academic Planning and Budget Committee. Past Senate Chair David Hildebrand reported that a continuing focus of the Academic Planning and Budget Committee has been the plan of the School of Arts and Sciences. That school’s plan indicates as major priorities the preservation of a high quality faculty, the renovation of science labs, and improvement and innovation in undergraduate education. Three particular initiatives of note are a planned center for the humanities, which will house visiting scholars of distinction for substantial lengths of time, a focus in astrophysics as a focus for the sciences, and continued development of the school’s strengths in the “mind, brain, and behavior” area.

Arts and Sciences has continuing financial problems. The school is underendowed for its size, though the endowment has grown substantially (more than doubling since 1987). It has accumulated deficits from the past several years, and essentially no capital budget. Subvention as a percentage of revenue has declined over the past several years and undergraduate financial aid has increased as a percentage of expenses. The school must find funds to invest in research facilities, to improve its technology in such areas as computing, and to pay its share of the debt for the Institute for Advanced Science and Technology building. The overall picture for the school is one of considerable strength in some areas combined with difficult financial problems.

As a related concern, Penn’s library system is struggling to do well with a restrictive budget. The library is struggling to do a top 10 job on a top 20 budget. It is notable that Penn’s library is one of the most extensive borrowers for interlibrary loans. The basic strategy is to focus acquisitions of conventional books on the humanities, where conventional published products still are crucial, while trying to adapt to the needs of the sciences through other forms of knowledge transmission such as electronic publications.

The committee considered plans to integrate the University’s capital budget with its operating budgets. Evidently, new construction implies continuing costs for maintaining and operating the facilities. Until recently, the connection had not been made within the University’s budget system. The details of the connection are much too complex to summarize; the effort is being made.

The committee will have to consider some serious issues next year. The School of Arts and Sciences must find a sounder footing, lest Penn lose the core of its intellectual activity. It is time to consider modifying responsibility center budgeting to reduce the barriers for education among the undergraduate schools, and to provide the Provost with funds to support cross-school educational activities (as recommended by the report of the Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy). Finally, the percentage of tenured faculty is high at Penn, approaching 80% as compared to 50 to 60% among our competitors. Combined with uncertainty about retirements, this fact raises serious concerns about the continuing renovation of faculty.

2. Extension of SCAFR term.

A motion was moved and adopted that the 1995-96 Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility be extended until June 30, 1996, to complete the work begun this academic year.


The proposal from the Senate Committee on Administration was approved (see next page). In addition, SEC asked that the proposal be forwarded to the Provost with the statement that existing deans should be grandparented.

(SEC Actions continued next page)
4. Just Cause Revision. The Faculty Senate Chairs met with members of the Trustee Committee on Academic Policy to discuss the Faculty Senate’s Proposed Procedure Governing Sanctions Taken Against Members of the Faculty, dated March 1, 1995 (Almanac March 14, 1995). Those discussions centered on who determines sanctions, what appellate procedures exist, and the need to separate the Policy on Misconduct in Research from the Just Cause procedure. The Faculty Senate Chairs proposed two amendments. Motion A would add a new paragraph to the procedure allowing the President to ask for review of a sanction but not to change the sanction. The respondent may also ask for a review. Power to change a sanction would rest with the original hearing board. Motion B would make the Policy on Misconduct in Research a separate document to allow for more detailed required by government agencies. Motion A and Motion B were moved and adopted as follows:

Motion A: Either the President or the respondent may request reconsideration of a sanction recommended by a Hearing Board by submitting a written statement to the chair of the Board within 5 days of the panel’s initial recommendation. In the event of such a request, the chair shall reconvene the Hearing Board within 5 days of the receipt of the request and hear statements from both the complainant and the respondent, delivered either personally or through counsel. The Hearing Board may, by majority vote, elect to recommend an increased or a decreased sanction; if the Board does not vote to change its recommendation, the initial recommendation remains in force. The chair of the Hearing Board shall communicate its recommendation to the President and to the respondent in writing immediately following the Board’s decision.

Motion B: SEC moved that, the Policy on Misconduct in Research be separated from the Just Cause procedure, provided that no changes in substance or definition are made.

5. Faculty Exit Interviewers. SEC made additional nominations to a pool of faculty for exit interview panels. In 1993 SEC adopted the Committee on the Faculty’s recommendation to establish exit interviews. Interviews will commence during the next academic year, pending approval by the Faculty Senate and the administration of a questionnaire and interviewer training. President Rodin stated the information from the interviews would be very useful.

6. Proposal to Abolish the annual meeting of the Faculty Senate. The following motion was moved:

Whereas, the Faculty Senate of the University of Pennsylvania comprises some 2000 Standing Faculty. The Senate holds an annual Spring meeting for which a quorum has been set at 100 members in attendance. In recent memory a quorum has been achieved on but a few occasions. On several, however, significant issues have drawn a very large attendance. It would seem appropriate to amend the Faculty Senate Rules to preserve the forum when needed but to substitute dissemination of information about the work of the Senate Executive Committee and other Senate committees in more routine years in lieu of a sparsely attended ritual.

First, it is proposed that the annual Spring meeting be discontinued except on the call of the Chair or a determination by the Senate Executive Committee in March. It would continue to be possible for any twenty members of the Standing Faculty to call for a meeting by petition.

Second, the Chair will publish in Almanac for 1996-97 a comprehensive report of the work of the Faculty Senate for the current academic year and probable significant issues for the succeeding academic year.

Third, additional reports of the other Senate committees as well as SEC Actions will continue to be published in Almanac for information and comment.

Motion: Be it resolved that, the Senate Executive Committee moves the following principle be submitted to the standing faculty for a vote by mail ballot: The required annual Spring Faculty Senate meeting shall be replaced with a required written annual report from the Chair of the Faculty Senate published in Almanac by the third week in April. An annual Spring meeting of the Faculty Senate shall be held on the call of the Chair or a determination by the Executive Committee in March.

It was stated that no other changes in the rules were intended. SEC was asked only to vote on whether to send the motion to the standing faculty for a vote. Lively discussion ensued. In support of the motion a SEC member noted the declining attendance at the annual meeting meant that SEC members and committee chairs comprised those present and that often more faculty attend SEC meetings. Other views were the need to: 1) publish the proposal; 2) allow sufficient time for discussion; and 3) retain the annual meeting to allow questions by faculty not serving on Senate committees and to provide faculty the opportunity to directly ask questions of the President and Provost. A motion was made to table. The motion to table was adopted.

7. Retiree waiver required by University. SEC Law School representative Charles Mooney was asked by the Faculty Senate Chairs to review the waiver in response to concerns raised by several retiring faculty members. The waiver states that retiring faculty will discontinue any complaints against the University that are pending and will release the University on any claims up to that time. His analysis was that this is reasonable to expect, but suggested two points. One, add to the waiver a provision allowing existing claims with the administration to be left on the table for negotiation. Two, develop a brief cover sheet explaining why the University needs this waiver to be signed by retirees. The Provost stated the cover sheet was a good idea and that he would look into the other suggestion.

New Business

8. Selection of Four SEC Members for the Council Steering Committee. Five SEC members were nominated for 4 positions on the 1996-97 Council Steering Committee. Voting was accomplished by paper ballot.

9. Informal discussion with the President and Provost. President Rodin stated the University is moving forward on reengineering. She noted the positive effects the new Barnes and Noble Bookstore will bring to the University, other merchants and the community. The focus next year will be on the future of academic programs. The President noted the continuing challenge in the lack of understanding by the general population regarding the integration of teaching and research and the role of research universities. Provost Chodorow said his focus next year would be the continuation of the development of the 21st Century Project, the improvement of the undergraduate experience, and enhancing technology across the board.

10. June Meeting. A motion was moved and adopted that the SEC meeting scheduled for June 7 be cancelled.

11. New Business. Peter Kuriloff stated what he saw as the central issues facing the University and SEC for next year: faculty benefits, the status of the School of Arts and Sciences, undergraduate education and implementation of recommendations of the Committee on Undergraduate Education, and Educational Policy (Almanac April 16, 1996), and the ongoing and complex relationships between the rest of the University and the Medical School. On the last issue, plans are being made to establish a joint committee of the Faculty Senate and Medical Faculty Senate. SEC members were invited to communicate their suggestions for committee charges for 1996-97.

Outgoing Faculty Senate Chair William L. Kissick thanked Past Chair David K. Hildebrand and Incoming Chair Peter J. Kuriloff.

Revised Proposal on Renewals of Terms of Office for Deans

May 1, 1996

The following is proposed for revision of the Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators Section I.E.2. p. 9.

Deans. Deans are appointed for terms of no more than seven years. Cumulative service for a maximum of ten years may be approved by the President and Provost in exceptional cases, and additional three-year terms beyond the ten-year maximum may be approved by the President and Provost upon the recommendation of eighty percent of the voting faculty of the school, polled in a secret mail ballot.

If any reappointment for a term of two years or more is contemplated, a consultative review committee shall be established in the penultimate year of the appointment. The voting faculty of the school shall elect four of its own members to this committee, to be matched by an equal number chosen by the President and Provost, who shall ensure that there are faculty representatives from within the University but from outside the school. There shall be one non-voting alumni representative, one non-voting graduate-professional student, and in the case where there are undergraduate programs in the school, one non-voting undergraduate student. The consultative committee shall advise the President and Provost on the desirability of reappointment. The committee may determine to seek additional information and advice they think appropriate.

The committee shall seek the opinion of all faculty and students in the school, and it shall forward such opinions to the President and Provost. If the school has been recently reviewed by the Council of Financial Planning and Budget Committee, an outside accreditation organization, or some other means, those findings and reports shall be made available to the consultative committee.
Death of Dr. Samuel P. Martin

Dr. Samuel Preston Martin, III, an innovator in the field of medical education and management, died of lymphoma in Gainesville, Florida, on May 2. He was 80 years of age.

Dr. Martin was professor emeritus of medicine and health care systems at Penn. During his quarter century here he was professor of medicine, executive director of the Leonard Davis Institute of Health Economics, chairman of the Health Care Systems Unit of the Wharton School, master of Ware College Health and Society House, founding Director of the Robert Wood Clinical Scholars Program, for fellowship training in the social, behavioral and management sciences for board certified physicians.

A leader in developing the M.B.A. Program in Health Care Management at the Wharton School, he taught in it for some two decades. Since 1970, the program has graduated more than 100 physicians with an M.B.A. degree.

He was born May 2, 1916, in East Prairie, Missouri, a community of 600 where his father was a general practitioner. After receiving his medical education at Washington University of St. Louis, he pursued his house officer training at Barnes Hospital in St. Louis.

In September 1946, as a captain in the United States Army Medical Corps, Dr. Martin—a veteran Arctic explorer and woodsman—led the team that rescued the survivors of a Sabena transatlantic airliner that crashed in a dense forest southwest of Gander, Newfoundland. For his heroic efforts he was awarded the Belgian Order of Leopold.

Dr. Martin was a Markle Scholar from 1950 to 1955 and began his academic career at the Duke University Medical Center as an assistant professor in medicine. He was recruited in 1956 to the newly organized School of Medicine at the University of Florida in Gainesville, as professor and head of the Department of Medicine.

Subsequently he was appointed Provost for Health Affairs of the J. Hillis Miller Health Center and teaching medical complex for the University of Florida, comprising schools of medicine, nursing, dentistry, and the University teaching hospital.

In 1970 he spent a sabbatical year at the Harvard Medical School and the London School of Economics pursuing his interests in health services research. It was at this time that he was recruited to a newly organized Department of Community Medicine at the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine and at age 54 began his remarkable career Penn.

Over the years, Dr. Martin has served as a consultant to the U.S. Public Health Service, the U.S. Office of Education, the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. For more than a decade he served on the Board of Directors of SmithKline Beckman Corporation. He also served as a consultant to the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.

Revered by his colleagues and students, Dr. Martin enjoyed their awe and affection. At 6’4” he was an imposing figure. His long and varied career provided a wealth of stories, some told with tongue in cheek. A father figure to many young women and men in the medical profession, he will be remembered for his astute counsel and warm and gentle demeanor so reminiscent of the beloved country doctor. Always an innovator, he probed boundaries and constraints of conventional wisdom in search of creative resolutions for seemingly insurmountable problems in the American health care enterprise.

A memorial service will be announced in the fall for Dr. Martin, who is survived by his first wife, Ruth Campbell Martin, three children—Dr. Samuel Preston Martin IV, Dr. William Barry Martin, and Dr. Celia Martin—and by five grandchildren. His second wife, Dorothy Everett Martin died in February 1996.
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A City-Wide ‘Best Secretary’

Monica Dalin, assistant to the chair in chemical engineering, was one of five winners in the city-wide “Best Secretary Contest” sponsored by HQ Business Center a world-wide firm with offices in Center City Philadelphia.

On Secretary’s Day, Mayor Ed Rendell presented certificates to the five, who were chosen from some 300 nominees on the basis of 50-word statements sent by their supervisors. Ms. Dalin was nominated by Dr. T. Kyle Vanderlick, Class of 1942 Term Professor, who wrote: Like Lou Grant, I have a Mary who can turn the world on with a smile. Like Captain Stubin, I have a Julie who keeps the ship sailing smoothly. When the going gets tough, I have Thelma and Louise to set things straight. My dream team is my secretary—Monica.

Ms. Dalin joined Penn in 1987 and moved to the chemical engineering department in 1992 as graduate assistant to Dr. Vanderlick. Ms. Dalin was promoted to the assistant to the chair in 1995.
A New Prize: March of Dimes Award to Dr. Brinster
Dr. Ralph Brinster, Richard King Mellon Professor of Reproductive Physiology in the School of Veterinary Medicine, is the co-recipient (with Dr. Beatrice Mintz of Fox Chase Cancer Center), of the first annual March of Dimes Prize in Developmental Biology. Dr. Brinster and Dr. Mintz share a $100,000 prize, which was presented at an April 12 ceremony in Manhattan, attended by Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, the granddaughter of the President who was a founder of the March of Dimes, and by Francoise Gilot, the widow of Dr. Jonas Salk, in whose name the award was created.

Through concepts and techniques pioneered independently by the two scientists, a March of Dimes spokesperson said, a “transgenic” mouse was created and is being used to discover how genes are “turned on and off” during the course of normal and abnormal embryonic development. The mice produce models for many human disorders, including birth defects, cancer and heart disease. They also guide scientists to the location of genes that control certain traits, such as inherited susceptibility to diabetes.

A Tribute to Bruce Montgomery
On Saturday night, April 27, the Annenberg Center’s Zellerbach Theatre was the setting for a demonstration of affection for a continuing member of the University which I believe was unique in the history of Penn.

Friends, family and hundreds of alumni Glee Clubbers came from all points of the compass to express their love for and pay tribute to Bruce Montgomery. The occasion was a salute to Bruce for his 40 years as Director of Penn’s Glee Club, and at the same time a fund-raiser for the Montgomery Fund established in Bruce’s honor to support Glee Club activities.

It was an evening of glorious music performed by the present undergraduate Glee Club, with individual numbers by old-time Clubbers giving us selections from programs produced during Bruce’s past 40 years. Topping off the scheduled numbers, alumni of four decades left their seats in the audience to join the undergraduates on-stage for the finale. What ensued was a rousing medley of massed four-part choral singing, with young and old rendering their respective parts flawlessly under “Monty’s” direction.

Provost Chodrow, in his tribute to Bruce, emphasized the important role played by Penn’s art activities in the enrichment of student life, and the invaluable contribution Bruce has made—and continues to make. I heartily second the tribute.

— Maurice S.arrison, Director, The Faculty Club Art Gallery

Reminders:
Faculty Club Annual Meeting
Today is the annual meeting for Club members at 4 p.m. in the Faculty Club. The agenda includes a long-range planning report and the election of members to the Faculty Club Board of Governors (Almanac April 16).

Baccalaureate Procession
As noted by the interim chaplain last week, faculty who wish to march in the procession on Baccalaureate Sunday afternoon, May 19, should contact the Rev. Frederic Guyott, III, at 898-8456 or by e-mail at mora@pobox.upenn.edu.

A Scholarship Fund for Dr. Wallace Miller
The Wallace T. Miller, Sr., M.D., Scholarship Fund has been inaugurated to honor the many personal and professional contributions of that Dr. Miller, as professor of radiology and chief of the department of radiology’s chest division, has made to the University of Pennsylvania Medical Center and Health System.

Funded primarily through the generosity of former Radiology residents, the drive to establish this fund was initiated in December 1994 following Dr. Miller’s receipt of the Philadelphia Roentgen Ray Society Outstanding Educator Award. The Miller Scholarship Fund will provide tuition assistance on an annual basis to deserving medical students who demonstrate financial need and who exhibit great potential for excellence in the teaching and practice of medicine.

Dr. Miller has been an integral part of the Medical Center and Health System for almost 40 years. Since completing his residency in radiology at HUP in 1960, in his numerous academic and professional appointments with the department of radiology, he has served “with great dedication, offering to all his concern and expertise as an accomplished physician, educator and mentor,” one former resident said. “In learning from Wally, you went through several distinct phases. First, you were infected by his enthusiasm; then you were awed by his skill as a radiologist; and finally you were appreciative of his commitment as an educator to each resident.”

The Miller Scholarship Fund recognizes Dr. Miller’s many outstanding accomplishments while rewarding and encouraging medical students who exemplify the skill and integrity that Dr. Miller consistently has exhibited in his dealings with students, trainees, colleagues and patients. To join in this tribute to Dr. Miller, call the Office of Medical Center Development at 898-9486 for more information.

— Nelda Siemion, Associate Director, Medical Center Development

Some winners at the AWFA Awards breakfast, left to right: Catherine Carr, Madeleine Lopez, Elena DiLapi, Onyx Finney, Mika Rao, Jennifer Pollitt, and Christine Dacier.
Philomathean Society Puts on a Good Show

By Jerry Janda

Father Goose started the play with a tirade on his wife, Mother Goose. And for good reason.

“You know those stories she is so famous for telling?” he asked the audience. “You know, the one about the egg who took a fall, those poor kids who live in the Nike, and

that stupid girl who should have been arrested for breaking and entering the Bears’ pad?”

A few youngsters answered in the affirmative. Some nodded their heads. Most just gandered at the feathered narrator.

“Well, I wrote them,” he continued, sounding understandably upset over his missus’s plagiarism. “She took them, maybe changed a few minor points, here and there, and made a killing with them on The New York Times Bestseller List. Now, I’m here to set the record straight, and tell the stories the way they were meant to be told—the way I wrote them. So, sit back and relax and enjoy the fairy tales of Father Goose....”

For forty minutes, Father Goose and a gaggle of colorful characters captivated a roomful of patients at Children’s Hospital of Philadelphia (CHOP). The characters, themselves, are nothing more than puppets, fashioned from simple materials: paper-mache, coats of paint, pieces of brightly colored cloth. But in the hands of four talented Penn undergraduates, the puppets came to life—cracking jokes, teaching valuable lessons about individuality and friendship, and bringing smiles to the faces of sick children.

The puppet play was born through Philo’s Living and Advocating Youth Committee. PLAY is the brainchild of Elliott Witney (C‘97), an officer in the Philomathean Society (Philo for short).

As members of Penn’s oldest student group, students in Philo work hard to promote learning and increase the academic prestige of the University. Naturally, Witney wanted them to add PLAY to their busy schedules.

“The idea is that if you are not relaxed, and you’re stressed out, you won’t produce anything,” he explained.

Last year, PLAY planned activities reminiscent of the days of youth. Philo members chased each other through games of tag. They climbed trees. In short, they had a good time. But something was missing. Philo members concluded that PLAY should incorporate some community service into its events. Only then were they sure how.

Until April Richard (C‘96) came along. Richard believed a puppet show would be the perfect way to provide community service while still serving PLAY’s main purpose: having fun in a childlike fashion. Witney agreed, adding that CHOP would be a good place for the play.

“Sick children have nothing to do except sit around and be sick,” he said. “So let’s brighten their lives a little bit.”

CHOP’s Child Life Department gave the students certain guidelines to follow. They also reviewed the play’s script for appropriateness and requested a few changes. Not because the play was too mature for young audiences, but because the average child doesn’t have the vocabulary of a typical Penn student.

“We changed words like ‘monarch’ to ‘king,” ‘Richard said with a chuckle.

Even after the rewrites, some of the jokes went over the children’s heads. When the play’s wicked witch—a ubiquitous character in any fairy tale—slunk off to turn a newt into a congressman, the children sat stony-faced. But the parents and nurses in the room grinned in appreciation.

Subtle political humor aside, the play offered plenty to keep the kids entertained. “I thought the script was very cute,” said Amanda Butler, a child life assistant at CHOP. “and the children really seemed to enjoy it.”

The script is actually two scripts, tied together by Father Goose’s narration. Although Father Goose takes credit for the tales, the real authors are Philo members.

Jeff Wachs (C‘97) penned the first story. A twist on a common theme, it’s about a wicked witch who turns a frog into a prince. While one might expect the onetime amphibian to bask in the luxury of royal mammalian comfort, the former frog longs for his flippers and lily pad.

“It’s very funny,” Richard said. “Jeff is very talented at comedy.”

Not so funny is Utpal the tiger, the protagonist of the second story. Utpal tries to impress the other animals in the jungle by telling jokes. The problem is, he’s not a very good comedian. In fact, he stinks.

“It has a moral in it about friendship,” Richard said of the story, written by Richard Cardona (C‘96). “The moral of the story is to be yourself.”

Cardona and Wachs were only two of the Penn students who helped make the puppet show possible. Nearly 30 people, many not
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Philos’s puppets take the stage at CHOP.
affiliated with Philo, chipped in by building the theater and designing the puppets.

Funding for the play came from Philo’s treasury. SAC also reimbursed some of the purchases made by Richard, who got discounts from vendors in West Philadelphia.

“We’ve tried to keep it as low-cost as possible,” she said.

“Without stealing,” Witney chimed in.

Luck and generosity also played pivotal roles. During a last-minute search for some plywood for the puppet theater, Richard noticed a construction worker at College Hall. “I asked, ‘Do you know where I can get two sheets of plywood at two in the afternoon?’” she recalled. “He said, ‘We’ve got two extra sheets for you.’ That turned out to be a lifesaver.”

When the students couldn’t get something they wanted, they made do with what they had. That’s why one of the puppets, an elephant, is pink. “We couldn’t find any gray material,” Richard said, laughing.

This kind of creative spontaneity was also demonstrated backstage. Some unforeseen mishaps called for impromptu solutions.

“We had some problems behind the scenes, like scripts falling on the floor in a thousand places, but no one knew that on the other side, and we had fun, improvising at some areas,” Richard said. “One of the main props, a little frog that turns the frog prince back into a frog, dropped, so we improvised, and that was fun, too.”

Richard and three other Philo members used nine puppets to portray 11 characters. That meant that the puppeteers had to master multiple voices. “I had to work on my laugh,” said Richard, who provided the wicked witch’s sinister cackle, as well as the voice of the pink elephant. Albert Dickson (C’96), Caith Kushner (C’99) and Wachs, who showed that he can act as well as he can write, rounded out the cast.

The Penn students encouraged audience participation, and the youngsters enthusiastically accepted the invitation, reciting dialogue and providing sound effects. The puppeteers also mingled with the children.

“At the beginning and end of the play, they were allowed to actually handle the puppets and meet the puppeteers, and they really enjoyed that,” Butler said.

Richard said that many of the children wanted to play with Utpal, who, despite his horrible jokes, won the approval of the audience. The king—the “monarch” of the original script—was also a hit.

“The king has a very funny voice,” Richard said, “so everyone wanted to come up and talk to him.” Since Philo now has all of the props needed to put on a puppet play, Richard hopes to take the show on the road—perhaps performing at schools and other hospitals. The play will also stop back at CHOP. Butler welcomes the encore.

“I’d love to have more puppet shows in the hospital,” she said.

Preparing Bookstore Employees for Barnes & Noble

The Human Resources and Business Services divisions are working together to assure that bookstore employees are provided with information and services now that Barnes & Noble is assuming management of Penn’s bookstore on July 1.

“We care about our employees, and we understand that they are anxious about their future employment,” said Executive Vice President John Fry. “We are keeping everyone informed about the process, about Barnes & Noble policies, and about the resources available to help them through this transition.”

Barnes & Noble has agreed to give first consideration to all current University bookstore employees. Fry said. Barnes & Noble began interviewing all current employees yesterday and will complete those interviews today. The company will notify all employees of their status by May 30.

Approximately 45 employees attended three résumé-development and interviewing-skills sessions conducted last week by Human Resources. Employees were provided with general information about Barnes & Noble, as well as the specific questions they would be asked at their interviews. In addition, each bookstore employee received a letter with the following details:

• Staff hired by Barnes & Noble will receive their current rate of pay plus a salary increase equal to that for which they were eligible on July 1, 1996.

• Barnes & Noble will provide annual vacation time equal to each staff member’s current eligibility or the Barnes & Noble schedule, whichever is greater.

• For weekly paid staff in the defined benefit pension program, Barnes & Noble will vest each individual with their current years of service at Penn in the Barnes & Noble 401(k) plan.

• Barnes & Noble will waive any pre-existing conditions for eligibility in its medical and dental plans.

Marie Witt, director of support services for Business Services, said that bookstore employees hired by Barnes & Noble will still be able to use Penn’s credit union.

Fry said that the University was continuing to negotiate with Barnes & Noble regarding other issues, such as sick leave, short-term disability and other benefits.

“We entered into this arrangement with Barnes & Noble not only because they are a terrific bookstore, but also because they are a first-class employer,” Fry said.

Those employees not hired by Barnes & Noble will be assisted by the University’s Position Discontinuance and Staff Transition (PDST) policy. The policy provides for both inplacement and outplacement services, pay continuation, and continuation of some benefits to those eligible employees whose positions are eliminated as a result of administrative restructuring.

Photograph by Candace diCarlo

The king (Dickson) holds court with one of his fans.
Shalala Discusses Poverty, Welfare Reform

Thursday, April 25, was “Take Our Daughters to Work” day, and Donna E. Shalala, U.S. Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS), noted that fact at the top of the keynote address she delivered at the Annenberg Center during the spring meeting of the Trustees’ Council of Penn Women.

“What our daughters are seeing today is a new world of women at work—a world forged by their mothers and grandmothers—year by year, in different ways, women have climbed new mountains—and secured new rights,” Shalala said. “Voting rights. Reproductive freedom. Economic security. Employment opportunities.”

After acknowledging the progress of the past, Shalala spoke of creating a women’s agenda for the 21st century. “In order to do this, we must tackle one of our nation’s greatest tragedies: women in poverty,” she said. “Why? Because poverty hurts our families and children. It weakens our economy. And it touches all of us, rich and poor, women and men.”

Reforming the welfare system “the right way” was a key focus of the secretary’s message. “I had a working-class childhood in the traditional sense of the word: everybody worked, played by the rules and taught their children to do the same,” Shalala said. “Children, then and now, need to see adults working. They need to see work as an inherent part of citizenship and responsible adulthood.”

Shalala said that the solution is to make work pay, so that going to work is a more-rational choice than staying on welfare. She cited the step her department took in 1993, by expanding the Earned Income Tax Credit by $22 billion. She noted that this credit gives a tax refund to the working poor, including millions of female-headed households. In addition, she emphasized the importance of raising the minimum wage from the current $4.25 an hour to $5.15, which adds up to $1,800 a year for a full-time worker.

Shalala also discussed the role of fathers. “We need to counter the sometimes unconscious message that children don’t need fathers—that mothers are the only nurturers—and fathers are a bonus, but hardly a necessity,” she said. “Children need both parents to teach them right from wrong. Both parents to walk them to school and meet their teachers. And both parents to love and guide them through the rough waters of adolescence.”

GSE Spring Forum ’96 Honors Ann Lieberman

GSE Dean Susan Fuhrman (left) noted that Spring Forum honors “the nation’s most-distinguished educators.” Spring Forum ’96 was no exception.

Ann Lieberman (center)—professor at Teachers College, Columbia University, and co-director of the National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching—was this year’s recipient of the National Award of Distinction of the University of Pennsylvania Education Alumni Association. The Education Alumni Association (EAA) co-sponsors the Spring Forum with GSE, Phi Delta Kappa (Tau Chapter), Pi Lambda Theta (Philadelphia Area Chapter) and the GSE Student Organizations Committee.

In presenting the award to Lieberman, EAA President Amy Sichel (right) said, “You are respected in the educational community for your wisdom and your character.”

As the forum’s keynote speaker, Lieberman discussed “Network and a Changing View of Professional Development.” She explained that teacher networks are great instruments of reform, because they encourage learning, sharing and discussion.

Lieberman started her career as a sixth-grade teacher. Back then, she said, teachers had little influence on educational reform. “Things have changed since those days,” she continued, “but not enough.”

According to Lieberman, networks allow teachers to take an active role in reform. Network members share goals and responsibilities. Everyone is given an opportunity to contribute. This dynamic participation breeds reform plans.

Lieberman has studied 16 different networks. One thing that they all share in common is the fact that they are all so diverse. “You can’t franchise networks,” she said, “because no two are alike.”

Lieberman pointed out that successful networks, despite their differences, empower participants. Through networks, teachers listen to the ideas of others yet still have the freedom to make their own decisions. “Teachers don’t have to solely be the recipients of other people’s agendas,” she said.
Innovation Corner

Supporting Research

By Phyllis Holtzman

With over $260 million generated annually in sponsored research, Penn has consistently ranked in the top 20 research institutions nationwide. The process of supporting the research enterprise—functions that range from preparing and submitting the initial proposal to accepting awards, preparing budgets, managing funds and reporting to sponsors—is integral to the continued success of this critical University mission.

In fact, President Judith Rodin’s Agenda for Excellence has identified increasing Penn’s research opportunities as a key strategic goal. A component of this strategy is streamlining the University’s pre- and post-award processes to increase efficiency and facilitate the pursuit and receipt of external funds.

The Research Administration Reengineering Team, chartered in August 1995, has completed its preliminary report, which will be published for comment in next week’s Almanac. The team operated under the direction and oversight of a Steering Committee comprising deans, faculty and senior academic administrators. The committee was co-chaired by Provost Stanley Chodorow and Executive Vice President John Fry.

“The committee interviewed faculty members extensively and learned a great deal about how to streamline those operations that support faculty research,” Chodorow said. “This report reflects that input and will greatly improve our ability to meet the overall research goals of the University, as well as those of individual faculty members.”

The team’s goal is to develop a new model for research-administration support processes that would improve the delivery of service to faculty, said Anthony Merritt, director of the Office of Research Administration and the team’s leader. “We’re trying to make life as easy as possible for faculty researchers while assuring adherence to our sponsor’s requirements and University policies.”

The team sought to involve a broad range of University faculty and staff in gathering data for the report by conducting surveys, focus groups, and individual interviews with faculty, administrators and department chairs. After analyzing the data collected, the team identified five parts of the process of most concern to faculty researchers. The areas viewed as problematic were: compiling nonresearch portions of the proposal; submitting the proposal on time to sponsors; gaining University approvals; preparing and calculating non-standard budgets; and having timely access to accurate financial information.

“We had a high response rate from our faculty survey,” Merritt noted. “We feel confident that the issues we addressed are representative of the full range of faculty concerns.”

The new model addresses those concerns, Merritt said, primarily by providing improved information and service to faculty through the use of new technologies, including the World Wide Web; enhanced training and communications; and reducing the number of reviews.

“These improvements are crucial to maintaining Penn’s pre-eminent research enterprise,” said Ralph Amado, acting vice provost for research and a member of the Steering Committee. “Attracting and retaining the best faculty researchers, who advance knowledge on nearly all fronts and provide our students with the unique opportunity to have the richest research training experience, will be enhanced by this effort.”

The model proposed by the team will rely heavily on the development of a comprehensive and interactive information system. Such a system would allow for electronic transmission of information at all steps of the process; reduction of paper; speedier approvals; timely award notification and account establishment; desktop management of award funds; accessibility to all pertinent data; and reduction of redundant data entry. An example of the changes to be made is allowing faculty researchers direct access to the Sponsored Projects Information Network (SPIN) for identifying funding sources.

“The research enterprise is a critical component of Penn’s mission,” Fry said. “It’s time to take our sponsored-projects support processes to the next level, by taking advantage of new technologies.

Many universities are looking to do this, and we are confident that Penn will lead the charge.”

Stephen Golding, vice president for finance, noted that FinMIS (Financial Management Information System)—the University’s new accounting and purchasing system, which will be in place July 1—is a first step toward maximizing the use of new technologies in the University’s business practices.

“FinMIS will allow us to do a lot of things more efficiently, more efficiently, and with more responsiveness to the needs of the people we serve,” Golding said. “Other new technologies we envision for our re-engineered research support practices will need to be developed over time.”

Merritt praised the efforts of the 11-member team, who “committed an enormous amount of time and energy to the project, while maintaining their regular workday schedules.”

“This was a tremendous effort by everyone involved, and we are very appreciative of their work,” he added.

The following are additional highlights of the team’s recommendations:

• Standard proposals (defined as proposals having standard indirect cost rates, no renovated or new space requirements, no matching institutional funds, and not seeking corporate sponsorship) will no longer require review by the dean of the principal investigator’s school, and will no longer require review by deans and department chairs of co-investigators’ schools; however, deans and department chairs will have access to the proposal information at all steps in the process via the sponsored-projects information system and database.

• The process for reviewing nonstandard proposals (defined as proposals having nonstandard indirect cost rates, new or renovated space requirements, matching institutional funds, or sponsored by industry) will be streamlined to allow for early and ongoing negotiation of terms and conditions, accessibility of information/data by all required parties, and a nonlinear process of obtaining required approvals.

• Enhanced training and communication in all aspects of managing the sponsored project’s life cycle will be a priority.

Questions? Comments? Something newsworthy to report? Contact The Compass at (215) 898-1427 or jandag@pobox.upenn.edu.
Mary Ellen Mark’s Photography on View

By Kirby F. Smith

Award-winning documentary photographer and photojournalist Mary Ellen Mark came to campus last month to give a slide lecture as part of “Mary Ellen Mark: 30 Years,” the current exhibition at the Arthur Ross Gallery. It was a homecoming of sorts.

Mark, a Penn alumna, developed her love for photography at the University. She received a bachelor’s degree in painting and art history in 1962, and a master’s degree in photojournalism from the Annenberg School for Communication in 1964. “From the very first class I took at Annenberg, I knew that photography was my vocation,” she said. “I attended graduate school on a Walter Annenberg scholarship, and I thank him for that gift.”

Throughout her 30-year career, Mark has focused on the “unfamous.” From blind children in the Ukraine to homeless teenagers in the United States, she brings out the common humanity in her subjects.

“Mary Ellen Mark: 30 Years” displays more than 100 of Mark’s black-and-white pictures. The exhibition includes photographs of rural America, heroin addicts in London, and street children all over the world, as well as photos taken during Mark’s trips to India, where she visited 16 circuses. The exhibition also features 10 previously unpublished photographs that Mark selected for the Arthur Ross Gallery.

“The works she chose to print for us, like all her images, tell the whole story while also reflecting recurrent themes: homelessness, confinement, the circus, and people from all walks of life,” said Dilies Winegrad, director of the gallery. “In the new photographs, the artist returns to a family she’s documented before; portrays youngsters in Ireland and the Bronx; and presents images from the National Circus of Vietnam. People appear together with their animals or the plaything that provides comfort.”

Mark began her photographic career in 1965, when she was granted a Fulbright scholarship to photograph in Turkey. She returned to New York a year later and began to document anything that interested her: Central Park, the early days of the women’s movement, body builders, the Psychedelic Burlesque.

In 1967, Mark was contracted to make stills for the movie “Alice’s Restaurant.” Since then, she has worked on many films, such as “The Day of the Locust,” “Apocalypse Now,” “Ragtime,” “Silkwood,” “Carnal Knowledge” and “Catch-22.”

During her lecture, Mark noted that she always tries to win the confidence of the people she photographs. This allows her to get close to her subjects.

“One of my assignments was to take pictures of prostitutes in the Falkland Road section of Bombay,” she explained. “I started wandering the streets of the district, because I knew that I had to gain access and the trust of the women I wanted to photograph. I was tenacious, and finally, after three months, I was able to be accepted.”

Mark was quick to add, however, that it’s possible to get too close to a subject. She found this out while making stills for “One Flew Over the Cuckoo’s Nest.” During the shoot, she had the opportunity to photograph one group of women in a hospital, day after day. “Those women in the hospital were filed away and forgotten,” she said. “Taking pictures of them taught me to know how far you can go—how close you can get to your subject before you have to stop.”

Mark noted that she often chooses subjects that cross cultural boundaries, as demonstrated in her series of portraits of street children. In 1983, she had an assignment from Life magazine to take pictures of homeless youth. She chose Seattle as her base, because she wanted to show that if one found kids living on the streets of Seattle, one would find them in every city. A later assignment took her to Khartoum, in Sudan, where she photographed children who were drug addicts. “Just like the kids in Seattle, only younger,” she said.

To avoid clichés in her photography, Mark does a great deal of research before taking on an assignment. That’s why in a series on poverty, she photographed three brothers, ranging in age from 8 to 13, who were sucking their thumbs.

“Taking pictures of people in poverty is difficult, because of so many clichés,” Mark said. “Poverty is about major societal problems, like dysfunctional families, and I think that showing three older boys sucking their thumbs conveys the power of poverty, beyond cliché.”

Following Mark’s lecture, a reception was held in her honor at the Arthur Ross Gallery. At the reception, Annenberg School Dean Kathleen Hall Jamieson told those in attendance that it was clear Mary Ellen Mark was always interested in the human beings she photographed, because during her slide lecture, she identified everyone in her pictures by name.

Mark’s work has been published and exhibited internationally. Her books include “Passport,” “Ward 81,” “Falkland Road,” “Mother Teresa’s Missions of Charity in Calcutta,” “Streetwise,” and “The Photo Essay.” She has received three National Endowment for the Arts grants and many photography awards. “Mary Ellen Mark: 30 Years” remains on view in the Arthur Ross Gallery through June 9.

Questions? Comments? Something newsworthy to report? Contact The Compass at (215) 898-1427 or jandag@pobox.upenn.edu.
Listed below are 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, 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. (Baseline-across from B-30) Hamilton Hall—53th & Spruce St. (Baseline-across from 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 (www.hr.upenn.edu/appointment). A position must be posted for seven (7) calendar days before a position can be made. The Job Opportunities Hotline is a 24-hour interactive telephone system. By dialing 888-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 DETAILED 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

**RESEARCH SPECIALIST IV** (04388NS) Responsible for maintaining advanced physics lab, overseeing students performing experiments in lab; develop new labs, both at the grad/undergrad level & develop report on the undergraduates level. Qual.: Master’s req.; PhD preferred at least two five yrs. exp.; mechanical skills &/or electronic skills &/or computer skills preferred; good interpersonal skills helpful; computer and word processing. Grade: P6; Range: $31,900-40,600 4-30-96 Physics & Astros.

**ASSISTANT DIRECTOR II** (03283NS) (End date: 9/30/98) P4; $26,200-34,100 4-1-96 Political Science

**ASST DEAN & ADVISING II** (03205NS) (End date: 5/1/97) P6; $31,900-40,600 3-22-96 College BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR V/MANAGER & FINANCE (04358NS) P6/P7; $31,900-40,600 3-30-96 Political Science

**INFO. N MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST I** (11589NS) P4; $26,200-34,100 11-24-95 SAS Computing PROGRAMMER ANALYST I (03264NS) P4; $26,200-34,100 3-25-96 Linguistics

**RESEARCH COORDINATOR, SR.** (03203NS) P4; $26,200-34,100 3-3-96 Linguistics/LDC

**RESEARCH SPECIALIST, JR.** (02171NS) P1; $19,700-25,700 3-3-96 Biology

**RESEARCH SPECIALIST JR.** (03282NS) (End date: 4/30/99) P1/P2; $19,700-25,700 3/20-96 4-3-96 Physics & Astronomy

**RESEARCH SPECIALIST I** (03131NS) P2; $21,700-28,200 4-9-96 Biology

**ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST III** (03204NS) 11; $19,900-25,300 3-8-96 Political Science

**OFFICE ADMIN. ASSISTANT I** (37.5 HRS) (04343NS) G9; $18,321-22,929 4-3-96 Chemistry

**SECRETARY IIY** (37.5HRS) (04344NS) G9; $18,321-22,929 4-3-96 Office of the Dean

## DENTAL SCHOOL

**Specialist:** Clyde Peterson

**RESEARCH SPECIALIST, JR.** (03212CP) P1; $19,700-25,700 3-8-96 Pathology

**ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT II** (04366CP) G10; $18,700-23,300 4-25-96 Restorative Dentistry

**DENTAL ASSISTANT I** (40 HRS) (07098NS) G7; $16,571-23,266 3-8-96 Dental Medicine

**DENTAL ASSISTANT I** (40 HRS) (10429CP) G7; $16,571-20,686 10-5-95 Dental Care Center

**DENTAL ASSISTANT II** (40 HRS) (04301CP) (Schedule: 8 a.m. - 5 p.m.) G8; $18,400 4-8-95 Dental Medicine

**DENTAL ASSISTANT II** (40 HRS) (04351CP) G8; $17,943-22,400 4-22-96 Implant Center

**RESEARCH LAB TECHNICIAN III** (05213CP) G10; $18,700-23,300 3-30-96 Pathology

## ENGINEERING/APPLIED SCIENCE

**Specialist:** Clyde Peterson

**STAFF ASSISTANT III** (043871Z) Provide high level administrative coordination & management support to the Director of the new Institute for Medicine & Engineering; develop relationships & act as liaison with faculty & administrators from various schools, departments, University staff & outside agencies; develop office policies & procedures; create & maintain database; assist in establishing visibility of Institute; schedule meetings, calendar, travel & recruitment visits; assist in grant proposal preparation; work on independent projects, managing data & preparing reports; provide up-dates on status of projects & initiatives to Director; write correspondence & minutes; perform word processing & transcription; manage phone & office reception.

**Qualifications:** BA/BS or equivalent; knowledge of policies & procedures at the University level preferred; knowledge of School of Medicine &/or School of Engineering & Applied Science desired; demonstrated initiative, ability to meet deadlines & teamwork approach; high level of computer literacy, Macintosh expertise, Microsoft Word, FileMaker Pro, Excel & Up-to-Date. STAFF ASSIST. II: one-two yrs. of professional & responsible administrative management. STAFF ASSIST. III: three-five yrs. of professional & responsible administrative management.

**Grade:** P2/P3; Range: $21,700-28,200 3/20-96 5-2-96 Institute for Medicine & Engineering

**SYSTEM PROG. II** (08055CP) (Ongoing contingent on funding) P7; $35,000-43,700 5-17-95 CSIRCS ADMIN. ASSISTANT III (02186CP) G11; $19,900-25,300 4-3-96 Undergraduate Education

## EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

**Specialist:** Nancy Salvatore/Susan Curran INVESTIGATOR, SR. (40HRS) (04391NS) Concept & criminal & other investigations, arrest violators, develop crime analysis & information exchange with this information with other law enforcement agencies; establish a close liaison with local, state & federal law enforcement agencies & with the University community & West Philadelpheia community organizations; train other UPPD investigators & patrol officers to develop their investigative skills & abilities; assist the investigative supervisor in developing policies, procedures & systems to improve the efficiency & effectiveness of the UPPD Investigation Unit. Qualifications: High school graduate or equivalent. Knowledge of local, state & federal law enforcement agencies; arrest violators, develop information & exchange this information with other law enforcement agencies; establish a close liaison with local, state & federal law enforcement agencies & with the University community; ability to obtain a position will require extensive travel throughout the city & on occasion will require unusual hours &/or overtime; position is contingent upon the successful completion of a background investigation & physical examination.) Grade/Range: Union 5-1-96 Division of Public Safety

**ACCOUNTANT, JR.** (04365NS) Perform accounting tasks; handle accounts reconciliations, post journal entries, prepare financial statements in accordance with federal contract & grant guidelines or other sponsored program agreements; interact extensively with University Business Administrators. Qualifications: High school graduate; business curriculum preferred; college level accounting courses or equivalent; two-three yrs. senior accounting clerk experience; demonstrated verbal & written communication skills required. Grade: G11; Range: $19,900-25,300 4-25-96 Comptroller's Office

**ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT III** (37.5 HRS) (04355SC) Provide support to the Manager and Assistant Manager & the Staff & Labor Relations Team; act as liaison with senior management & with numerous & diverse customers; manage Performance Appraisal process in generating reports on return rates; prepare, distribute & collect appraisals; compile & maintain accurate records of appraisals sent & received from field; coordinate information & statistics; respond to inquiries that may require interpretation of policies & procedures; complete & summarize data; prepare reports; organize & maintain confidential office records & files; assist in the administration of the Leave of Absence Procedure & Leave of Absentee Team; manage phases of the Employee Handbook; schedule meetings, events & appointments; compose correspondence, develop forms & brochures, collect, open, sort & distribute mail; handle customer service for department. Qualifications: High school graduate or equivalent; BA/BS preferred; at least two yrs. at the AAII level or comparable background; skilled in project planning & management; expertise in word processing, spreadsheet & computer graphics for correspondence, reports & presentation; knowledge of WordPerfect, Microsoft Windows 3.1-3.5; skilled in dealing with diverse customer & demanding situations continuously, professionally & appropriately; skilled at prioritizing & managing multiple, competing priorities; positive & professional in approach; ability to be collaborative & flexible in approach; superior customer service skills; ability to communicate effectively both orally & in writing. Grade: G11; Range: $21,321-27,107 5-1-96 HR/Staff Relations

**ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT III** (37.5 HRS) (04355SC) Provide administrative support to the Director of the Staff & Labor Relations Team; may also provide support to the Vice President of Human Resources; act as liaison with senior management & with numerous & diverse customers; type & proofread highly confidential &/or comparative material; respond to inquiries that may require interpretation of policies, procedures & contracts; research, compile & summarize data; prepare reports; organize & maintain confidential office records & files; manage contract administration process; manage phases of publishing policies & contracts; develop presentation-quality spreadsheet, charts & graphs; manage personnel; prepare presentations for state & local meetings; events & appointments; maintain records on & monitor expenditures; compose correspondence, develop forms & brochures; collect, open, sort & distribute mail; handle customer service for department. Qualifications: High school graduate or equivalent; BA/BS preferred; at least two yrs. at the AAII level or comparable background; skilled in project planning & management; expertise in word processing, spreadsheet & computer graphics for correspondence, reports &
serve on a variety of committees; serve as a liaison; coordinate logistics for special events on or off campus; ensure the accurate, appropriate & timely flow of information to & from the President’s office on projects & critical current student issues; consult with members of President’s staff & overall University community to gather information needed to appropriately respond to correspondence & write memos & reports for specific occasions; general knowledge & specific interest in administration; evidence of ability to write clear, well-organized, professional reports for internal & external audiences; coordination of moderately heavy equipment. 

(high level administration, pref. in higher ed. or equiv.; responsible for maintaining & operating moderately heavy equipment, process radioactive waste; respond to spills/incidents (24 hour on call) & questions by radioactive worker. Qualifications: 2 years of general college & work experience in a science setting or equivalent. Experience operating moderately heavy equipment desirable; HP Technology Certification or Board eligible; good math, computer & electronics skills. Grade: G12/G13; Range: $22,200-28,600/$24,400-31,400 4/1/96)

CHAPLAIN (08247CP) Ungraded 8-23-95 Provost’s Office

CLINICAL VETERINARIAN (03257CP) (Willing to work irregular hours, weekends & holidays & assume emergency “on-call” responsibilities) Blank 3-28-96 ULAB

CLINICAL VET, (04374CP) (Willing to work irregular hours, weekends & holidays & assume emergency “on-call” responsibilities) Blank 3-28-96 ULAB

DATA ANALYST, SR. (02184CP) P8; $38,500-48,100 3-9-96 UMIS

DATA ANALYST, SR. (03230CP) (Application deadline: 5/15/96) P7; $31,600-40,600 4-29-96 Laboratory Libraries

INTERN, ATHLETICS I (03227CP) (Some evenings & weekends required) (End date: 6/30/97) $10,000 yr.

INTERN, ATHLETICS II (03403CP) (Application deadline: 4/30/96) (End date: 6/30/97) $12,000/monthly 3-21-96 Museum

MUSEUM PUBLIC INFORMATION INTERN (03255CP) (Application deadline: 5/5/96) (End date: 5/31/97) $1200/monthly 3-21-96 Museum

PROGRAMMER ANALYST II (02183CP) P7; $35,000-43,700 3-19-96 University Libraries

PROGRAMMER ANALYST III (03273CP) P7; $35,000-43,700 3-26-96 DCIS

PROGRAM ANALYST II (03327CP) P6/P7; $31,900-40,600/$35,000-43,700 3-26-96 University Libraries

STAFF RESEARCHER I (03211CP) P7; $23,900-30,000 4-29-96 University Libraries

TECH, VET I/II (SPORTS MEDICINE & IMAGING) (03238CP) (Some evenings & weekends as needed) $28,500-48,100/35,000-40,600 4-29-96 UVP

VETERINARY SCHOOL

ASSISTANT TO CHAIRMAN I (04331CP) P1; $19,700-25,700 4-18-96 Provost’s Office

ASSISTANT TO CHAIRMAN II (04383CP) P11; $38,500-48,100 4-19-96 Provost’s Office

ASSISTANT TO CHAIRMAN III (03250CP) G10; $21,600-28,600 4-30-96 Provost’s Office

ASSOCIATE VETERINARY TECH (03252CP) G9; $17,500-24,400 4-29-96 Provost’s Office

CLASSIFIEDS

SALE
51st and Hazel, University City (above Balti- more Ave.), 3 story townhouse 7 bedrooms, 3 baths, fully intact Victorian features in bare wood (never painted), leaded glass French doors, built-in kitchen, excellent condition. $60,000. 349-8911, 748-7335 after 6 p.m.

SUBL ET

Rittenhouse Square, 18th & Spruce. 1 bed room-furnished, $525/month...negotiable. (215) 732-2064.

VACATION
Pocono Chalet, 3DR/1B, deck. Swimming, fishing. $350/week. (215) 573-9048

Wharton School

Specialist: Janet Zinser

ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR IV (02178CP) P7; $31,900-40,600 3-5-96 Management/Leadership

DIRECTOR IV (11550JZ) P7; $45,900-61,100 11-8-95 INFORMATION SYSTEMS SPECIALIST I/II (02145JZ) P5/P6; $28,800-37,600/$35,000-43,700 2-19-96 CWIT

MAJOR GIFT OFFICER (I/II) (11549JZ) (11550JZ) P7; $40,000-50,000/$43,700-50,000 4-19-96 CWIT

Support Office

Specialist: Clyde Peterson

Assistant Director, Upward Bound Program (03211CP) (Work schedule: Tuesday-Saturday) P4; $26,200-34,100 3-7-96 Academic Support Services

Director, Tutoring Services (08363CP) P3; $29,900-33,000 4-22-96 Academic Support Programs

Director, Undergraduate Admissions (04332NS) (Some evenings & weekends as needed) P8; $38,500-48,100 4-26-96 Administrative Affairs

Director, University Libraries (04328CP) (Application deadline: 4/30/96) P7/P8; $38,500-48,100 4-19-96 CWIT

Director, University Libraries (03297CP) (Application deadline: 6/30/96) P6/P7; $31,900-40,600/$35,000-43,700 3-26-96 University Libraries

Director, University Libraries (03296CP) P1; $19,700-25,700 4-19-96 CWIT

Director, University Libraries (03206CP) P3; $23,900-30,000 3-26-96 CWIT

Director, University Libraries (03155CP) G9; $21,600-28,600 4-29-96 CWIT

Director, University Libraries (03435CP) (Applications deadline: 4/30/96) P5/P6; $28,500-37,600/$31,900-40,600 4-29-96 CWIT

Director, University Libraries (03437CP) P7; $35,000-43,700 11-10-95 External Affairs

Director, University Libraries (03433JZ) P6/P7; $31,900-40,600/35,000-43,700 4-29-96 CWIT

Director, University Libraries (03431JZ) P6/P7; $31,900-40,600/35,000-43,700 4-29-96 CWIT

Director, University Libraries (04303JZ) P5/P6; $35,000-43,700 4-29-96 CWIT

Director, University Libraries (12650CP) (Work schedule: Tuesday-Saturday) (End date: 5/31/97) $23,900-30,000 12-13-95 Academic Support

Director of Administration (04300JZ) P4; $38,500-48,100 4-29-96 CWIT

Director of Institutional Research (03225CP) P7; $35,000-43,700 3-26-96 DCIS

Director of Institutional Research (04296CP) P1; $19,700-25,700 4-19-96 CWIT

Director of Institutional Research (03206CP) P3; $23,900-30,000 3-26-96 CWIT

Director of Institutional Research (11555CP) G9; $21,600-28,600 4-29-96 CWIT

Director of Institutional Research (11554CP) P5/P6; $28,800-37,600/$35,000-43,700 2-19-96 CWIT

Director of Institutional Research (11553CP) P5/P6; $28,800-37,600/$35,000-43,700 2-19-96 CWIT
The Quaker Basketball Camp will be held at the Palestra June 24-28, and a moving camp will be held July 1-3. There will also be an overnight camp at Sandy Hill in northeast Maryland July 28-August 2. Camp Sandy Hill is a privately owned residential youth camp located on the Elk River at the headwaters of the Chesapeake Bay. The camp is for both boys and girls, ages 7-18 years old. Information, competition and games are designed to address the age and maturity of the camper. Each camper will be coached throughout the week by Penn players and staff members recognized for their ability to teach basketball in an enthusiastic and safe way.

The Quaker Day Camp fee is $135 with special rates available to children of Penn employees and alumni and families with two or more children attending. The Penn overnight camp at Sandy Hill is $335 with special rates also available. For information and registration forms, please contact Steve Donahue at 898-6142.

Crime Alert: Armed Car Robberies
The Penn Police Department has received information regarding a series of armed car robberies that have occurred in Philadelphia—four apparently connected robberies indicating that Brink’s Armed Car Service has been targeted by a group operating out of the West Philadelphia area. Some safety tips:

- Do not loot near armed car activity. Try to keep a safe distance from armed car activity.
- Do not stop and give information to strangers as this group of actors has been known to engage in confrontational verbal threats.
- If you notice suspicious activity in the area of armed cars, call police immediately by using a Blue Light phone, or dialing “511” from a campus phone or “911” from a pay phone.

Requested by the University Police department between the dates of April 22 and April 28, 1996. Also reported were Crimes Against Property, including 55 thefts (including 4 burglaries, 8 thefts of auto, 16 thefts from autos, 8 of bicycles and parts); 3 incidents of forgery and fraud; 8 incidents of criminal mischief and vandalism; and 1 incident of trespassing and loitering. Full crime reports are in this issue of Almanac on the Web (http://www.upenn.edu/almanac/v42/n31/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 April 22 and April 28, 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 crime report, please call the Division of Public Safety at 888-4482.

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 April 22 through April 28, 1996. Also reported were Crimes Against Property, including 55 thefts (including 4 burglaries, 8 thefts of auto, 16 thefts from autos, 8 of bicycles and parts); 3 incidents of forgery and fraud; 8 incidents of criminal mischief and vandalism; and 1 incident of trespassing and loitering. Full crime reports are in this issue of Almanac on the Web (http://www.upenn.edu/almanac/v42/n31/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 April 22 and April 28, 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 crime report, please call the Division of Public Safety at 888-4482.

Crimes Against Persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Suspect/Threats/Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/23/96</td>
<td>1:04 PM</td>
<td>3402 Sansom St.</td>
<td>Robberies (attempts)</td>
<td>2 Simple assaults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/24/96</td>
<td>20:53 PM</td>
<td>200 Bk, 38th</td>
<td>Wallet taken from complainant by suspects with knife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/23/96</td>
<td>10:29 PM</td>
<td>Kings Court</td>
<td>Unwanted calls received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/26/96</td>
<td>11:08 PM</td>
<td>Sloufter Dining</td>
<td>Complainant reported being struck and threatened</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/28/96</td>
<td>8:53 PM</td>
<td>3700 Bk, Chestnut</td>
<td>2 complainants robbed of wallets by unknown suspects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38th to 41st to Market to Baltimore: Robberies (attempts)—2, Threats & harassment—5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Suspect/Threats/Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/22/96</td>
<td>3:37 PM</td>
<td>Harrison House</td>
<td>Unwanted phone calls received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/21/96</td>
<td>3:06 PM</td>
<td>4020 Spruce</td>
<td>Harassing/threatening calls received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/24/96</td>
<td>5:39 PM</td>
<td>4000 Bk, Spruce</td>
<td>Threat received via phone message</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/26/96</td>
<td>12:27 AM</td>
<td>Harrison House</td>
<td>Harassing calls received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/26/96</td>
<td>5:19 PM</td>
<td>Harnwell House</td>
<td>Unwanted calls received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/27/96</td>
<td>12:51 PM</td>
<td>4000 Bk, Walnut</td>
<td>Unknown males robbed compl. w/simulated weapon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/28/96</td>
<td>7:54 PM</td>
<td>4038 Sansom St.</td>
<td>Unknown suspect attempted to rob complainant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30th to 43rd to Market to University: Robberies (attempts)—1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Suspect/Threats/Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/26/96</td>
<td>12:11 PM</td>
<td>Franklin Field</td>
<td>Unknown males attempted to take glasses from compl.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Suspect/Threats/Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/21/96</td>
<td>10:46 AM</td>
<td>Princeton Univ.</td>
<td>Unwanted e-mail received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/21/96</td>
<td>1:14 PM</td>
<td>Kelly Drive</td>
<td>Male reported to be exposing self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Crime Against Society

38th to 41st to Market to Baltimore: Disorderly conduct—1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Suspect/Threats/Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/23/96</td>
<td>4:40 PM</td>
<td>100 Bk, 40th</td>
<td>Disorderly conduct</td>
<td>Male arrested for disorderly conduct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Honoring the New Emeritus Professors

Annenberg School for Communication
Charles Wright, Communications and Sociology, 1969

School of Arts and Sciences
Malcolm Campbell, History of Art, 1963
- Richard S. Dunn, History, 1957
- Robert Ian Harker, Geology, 1972
- Robert H. Koch, Astronomy, 1967
- Neil Leonard, History, 1961
- Robert F. Lucid, English, 1964
- John W. McCoubry, History of Art, 1960
- Roy Middleton, Physics, 1965
- Benjamin S. P. Shen, Astronomy and Astrophysics, 1966
- Ake W. Sjoberg, Asian and Middle Eastern Studies, 1966
- Wesley D. Smith, Classical Studies, 1961
- Arnold W. Thackray, History and Sociology of Science, 1968
- Robert Y. Turner, English, 1961
- Richard F. Wernick, Music, 1968
- Robert W. Zurmuhle, Physics, 1963

School of Dental Medicine
Burton Rosan, Microbiology, 1963
- Henry Trowbridge, Pathology, 1972
- Anthony Vito, Periodontics, 1962

School of Engineering and Applied Science
Burton Paul, Mechanical Engineering and Applied Mechanics, 1969
- Noah Prywes, Computer and Information Science, 1958
- Bernard Steinberg, Electrical Engineering, 1973
- Jay Zemel, Electrical Engineering, 1966

School of Medicine
Zalman S. Agus, Medicine, 1973
- Balu Athreya, Pediatrics, 1970
- John E. Bivilacqua, Neurology, 1965
- Edward S. Cooper, Medicine, 1964
- John J. Downes, Anesthesia, 1966
- Karl Engelman, Medicine, 1970
- Maria Erecinska, Pharmacology, 1971
- Frances M. Gill, Pediatrics, 1973
- Gunter R. Haase, Neurology, 1974
- Nicholas A. Kefalides, Medicine, 1970
- Ralph W. Hamilton, Surgery, 1969
- Martin T. Orne, Psychiatry, 1964
- Giuseppe G. Pietra, Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, 1969
- Martin Reivich, Neurology, 1966
- Luis Schut, Neurosurgery, 1970
- Bayard T. Storey, Obstetrics and Gynecology, 1967
- Willys K. Silvers, Genetics, 1965
- Cam L. Witzleben, Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, 1973
- Chester M. Zmijewski, Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, 1975

School of Nursing
Constance Carino, 1980
- Claire M. Faigin, 1977
- Joan Lymaugh, 1980
- Elsa Ramsden, 1969

School of Social Work
Howard Arnold, 1970

School of Veterinary Medicine
Donald A. Abt, Pathobiology, 1966
- Carl E. Aronson, Animal Biology, 1971
- Richard C. Bartholomew, Clinical Studies, New Bolton Center, 1968
- James W. Buchanan, Clinical Studies, Philadelphia, 1964
- Elaine P. Hammel, Clinical Studies, New Bolton Center, 1971
- Lin V. Klein, Clinical Studies, New Bolton Center, 1976
- Richard A. McFeely, Clinical Studies, New Bolton Center, 1966
- Donald F. Patterson, Clinical Studies, Philadelphia, 1962
- Robert M. Schwartzman, Clinical Studies, Philadelphia, 1959

Wharton School
Jack M. Guttentag, Finance and Real Estate, 1962
- Gerald Hurst, Operations and Information Management, 1969
- Peter H. Knutson, Accounting, 1966
- James Pickands, Statistics, 1969
- Matthew J. Stephens, Accounting, 1964

In the list of new emeritus professors above, Lindback Award winners are marked (*), and the date after the name and field is the date the professor joined the faculty.

Senior Among Seniors: Having joined the University in 1958, Dr. Noah Prywes, center, led in length of service among the 62 who became emeritus professors this year. President Judith Rodin presented the certificates as each School’s dean gave highlights of each faculty member’s career. Dr. David Pope, associate dean of SEAS (right), recalled Dr. Prywes’s role in the development of a new field.
To the University Community

Penn’s new model for computing services weaves computing into the academic and administrative fabric of the University. The model makes sense in Penn’s environment and positions the University to take advantage of information technology in new and exciting ways. We invite your guidance and participation in the continuing process of making computing easier and more cost-effective for everyone who uses it.

—Stanley Chodorow, Provost, and John Fry, Executive Vice President

A New Model for Computing Services Across Penn

April 29, 1996

Abstract

Computing now touches everyone at Penn. Those who use and those who provide computing services recognize that Penn’s structures for support can be improved. The model presented here was developed by a campus-wide task force in the fall of 1995 and vetted across the University. Pilot projects are underway to test and refine the model.

The model clarifies a division of labor at Penn. Primary computing services will be provided close to the user by schools and units, while core infrastructure and second-tier support will be delivered by the central computing group, confederations, or outside vendors. Two strategies help shape secondary services: networking as a regulated public utility and service bureaus where markets exist. The model also offers a potentially powerful way for Penn to take action at the University level; a few cross-cutting processes will be funded directly and managed across traditional organizational boundaries.
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For more information

The project’s World Wide Web site can be found at http://www.upenn.edu/restruct.
Or, contact Linda May for more information (may@isc.upenn.edu; 215-898-0005).
A New Model for Computing Services Across Penn

Computing now touches everyone at Penn. It has become a vital element in a world fueled by information. In the fall of 1995, Penn’s Provost and Executive Vice President appointed a University-wide task force to make computing services easier and more cost-effective for those who use them. Our charge was to design a new structure for organizing, staffing, and funding computing services across Penn. The task force (Appendix I) has produced a model that will guide organizational change over the next few years. Pilot projects are underway to test and refine the model, but principles and basic components can be described in some detail.

The model doesn’t claim to do everything. It doesn’t ignore history. It is a way of doing business that gives members of the community the chance to make Penn better and exposes each of us to the costs of bad decisions and the benefits of good ones.

What Problem Are We Trying to Solve?

Those who use and those who provide computing services recognize that Penn’s structures for support can be improved. Some things are needlessly complicated. People don’t always know where to go for help. It’s hard to tell what things cost. Changing things won’t be easy—demand is soaring, technology changes relentlessly, and Penn is a very complex place. But we have accepted the challenge to make computing work better at Penn.

Each of Penn’s twelve schools supports the technology needs of its faculty and students in different ways—and the principle of Responsibility Center Management requires us to expect the schools to pay their own way. Some, but not all, of Penn’s administrative divisions have their own computing staffs. The central computing group, Information Systems and Computing, provides services that range from essential infrastructure best managed University-wide (the network, for example, or payroll) to frontline user support. Central/peripheral tensions are played out at several levels: from center/school to school/academic department. The Library is caught in the middle of technology decisions made by ISC and the schools. And everywhere people need more and better support. In short, we have Responsibility Center Management in principle, but a messy situation in practice.

Principles

For computing to be applied strategically at Penn, it must be easier and more cost-effective for the people who use it. To this end, the task force took Responsibility Center Management as a framework and tried to unite responsibility and authority where they have grown apart. At the same time, we tried to focus Penn’s actions at the University level. And we tried to create incentives to integrate computing decisions into the core decisions of the University.

The new model is based on the following principles:

1. Put the client first. Locate support and support decisions close to the recipient.
2. Integrate computing decisions into the strategic decisions of the University.
3. Give units more control over costs. Offer services on a market basis where possible.
4. Focus Penn’s energies by organizing and funding a few important activities along process lines.
5. Move toward confederated activities that overcome the traditional Penn dichotomy of “school vs. central.”
6. Abolish unfunded mandates.
7. Build on Penn’s strengths and best practices. Learn from others.
8. Make plans and policies that encourage flexibility. Expose organizations, processes, and services to sunset laws that require them to prove their value in changing circumstances.

The Model

Basic elements of the new model are described here. More detail is found in four appendices. The project’s World Wide Web site can be seen at http://www.apenn.edu/restruct.

The User. The computer user is at the center of our model. Each person ideally has a local computing “home” and takes all computing questions there. Beyond this circle of primary support are expanding circles of secondary services—provided by ISC, by confederations, or by outside vendors. But the map of services is irrelevant to the recipient: the primary support person navigates that landscape.

Primary Services. In the model, schools and administrative divisions are responsible for their own primary computing support. This includes frontline customer support (including the desktop computer and its relationship to the network) and support of local academic and administrative systems, services (including local-area networking), and innovations. Units can provide primary support themselves or buy it from other schools, from ISC, or from outside Penn. The task force urges that guidelines for basic primary support levels be set and that Penn institutionalize ways to keep these levels moving up.

The model makes primary support local so that decisions are based on the real cost of service. Primary support providers can do a good job of telling users what things cost and helping them make responsible choices. The model seeks to end current incentives that lead people to demand unlimited services. (Allocated-cost service is “free”—because already paid for—the reasoning goes, so why not ask for more?) The model also seeks to end unfunded mandates at every level. Schools may reasonably fear that burdens will shift to them as ISC stops offering primary support as an allocated-cost service to the general community. This reflects, however, the extent to which ISC has been the recipient of unfunded mandates in the past, a practice the task force recommends ending as efficiently as possible.

While frontline support for faculty, students, and staff is the responsibility of Penn’s schools and business units, their ways of delivering and funding that support will vary widely. For many faculty, for example, the department is the natural computing “home”—yet economies of scale are needed. The task force recommends that schools explore departmental coalitions and other affinity groupings based on location, discipline, or
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The model offers a Process Teams to Focus University Action.

Secondary Services. Secondary services undergrad primary support and make the whole greater than the sum of the parts. The task force calls for a more focused set of such services: core administrative systems, networking, data administration and information security, second-tier support for computing organizations around campus, standards and architecture, site licensing, and communication at the enterprise level. Penn’s central computing group, ISC, will concentrate on these services. A few may be candidates for delivery by confederations, individual schools, or outside vendors. ISC will review each of the services it now provides, eliminating some and focusing more heavily on others. While most of these secondary services will continue to be funded by allocated costs, Penn will move over time, as indicated below, to market-based structures where they make sense.

A vital central function that aids confederation and contains costs is the negotiation of standards across Penn. The task force stresses that standards succeed at Penn only when they are worked out by the community itself. The many and sometimes hidden costs of compliance with standards otherwise become another kind of unfunded mandate. Incentives to adopt standards will be built into the support structure.

Two new strategies help shape secondary services:

• Network as a Regulated Utility. Penn’s network will be run as a regulated public utility—with service-level agreements, campus-wide standards, and a “Public Utility Commission,” or governing board, drawn from Penn’s schools and units. The principle here as elsewhere is to let the common business of the institution be managed in common as far as possible. As a utility, the network will be funded by a mix of allocated and direct charges, with specific funding strategies to be taken up by the PUC. Telephone and video services will be incorporated into this utility structure.

• Market-based Service Bureaus. Small businesses, or “service bureaus,” will be set up where markets exist. The intent is to establish, over time, enough of a marketplace to help control costs and encourage a focus on the customer. Service bureaus can already be found at Penn. Wharton Reprographics is well known; ISC sells support-onsite, training, application development, and facilities management of computer systems and will scale up these businesses and launch others if markets prove to exist. Any unit is invited to set up a service bureau in Penn’s evolving economy.

Process Teams to Focus University Action. The model offers a potentially powerful way for Penn to take action at the University level. Many cross-cutting processes will be funded directly and managed across traditional organizational boundaries. For the moment, Penn will concentrate on two or three high priority processes such as academic innovation and student services. These processes can be considered “institutional bets” with high potential payback. As political implications of the process perspective are worked out, more of Penn’s life may be organized and funded along process lines.

The task force can’t guarantee that process teams will transform the institution, but we can say that the innovations they achieve will not distort the system, create unfunded mandates, or break the bank. Processes will be funded partly at the University level and partly as units bring people, dollars, or facilities to the table. The high visibility of process teams can also draw outside funds. Process teams will buy services from existing organizations, strengthening the evolving market economy of the new model.

Process teams are confederacies. The task force on restructuring computing has already been this kind of confederated team, drawn from across the University to do the University’s business together. To work well, such groups need to bring the real interests of Penn’s units to a common project. They will be created not by any special mechanism, but by the responsible decision makers of the institution.

Governance. Computing has become essential to almost all fields of research and instruction and to Penn’s administrative life—and Penn is investing heavily. The task force calls urgently on the leaders of Penn’s schools and units to integrate computing decisions into the regular decisions of the University. Computing is no longer just a technical specialty, but a strategic advantage. We also urge the Provost and Executive Vice President to explore the feasibility and desirability of convening a chartered group to consider issues of campus-wide importance to Penn.

Costs. Cost-effectiveness, targeted investment, and giving units more control over their costs are aims of the model. In an area where Penn’s investment is sure to expand, our sponsors want to see money saved in some areas and reinvested in others. For example, as ISC reduces the number of things it does for allocated costs and cuts costs in other ways, funds can be returned to the Provost’s budget. The task force strongly argues that these savings be spent on forward-looking computing activities.

Process teams are a prime target for these funds.

We freely and frankly say that we cannot tell whether this model will be seen by individual units as costing them more or less. Rather, in an environment of exploding demand, the model will give units more control over their costs. The model tries to unite responsibility and authority where they have grown apart, to reveal real costs where they have become obscured, and to return choice to purchasers where it has been eroded.

In all, the model clarifies the division of labor under Responsibility Center Management. Schools (and business units) are responsible for their own primary computing support. They can provide it themselves or buy it from others. The center concentrates on secondary services. Standards help tie the structure together. The model encourages confederation for the common good even as it values organizational self-reliance; process teams, for example, focus action at the University level. The model calls on Penn’s leaders to integrate computing decisions into other core decisions of the University. And it aims to give units more control over their costs.

More details of the model can be found in four appendices:

Appendix IV: Primary services
Appendix V: Secondary services
Appendix VI: Cross-cutting processes
Appendix VII: Developing funding structures

The Future from Here

The task force has completed the design phase of its work. The Provost and Executive Vice President have appointed a much smaller Implementation Steering Group (Appendix II) to stimulate and oversee pilot testing and transition to the new model and to further develop funding structures. The sponsors and steering group continue to consult with leaders of Penn’s units and negotiate ways of applying the new model. For example, the question of primary support for all will need careful examination in virtually every unit. ISC is prepared for a transition of 18 months (from January 1996) to withdraw from providing primary support as an allocated-cost service to the general community (though contract or other arrangements can be negotiated with ISC).

Some of the analytical work of the original task force continues, notably in two teams (Appendix II) working on funding (how to pay for what we do, now and in the future) and benchmarking (what are best practices elsewhere for questions that arise here).

The following pilots are underway to test the new model:

1. New kinds of “learning spaces” (process team): Begin creating at Penn a range of technology-based “learning spaces” such as classroom/lab hybrids. Build on the success of the Provost’s Classroom Committee; seek outside funds.

2. Support-in-residence for students (process team; primary support): Pilot the viability of moving to residence-based primary computing support for undergraduates; lay groundwork for transition. Begin with one or two residential units and closely coordinate
with broader efforts to restructure student services across the University.

3. **Networking as a utility** (service-level agreements; public utility commission): Begin establishing Penn’s network as a regulated utility—with service-level agreements, campus-wide standards, and a “public utility commission,” or governing board, drawn from Penn’s schools and units. Develop funding strategies for the network.

4. **Link help desks across campus** (process team; primary support): Link help desks across campus by sharing software that tracks problems and solutions. Set common standards and practices for using the software. SAS and ISC will initially deploy the software; SEAS, the Library, and MED will help shape the implementation.

5. **Primary support-for-hire** (service bureau; primary support): Test and adapt for broader implementation ISC’s distributed staffing program, in which local units contract with ISC to locate computing support staff on-site. Explore market needs for other potential front-line services such as custom help desks or dispatch services.

6. **Second-tier support** (secondary services): Begin establishing a coherent and effective system of second-tier support for computing organizations around campus—including escalation of technical questions, “matchmaking” and resource sharing, and train-the-trainer activities. Determine organizational structures to deliver those services. Define performance measures, service-level agreements, and formal ways to get customer feedback.

7. **Facilities management-for-hire** (service bureau): Improve, expand, and formalize ISC’s program of facilities management, in which ISC provides technical and operational support for computer systems that belong to clients. Treat the recent contract with the School of Dental Medicine as a pilot to learn more about running this service as a business.

The Steering Group will guide and integrate these pilots. It will draw lessons from the pilots and revise and renegotiate the model in light of lessons learned. With the Penn community, it will design responsible funding structures and lay groundwork for transition to the new model. ISC and other Penn computing organizations are restructuring in line with the new model, ISC, for example, is rethinking roles and responsibilities, sharpening its focus on enterprise services, and restructuring to provide other services on a direct-charge basis or as regulated utilities. Other units at Penn—the School of Arts and Sciences is a notable example—are likewise rethinking the services they provide and the ways they provide them.

---

### Appendix I:

**Task Force to Restructure Computing Services Across Penn**

In the fall of 1995, Penn’s Provost and Executive Vice President appointed a University-wide task force to make computing easier and more cost-effective for those who use it. Our charge was to design a new structure for organizing, staffing, and funding computing services across Penn.

| Sponsors: | Stanley Chodorow | Provost |
| Chairs: | Peter C. Patton | ISC |
| | John Fry | Executive Vice President |
| | James O’Donnell | SAS |
| Project Manager: | Linda May | ISC |

#### Task Force:

| Carl Abramson | ISC | Mark Liberman | SAS |
| Noam Arzt | ISC | Linda May | ISC |
| Mark Aseltine | GSFA | Donna Milici | ISC |
| Robin Beck | ISC | Steve Murray | EVP |
| Eric Clemons | WH | Gerry McCartney | WH |
| Wilson Dillaway | Lib | Katie McGee | SAS |
| Mike Eleey | ISC | Bob Pallone | DEV |
| Al Filreis | SAS | Warren Seider | SEAS |
| Jim Galbally | DENT | Susan Shaman | Prov |
| Ben Goldstein | SAS | Al Shar | Med |
| Janet Gordon | EVP | John Smolen | VPUL |
| Pat Harker | SEAS | Lyle Ungar | SEAS |
| Bob Hollebeck | SAS | Dan Updegrove | ISC |
| Liz Kelly | LAW | Frank Warner | SAS |
| Michael Klein | SAS | Ira Winston | SEAS |

#### Center for Applied Research: Lynn Oppenheim and Mario Moussa

---

### Models Workgroup:

| Mike Eleey | ISC (captain) |
| Gerry McCartney | WH (captain) |
| Noam Arzt | ISC |
| Wilson Dillaway | Lib |
| Jim Galbally | DENT |
| Bonnie Gibson | ISC |
| Liz Kelly | Law |
| Mark Liberman | SAS |
| George McKenna | ISC |
| Bob Pallone | DEV |
| Al Shar | MED |

### Communication Workgroup:

| Al Filreis | SAS (captain) |
| Katie McGee | SAS |
| Ira Winston | SEAS (captain) |
| Helen Anderson | SEAS |
| Mark Aseltine | GSFA |
| Kristine Briggs | EVP |
| Randall Couch | ISC |
| Edda Katz | ISC |
| Teresa Leo | ISC |
| Jill Masler | EVP |
| Don Montabana | ISC |

### Benchmarking Workgroup:

| Donna Milici | ISC (captain) |
| Ben Goldstein | SAS (captain) |
| Pat Adams | ISC |
| Chris Cieri | Law |
| Mike Guilfoyle | ISC |
| Joe Harris | ISC |
| Mike Palladino | ISC |
| Nancy Rauch | ISC |
| Susan Shaman | Prov |
| Debbie Sokolczuk | SAS |
| John Yates | SAS |
In the new model, schools and administrative divisions are responsible for their own primary computing support—affirming the principle of Responsibility Center Management. They can provide it themselves or buy it from other schools, from ISC, or from outside Penn. In general, primary support will encompass frontline customer support (including the desktop computer and its relationship to the network) as well as local academic and administrative systems, services (including local area networking), and innovations. The task force urges that guidelines for basic primary support levels be set and that Penn institutionalize ways to keep these levels moving up.

Frontline support will be backed up by secondary services provided by the center, by other units, or by outside vendors. For the computer user, the primary support provider is the link to those services.

In practice, the distinction of primary and secondary support is not a dichotomy, but a continuum of services appropriately sited. For example, an individual laboratory might support its own local area network (LAN), the academic department that sponsors the laboratory might handle LAN upgrades, a set of departments might share a LAN expert, and the central computing group might make available a network engineer. In our model, the primary support person—not the user—navigates these complexities.

**Principles.** Because primary support is key to our model, we have described the ideal, our target, in some detail below.

**Primary support is accessible.**

The computer user knows the primary support provider and has easy access. Primary providers are physically located with their clients if possible. If clients are remote or scattered, the primary provider is accessible by email, telephone, or pager.

**Primary support owns its problems.**

Primary providers “own” the problems encountered by their users (for supported products and within the support limits set by the unit). A working principle is that a provider never says, “I can’t help you,” but says, for example, “I don’t know the answer to your problem, but I’ll find it, or find someone who can.”

**Problems are documented and structured.**

The primary provider works with users to structure their problems. This helps the provider understand the problem, and allows problems referred elsewhere to move more effectively through the support system.

**Primary providers have content knowledge.**

Primary providers know the operating systems of their users’ desktop computers and how to link the desktop systems to the network. They know mainstream productivity

(continued next page)
software, as well as the specialized software commonly used by their clients. (Special arrangements might be needed to support clients who are more technically sophisticated than their primary provider.)

The client base is well defined.

Primary providers are not only empowered, but required, to tell those who fall outside their client base to go elsewhere for support. To the extent possible, providers know where to direct those people.

Campus units that choose not to provide primary support to their members should expect to pay a premium for their members’ access to second- and third-tier support elsewhere in the institution. This is fair because the unsupported user is likely to bring small problems to expensive places and may not have exhausted cheaper remedies.

Problem escalation and referrals are handled smoothly.

Clients have paths to management when their problems are not well handled. Clients are, directed, however, back to the primary provider if they attempt to work around their immediate support structure and access second- or third-tier support without prior arrangement.

Mechanisms are in place to refer problems that a primary provider alone cannot solve. Sources of second- and third-tier support are clear, and means of access are well defined.

Primary providers share information with each other.

Primary providers know the activities and problems of their clients—and often learn of things outside their own domain. Both kinds of information are systematically shared across the broader support system.

Special Cases. A few special cases are noted; much more analysis is required.

On-site support for remote users: Remote users who require on-site support that cannot be delivered by the primary provider should be referred elsewhere within Penn or to preferred commercial vendors. Mechanisms are needed to evaluate and monitor those arrangements and negotiate the best prices. Penn’s remote users range from faculty and staff on leave or stationed elsewhere to those who sometimes travel or work from home.

Business consulting: Primary support providers are expected to integrate needs, resources, technology, data, etc. into a coherent support environment. Some problems, however, will require analysis that primary providers may lack the time or experience to perform. The task force suggests that a market may exist at Penn for a service bureau that helps people analyze business problems and assess possible solutions.

Informal support: Staff serving other functions can be very effective at delivering primary computing support if secondary support is in line to back them up. Staff already in place can do triage and “first aid” if they know how and when to pass people to the next level. This “Hey, Joe!” support is common at Penn and needs to be acknowledged in job descriptions.

The model recognizes that some types of computing services make the whole greater than the sum of its parts. The task force calls for a more focused set of such services, outlined below. ISC will concentrate on these secondary services. A few are good candidates for delivery by confederations, individual schools, or outside vendors. ISC will review the services it now provides, eliminating some and devoting more energy to others. With the community, ISC will perform periodic “sunset” reviews of services, processes, and organizations.

Networking
- Infrastructure
- Services

Core administrative systems
- Application development
- Technical and operational support

Data administration and information security
- University data model, data dictionary
- Negotiation of data issues that require consensus
- Information security

Standards and architecture
- Enterprise technology planning; standards and architecture
- Tracking of emerging technologies

Second-tier support for computing organizations around campus
- Escalation of technical problems and questions
- “Matchmaking” and brokering (interest groups, resource sharing, etc.)
- Other support-the-supporter activities (training, etc.)

Site licensing
- Site licenses and volume discounts for software and hardware

Communication at the enterprise level
- Outreach and advocacy
- News and information dissemination
- Point of contact for vendors, external organizations, and fundraising

While most of these services will continue to be funded by allocated costs, Penn will move over time to market-based structures where they make sense. ISC will give the Penn community a periodic accounting of what it receives for allocated costs.

Two new strategies for delivering secondary services are described below.

Network as a Regulated Utility. Penn’s network will be run as a utility—with service-level agreements, campus-wide standards, and a “public utility commission” (PUC), or governing board, to keep it responsive and competitive.

The PUC will approve tariffs, service levels, and standards; seek the input of the community; and participate with others in strategic planning for the network. The PUC governing board will be drawn from the units of the University and will include network-intensive researchers. As a utility, the network will be funded by a mixture of allocated and direct charges, with specific funding strategies to be taken up by the PUC.

Task force discussions have focused on PennNet and the Penn Video Network, both operated by ISC, with a view to making these services more like Telecommunications’ telephone service, which operates like a traditional utility (but without a PUC). Potential extensions of the model include a common PUC for all three services and a common management structure for all three.

Typical attributes of a utility include:
- Reliability
- Ubiquity
- Standards and codes for interconnection and use
- Economies of scale
- Regulated monopoly status
- Oversight by PUC on rates, service levels, and planning
- Service-level agreements (at least with major customers)
- Efforts to engage customers in planning and needs assessment
- Efforts to help users be “smart” consumers of services
- Standard ways for customers to add or change service and to report trouble
- Fees often related to service levels or use.

Currently, the Penn Video Network approaches the utility model, while PennNet and its related services are more mixed. In general, the PennNet core (backbone routers, inter-building fiber, etc.) comes closest to a traditional utility. Central PennNet services (authentication, directory, News, Web, list servers, etc.) operate somewhat like a utility. And satellite closets, station wiring, LAN servers and services, and email are subject to varying practices and interpretations. The Network Policy Committee has functioned, to some degree, as a PUC (with annual review of proposed rates, participation in network architectural planning, etc.) but has not had the governing authority that a PUC would have.

Market-based Service Bureaus. The model moves Penn toward a market economy in some areas, to control costs and encourage a customer focus. Where it makes sense, “service bureaus,” or small businesses, will sell products or services or hire out individual professionals to local projects or longer term assignments. Wharton Reprographics and ISC’s support-on-site program are examples of service bureaus that already exist at Penn. Any unit is invited to set up a service bureau. In practice, most will likely be run by the center.

Service-level agreements will define offerings, scope, cost, and performance measures. Primary providers will act as intermediaries or partners in such arrangements. With a healthy set of service bureaus in place, local units might see their own staffing needs shrink.

In their pure form, service bureaus compete in the open market. Strategic concerns might warrant an allocated component for some service bureaus. Start up might be funded by University seed money or loans, prepayment by key clients, or pooling of funds. Transition strategies (for ISC units in transformation) might involve a taping off of allocated funds—or perhaps a giveback of allocated funds with a promise to spend them with the service bureau for a period of time. The task force recognizes the difficulty of moving to a market economy. It knows that transition will take time and that not every new business will succeed.
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Appendix VI: Cross-cutting Processes

The model seeks ways to focus strategic actions at the University level. One potentially powerful strategy is the direct funding of broad processes that cross traditional organizational boundaries. These processes will be funded part-time at the University level and partly as participants bring people, dollars, or facilities to the table. For the moment, Penn will concentrate on a few high-priority processes such as academic innovation or student services. Over time, more of Penn’s daily life may be organized and funded along process lines.

Computing is just one element of these processes. The academic innovation process, for example, draws together schools, the library, the Division of University Life, the Classroom Committee, and the lab managers’ interest group, among many others. In practice, major processes encompass smaller ones. Academic innovation encompasses smaller processes such as classroom renovation and the introduction of software such as Maple into the curriculum.

Process teams are confederacies that link authority, responsibility, and funding. Leadership comes from wherever appropriate. Processes have “owners” who make sure that the work of the process doesn’t fall through the cracks between traditional organizational units.

Process teams have a life cycle. The initial political work is done by the process team; members need authority to commit resources and make decisions. As political issues are settled and the process becomes more routine, activities can be handed off in different ways. Labs, for example, might start out within a process team and be handed off to a lab managers special interest group. Some process teams may evolve into new types of formal organizations.

An opportunity to be explored is how the process perspective (and underlying machinery) can improve center/local interfaces—and more importantly, how the new perspective can influence the core activities of both central and local organizations.

Appendix VII: Developing Funding Structures

Cost-effectiveness, targeted investment, and giving units more control are aims of the model. With responsibility for primary support squarely at the local level, units have more control over what they spend—and greater control brings pressing decisions about the funding and staffing of services offered their members.

A funding framework for the new model is being designed by the Implementation Steering Group, the pilot teams, and a subgroup of financial specialists. The framework includes principles, operating guidelines, and specific mechanisms and structures. We are assembling a framework pilot by pilot in order to construct a campus-wide strategy—if that proves to be appropriate—from the ground up. Eyes on the horizon, we are concerned with “piloting the funding,” not just with funding the pilots.

As part of this effort, and in keeping with the model’s emphasis on local control, we are documenting basic building blocks of costs and funding—for example, support ratios, salaries for different kinds of computing staff, and costs of equipping a staff member. Penn’s units can combine these building blocks in ways that make sense for the unit. Or the unit might look for ways to trade off one type of cost against another: substituting capital for labor, for example, or transforming existing staff positions into computing positions.

The funding framework, like the entire model, rests on two basic assumptions about computing. First, computing isn’t something that happens “somewhere else.” It is inseparable from Penn’s mission and touches every member of the University community. Second, funding for computing is everyone’s business. The computing infrastructure is now part of the campus infrastructure and should be factored into fundraising strategies and budgetary planning.

Principles. All of this activity is guided by three funding principles, implied by the model’s organizational elements:

Choice and responsibility are linked.

Schools and units should be able to make choices about how to meet their own computing needs. With this choice comes responsibility for the consequences on finances, customer satisfaction, productivity, and learning—and for the effect on others in the Penn community.

Reserve central funds for enterprise-wide and strategic services.

Use central funds for services that support the University as a whole or that further Penn’s strategic agenda.

Fund processes.

Fund a few important processes directly. This is one way to make strategic “institutional bets.” Process teams represent Penn confederacy at its best, drawing funds from schools and units, the central computing group, University seed money, and external partnerships.

Operating Guidelines. Guidelines such as the following inform the evolving funding framework:

Encourage standards.

Standards are encouraged not to limit choice but to hold down the cost of computing. Recognize that unique solutions are sometimes the most effective, but take into account the full cost of non-standard technology.

Take life-cycle costs into account.

Plan for the entire life cycle of an investment in information technology.

Recognize economies of scale.

When economies of scale are substantial, schools and units gain by confederating or by counting on the center.

Guiding Questions. Questions such as the ones below are helping us develop specific funding models and mechanisms. In practice, for example, funding mechanisms act as incentives for behavior. Supporting a service wholly with allocated costs, for instance, may encourage customers to think of it as “free,” and stimulate demand, while supporting it wholly with direct charges may limit use. Penn will want some services to be perceived as free, or nearly so, and others as carrying a cost.

• What behaviors does the funding model encourage? Discourage?

• Does the funding model put services and dollars where they’re needed?

• How does the funding model hold down costs?

• Does the funding model still work if not everyone plays?

• Does the funding model still work if service complexity or volume increases substantially?

• How does the funding model help create services that adjust to what people need?
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PRIMARY SERVICES
- Desktop support
- Local services, systems, & innovation

SECONDARY SERVICES
- Networking & core administrative systems
- Second-tier support
- Delimited set of enterprise services

PROCESS TEAMS focus Penn’s action at the University level

USER
- Faculty
- Student
- Staff