The Pavers’ Progress
The repair of walkways in the heart of the campus got underway this summer as Facilities Management teams replaced crumbling bluestone with sturdier stone-and-asphalt Hasting Pavers. Suspended briefly to avoid interfering with last week’s new-student activities, the repaving of walkways north of College Hall is back on track for completion by September 28. Houston Hall Plaza’s bluestone will be replaced later, as part of the Perelman Quad Project.
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Photos by Tommy Leonardi
In the wake of the Penn Reading Project’s sampling of expatriate life in Paris through Ernest Hemingway’s *A Moveable Feast*, the English Department will sponsor a colloquium, “American Writers in Paris Following World War II,” with two who were there—author Norman Mailer and poet Richard Wilbur—bringing to campus their observations on the Left Bank after World War II.

The colloquium honors Dr. Robert Lucid, who retired this year after a long and distinguished career as professor of English, and who is a founding member of the Penn Reading Project and longtime head of the Council of Faculty Masters.

The program will be held from 3 to 4:30 p.m. Friday, September 27, in Rainey Auditorium of the University Museum. A reception will follow at Hill House, where Dr. Lucid was Faculty Master.

### Disciplinary Charter in Place

The Charter of the Judicial System, approved by all of the undergraduate schools and adopted in part by many of the graduate units which also have their own procedures, is published Of Record in this issue of *Almanac* (see center insert).

A call for University members to participate in the system as Advisers has been issued by the Office of Student Conduct (see page 5).

### Memorial Services

The campus memorial service for the Rev. Hermann Behrens, the late editor-in-chief of the Sumerian Dictionary Project who died on August 1 at 52, will be held in the Museum’s Rainey Auditorium at 4 p.m. Thursday, September 12.

An off-campus service for Dr. Digby Baltzell, the distinguished author and sociologist who died August 17, will be held Saturday, September 21, at 11 a.m. at Christ Church, Second and Market Sts. At the request of Dr. Baltzell’s family, the University’s own service for him will be scheduled later in the academic year. Gifts may be made to the University for the E. Digby Baltzell Sociology Fund, and sent to SAS External Affairs at 3440 Market/3325.

(Ed. Note: Obituaries for Dr. Ernest Dale of Wharton’s management faculty, and for E.J. Browne, the longtime head of Wharton Reprographics, were held for space reasons and will appear next week.)

### Council Meetings for 1996-97

On the dates listed below, the University Council will meet from 4 to 6 p.m. in McClelland Hall, the Quad. Members of the University who wish to attend as observers may contact John P. Wells at the Office of the Secretary, Ext. 8-7005.

- **Wednesday, September 25, 1996**
- **Wednesday, October 9, 1996**
- **Wednesday, November 13, 1996**
- **Wednesday, December 4, 1996**
- **Wednesday, January 22, 1997**
- **Wednesday, February 12, 1997**
- **Wednesday, March 5, 1997**
- **Wednesday, April 30, 1997**

### Resignation of Dean Rosemary Stevens

In a September 1 letter to President Judith Rodin, and another on September 3 to the SAS faculty, Dr. Rosemary Stevens has announced her decision to leave office at the end of her first five-year term, the resignation to become effective on selection of an interim dean.

“When Sheldon Hackney offered me the deanship of the School of Arts and Sciences in 1991, I assured him that I would serve for five years,” Dean Stevens wrote. “These five years ended on August 31, 1996.” Referring to summer discussions about continuing in office for another year, Dr. Stevens added, “I greatly appreciate the confidence in my deanship that you have expressed in suggesting this. However, sober reflection has convinced me that it is better that I stick to my original intention as far as possible.

A key factor in the timing of her return to the faculty full-time, Dr. Stevens explained, is that she has been asked to prepare a new, 25th anniversary edition of one of her major works, *American Medicine and the Public Interest*. “Given the strains and stresses in medicine and health since 1971, as well as the wealth of relevant research, this task is going to take an enormous amount of work, and I am anxious to begin,” she said in her letter to the SAS Faculty September 3.

President Rodin and Provost Stanly Chodorow accepted the Dean’s resignation with a mixture of “regret at your departure from the dean’s office: gratitude for all you have accomplished at SAS; and pleasure that you will resume your role as an outstanding member of our faculty.” In a memo to SAS faculty they said that “immediately look to appoint an interim dean and, in short order, form a search committee to appoint a permanent successor to Rosemary.”

The Dean told the faculty in her September 3 letter that she believes it is “a good time for the School to go through administrative transition. We have completed the strategic planning cycle... We have a superb, experienced group of deputy and associate deans. And we have an equally talented and committed group of faculty serving as chairs, as program center directors, and on SAS committees. President Rodin’s support of arts and sciences, and her fundamental understanding of what the arts and sciences are all about, will ensure the School’s continuing success under a new dean.”

Dean Stevens, who came to the deanship as professor and chair of the history and sociology of science, has served longer than any other dean of SAS since the School was created in the seventies by combining Penn’s undergraduate and graduate arts and sciences programs and incorporating some disciplines that had been lodged in the Wharton School (economics, political science and sociology, among them).

Dr. Stevens is recognized for her advocacy of a broad mission of arts and sciences, as well as for developing new instructional programs, funding student research fellowships, and developing faculty in Asian-American and Latin-American Studies, among other initiatives. “Graduate education has been on a roller-coaster everywhere, but SAS has maintained very high standards and wide choice of programs while substantially decreasing the number of students and trying to fund more of them” the President and Provost said.

Citing administrative changes such as establishing departmental visiting committees, Dr. Rodin and Dr. Chodorow also praised the Dean’s strengthening of SAS relationships with other schools and divisions by establishing the College/Wharton undergraduate major in international studies and business; strengthening the graduate Lauder program; supporting joint institutes with SEAS, LRSM, and IRCs; establishing the multi-school French Institute; and launching several initiatives not yet announced. “The University and we are deeply in your debt,” they concluded. “You have our thanks, and thanks from the entire Penn community, for a job well done.”

—Excerpt from letter, 9/1/96

### From the Dean to Dr. Rodin

...During my five years as dean, I have emphasized the central role of the School: I know you agree that SAS is the very heart of the University. To sustain and strengthen the School, I have given every support possible to our excellent faculty, encouraged their creativity and inventiveness, pushed for new associations with other schools and advocated new priorities. Always aware of the School’s pressing financial needs, I have spent a good deal of time “on the road” raising funds. In this regard, I am very pleased that the School’s major fund drive in the recent Campaign for Penn was successful in meeting its high target ($250 million); among many wonderful and important gifts, SAS raised 38 endowed chairs. As you know only too well, still more needs to be done.

I have tried to deal honestly with the budget situation as it has developed through three University administrations since 1991. Again, you know only too well, these have been years of constant budget cutting, as at many other universities. Downsizing has been painful, and I am fully aware of the fiscal strains and stresses in medicine and health since 1971, as well as the wealth of relevant research, this task is going to take an enormous amount of work, and I am anxious to begin,” she said in her letter to the SAS Faculty September 3.

I have tried to deal honestly with the budget situation as it has developed through three University administrations since 1991. Again, you know only too well, these have been years of constant budget cutting, as at many other universities. Downsizing has been painful, and I am fully aware of the fiscal strains and stresses in medicine and health since 1971, as well as the wealth of relevant research, this task is going to take an enormous amount of work, and I am anxious to begin,” she said in her letter to the SAS Faculty September 3.

...During my five years as dean, I have emphasized the central role of the School: I know you agree that SAS is the very heart of the University. To sustain and strengthen the School, I have given every support possible to our excellent faculty, encouraged their creativity and inventiveness, pushed for new associations with other schools and advocated new priorities. Always aware of the School’s pressing financial needs, I have spent a good deal of time “on the road” raising funds. In this regard, I am very pleased that the School’s major fund drive in the recent Campaign for Penn was successful in meeting its high target ($250 million); among many wonderful and important gifts, SAS raised 38 endowed chairs. As you know only too well, still more needs to be done.

I have tried to deal honestly with the budget situation as it has developed through three University administrations since 1991. Again, you know only too well, these have been years of constant budget cutting, as at many other universities. Downsizing has been painful, and I am fully aware of the fiscal strains and stresses in medicine and health since 1971, as well as the wealth of relevant research, this task is going to take an enormous amount of work, and I am anxious to begin,” she said in her letter to the SAS Faculty September 3.
The following statement is published in accordance with the Senate Rules. Among other purposes, the publication of SEC actions is intended to stimulate discussion among the constituencies and their representatives. Please communicate your comments to Senate Chair Peter Kuriloff or Executive Assistant Carolyn Burdon, Box 12 College Hall/6303, 989-6943 or burdon@pobox.upenn.edu.

Actions Taken by the Senate Executive Committee
Wednesday, September 4, 1996

1. Academic Planning and Budget Committee and Capital Council. The Academic Planning and Budget Committee discussed the Agenda for Excellence at its first meeting. Capital Council has not yet met.

2. Benefits review and changes: issues and implications for faculty. SEC discussed the benefits review that is underway with Associate Provost Barbara Lowery, Vice Provost for Human Resources Clint Davidson, and Personnel Benefits Committee Chair David Hackney. Coopers and Lybrand recommended in its December 1994 report (Almanac January 17, 1995) that Penn review its benefits and retirement programs. Committees with faculty representatives are at work and Towers and Perrin has been hired to assist. Detailed information is being gathered from 28 universities participating in a Penn survey. All benefits are on the table for review. Penn’s 30.1% employee benefits rate may be among the highest at comparable institutions. Current benefits are very complex resulting in costly administration and difficulty communicating plan options and comparing plans. Its retirement programs for those earning $65,000 and above and for those earning below that the president now has the ability to remand a decision of the hearing board for its reconsideration. Also, the Policy on Misconduct in Research has been separated from the just cause procedure and is again a stand alone document that has not been revised. The separation of the two documents is recommended because federal government regulations on misconduct in research change frequently and revisions will be easier to make. The Senate Chairs also agreed to non-substantive editorial clarifications.

3. Electronic Privacy Policy. University Council Committee on Communications Chair Martin Pring reviewed the background on the policy, noting that it had been on the agenda of the last two University Council meetings but no action was taken. The policy would protect the privacy of individual’s electronic information, wherever it resides, in the same way that physical property in faculty offices is currently protected under Human Resources Policy 002 “Safeguarding University Assets”. It was moved, seconded and adopted unanimously, that “the Senate Executive Committee endorses the Policy on Privacy of Electronic Information dated October 16, 1995 (Almanac March 19, 1996) and urges that it be adopted by University Council and the administration.”

4. Motion to abolish the annual meeting of the Faculty Senate. SEC member Larry Gross summarized the discussion begun at the May meeting pointing out that a quorum is frequently unmet. The proposal will still allow for special meetings to be called by petition of twenty faculty members. A detailed annual report by the Faculty Senate Chair would be substituted for the annual meeting. So few special meetings have been called in the past twenty years that it demonstrates faculty confidence in SEC. The few special meetings that have been called have had large turnouts and have demonstrated the power of an aroused faculty. It was moved, seconded and adopted that the proposal to abolish the annual meeting of the Faculty Senate be forwarded to the standing faculty for a vote.

5. Update on just cause revision. Faculty Senate Chair Peter Kuriloff presented a modified version of the proposed just cause revision that resulted from meetings of the Chair and Past Chair of the Faculty Senate, a faculty member, the Trustee Committee Chair, and a trustee member of the Trustee Committee on Academic Policy. The only substantive change from the earlier version (Almanac March 14, 1995) approved by the Faculty Senate and the Academic Policy Committee was to move the decision that the president now has the ability to remand a decision of the hearing board for its reconsideration. Also, the Policy on Misconduct in Research has been separated from the just cause procedure and is again a stand alone document that has not been revised. The separation of the two documents is recommended because federal government regulations on misconduct in research change frequently and revisions will be easier to make. The Senate Chairs also agreed to non-substantive editorial clarifications.

A question arose about whether the research faculty category, which had been added to the earlier revised just cause document, should be retained. A subcommittee was appointed to confer with experts and report back to the next SEC meeting, at which time a vote will be taken.

WXPN-FM: Vincent Curren

Vincent Curren, acting general manager of WXPN-FM (88.5) since January 1, was named General Manager on August 6, taking office immediately to head the University’s award-winning radio station.

A veteran of 20 years in broadcasting including nine years’ association with the Penn station, Mr. Curren was chosen after a national search to succeed Mark Fuerst, who left the University last year to become a consultant to the 35 top non-commercial FM stations in the country.

“Our search identified many fine, indeed outstanding candidates, but none better suited than Vinnie Curren,” said Barbara Stevens, Vice President and Secretary of the University. “He has a keen appreciation for the wide range of issues associated with public radio today, and he has been instrumental in fashioning WXPN-FM’s distinctive style.”

Mr. Curren took his bachelor’s degree in psychology from SUNY/Buffalo in 1972 and studied communication arts at Wisconsin and organizational dynamics at Penn. He was chief engineer at WORT-FM in Madison, Wisconsin, and producer-director at WKOW-TV in Madison before joining WXPN-FM in 1987 as assistant manager for programming and operations. In this period of his programming leadership WXPN-FM won three Gold Awards from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, a George Foster Peabody Award, and numerous other awards. He became assistant station manager for operations in 1991, with responsibility for planning, financial and technical management.

In 1994, Mr. Curren became assistant station manager for development, starting an upward curve in listener support by raising more than $1 million in FY 1995, up 10% from the previous year, while reducing the use of air-time for fundraising by 40%. Two of his fundraising innovations at WXPN-FM include the CD of the Month Club and The World Cafe Sampler CD, which together accounted for more than $250,000 of this year’s fundraising. Mr. Curren also directed the launch of Kids Corner, the Peabody award-winning program hosted by Kathy O’Connell, and was heavily involved in the development of the current local format and The World Cafe, now syndicated by Public Radio International.

Women’s Studies: Dr. Faust

Dr. Drew Gilpin Faust, Annenberg Professor of History in the School of Arts and Sciences, has been named Director of the Women’s Studies Program at Penn, SAS Dean Rosemary Stevens has announced. Dr. Demie Kurz will continue as co-director and Luz Marin as office manager for Women’s Studies.

Dr. Faust, who has both the Lindback Award and of SAS’s Ira Abrams Award for her teaching, is the author of the recent and widely acclaimed Mothers of Invention: Women of the Slaveholding South in the American Civil War, and of several earlier prize-winning books in her field.

Her appointment will be marked by a reception October 3 for past and present faculty members in Women’s Studies at Penn. It will be followed by the first meeting of the Women’s Studies Penn Mid-Atlantic Seminar, where Dr. Faust will give a presentation on Mothers of Invention with Dr. Peter Stallybrass of English as discussant.
Speaking Out

Memories
The recent death of Digby Baltzell served to recall his participation in an unusual oral history project that was active here in the late 1980s. The project’s activities took place in the Audio Visual Center then housed in Logan Hall’s basement under the direction of Lidia Messmer, the Center’s director at the time.

Messmer’s “Memories Project” called for the live visual recording of interviews with members of the University community at large. In a sort of free-wheeling question-and-answer format, interviewees were encouraged to recall personalities and events of past times as they related to the University. Some of those taking part are no longer with us.

In the course of the recorded interviews, the talk was wide-ranging. It included Penn’s role in the World War II effort, the planning of Penn’s campus expansion, and a diversity of subjects, Digby Baltzell, in his inimitable salty style, admiringly recalled the student activism of the ’60s.

Others who come to mind are Dr. Jonathan Rhoads, Provost Eliot Stellar, Engineering’s Dean Joseph Bordogna, Chaplain Stanley Johnson, College for Women Dean Jean Brownlee, Wharton’s Morris Hamburg, Dr. Harold Scheie, Campus Planner Harold Taubin, Fine Arts Dean Holmes Perkins, and the Annenberg School’s Charles Lee.

These interviews, recorded on tape, are part of the University Archives now. Their virtue lies in the human dimension they give to documenting the daily activities, the personalities, and the process of change that is a vital part of University life.

Are there still those among us with “Memories” worth recording?
— Maurice S. Burrison
Director, Faculty Club Art Gallery

Escort Service at Issue?
Following is an open letter to Thomas M. Seamon, managing director of public safety, which was received by Almanac on August 27 with the notation that it was a somewhat shortened version of a letter sent directly to Mr. Seamon on August 13. His response is further below.—Ed.

Dear Mr. Seamon:
Recently I came across an article in the Weekly Press (May 30, 1996, p. 9) reporting your remarks to a gathering of 40th Street area business owners concerning Penn Escort Service, and particularly your plans to discontinue Escort Service to Center City. According to the article, you stated, “We should be encouraging people to live here; instead we’re giving them free rides to the competition in Center City and our streets are empty…”

Sir, I was shocked, appalled and outraged by your remarks, on this and other subjects, by their patronizing and flippancy tone, and by their air of ignorance and misinformation.

I live in West Philadelphia and use Escort 5-7 times a week. I have been employed at Penn for almost 15 years and find that the Escort Service is the only part of the University that functions well (after its first year or so of poor service—up to two-hour waits!).

I wait no longer than half an hour; drivers are skilled and courteous; and best of all the service functions until 3 a.m., which is essential to me since I am sometimes on campus as late as 2 a.m. I am also pleased that Escort operates on weekends and holidays without schedule alterations, year in and year out. This is one of the few University functions that accommodates staff and recognizes us as part of the University community.

Both staff and students live in Center City as well as West Philadelphia. It is no business of the University or yourself where we live or why. Perhaps we room with friends or family, own or have inherited property, get a “good deal” from a friendly landlord. Neither you nor the University should be flakking for West Philadelphia real estate brokers. Your only task in this manner is to provide safe, free transportation to students and staff year around within a perimeter of reasonable distance from the University, evenly in at least two directions.

It was irresponsible of you to propose curtailment of University services during the middle of summer, when students and staff are on holiday, and in a journalistic organ not primarily serving the University, but aimed at West Philadelphia.

Mr. Seamon, I ask that you do nothing about Escort until after the school year begins in the fall—and then only after consulting the entire University community, giving us time to reply.

Students, faculty and staff, whether or not you live in Center City, please call or write Mr. Seamon. Tell him you want to see free, safe, dependable transportation east and west of the city maintained and improved, not curtailed.

And those of you living in or visiting Center City: Use that C van.

Support the service by using it.

If I lived in Center City, I should look forward to those long, dark lonely walks across the bridges, past shuttered businesses and “adult” theater marquees. (Public transportation is expensive and stops at about 12:30 a.m. Taxis are twice as expensive as in any other big city on the East Coast, and the drivers are worse than the perps on the street—and they don’t know where they’re going, either.)

But what would give me a real thrill is the anticipation of the millions of dollars I or my estate would realize from a successful suit against the University when I am severely injured or killed on my way home because the University chose to protect its staff and students unequally.

Thank you for your time.
— Frances G. Hoenigswald
Invoice Clerk
Biddle Law Library

Response to Ms. Hoenigswald
I have stated publicly on a number of occasions that in my opinion, as Managing Director of Public Safety at Penn, the University should reevaluate the extent of its Escort Service to insure it is compatible with the overall strategy of the University. Specifically, I believe that encouraging students to live and shop in Center City by providing free transportation is counterproductive to the goal of making the campus area a more vibrant place to shop, dine, and gather.

It is an accepted principal of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) that urban public areas are safer when there is a heavy, constant flow of pedestrians.

I have never advocated that the entire Penn Escort Service be discontinued. Indeed, if service east of the Schuylkill were discontinued it might be desirable to shift resources and increase service in the West Philadelphia area.

I have stated my opinion in the hope that it might lead to a reasoned discussion on campus regarding the future of the Penn Escort Services.
— Thomas M. Seamon, Managing Director, Public Safety

More on ‘Save Dining’
This letter is a follow-up to the response by John A. Fry, Executive Vice President, and Steven D. Murray, Vice President, Business Services, to the “Save Dining Services” letter printed in the 7/16/96 edition of Almanac.

First of all, I must thank Mr. Fry for pointing out the rather obvious: as a student in the College, I do not have the training nor the expertise that the Division of Business Services has in evaluating all of the factors which will go into outsourcing departments which are secondary, yet vital, to the University’s mission. Indeed, as I stated quite explicitly in my letter, I expect for them to thoroughly investigate those factors. Furthermore, his characterizations of the statements that I made as “assertions”, “unilateral”, and “conclusions” indicates a lack of basic reading comprehension. The words I believe do not denote absolute fact, which is what assertions, conclusions, and unilateral statements, in the context which he uses, require.

That having been said, Mr. Fry has not satisfactorily addressed the concerns that I have raised. His categorical statement that "Outsourcing does not necessarily put people out of work; it puts them to work in a new management environment where greater expertise is present" is a non sequitur. The threat to job security that outsourcing represents is tantamount in the minds of anyone whose department is being considered for such. What is foremost in their minds is “new management will not keep us”. This is espe-

(continued next page)
To the University Community

Wanted: Advisors for the Student Disciplinary System

We invite all members of the community to participate in the implementation of the new Charter of the University of Pennsylvania’s Student Disciplinary System* by volunteering to serve as an Advisor.

Any University faculty member, staff member, or student in good academic and disciplinary standing may serve as an advisor.

An Advisor helps students involved in disciplinary proceedings to understand the disciplinary process, respect and comply with the provisions of the Charter. Students involved in the Disciplinary System include complainants, witnesses, and respondents. Advisors help students prepare for meetings and hearings and advisors may accompany students to meetings and hearings. More importantly, advisors offer students guidance and support throughout the disciplinary process.

Advisors play an essential part in the Disciplinary System. The Advisor is the person best situated to turn the student’s experience with the Disciplinary System into an educational one.

To volunteer to serve, or to obtain more information, contact Sybil M. James at 898-5651 or james5@pobox.upenn.edu.

—Office of Student Conduct

* The Charter and related documents are published Of Record in the center insert of this issue.—Ed.

To the University Community

On Dining Services and Residential Living

On August 30, The Daily Pennsylvanian ran a story to the effect that both the dining services and residential living were “targeted for outsourcing.” This was inaccurate, misleading and inflammatory, and I said as much in a letter to the D.P. editors, which they were courteous enough to print on September 4. To make certain that the facts reach the entire University community, however, I would like to repeat the essence of my statement here:

We have made no decision to outsource Dining Services. Rather, we are conducting a comprehensive market study to determine how well Penn’s Dining Services meets the needs of our campus constituencies, with the goal of identifying opportunities to improve the quality and selection of food, enhance the service environment, and contain or reduce the cost of the Dining program. The outcome of this analysis will not necessarily be a decision to outsource, although contracting with an external provider of food services will certainly be examined as one potential option. The consultative committee being appointed to guide this analysis will be composed of students, faculty and administrators, and be supported by an external food service market consultant who has no ties to any of the major food services providers.

As to Residential Living, our primary focus is on developing a facilities reinvestment plan to improve the physical quality of the buildings, in order to make them more contemporary, attractive and safer places to live and work. At the same time, we are seeking to stabilize the management structure in the Department of Housing and Residence Life, given the recent resignations that have occurred in that department. At this time, there are no plans to outsource the operations of Residential Living, although we will continue to seek ways to better manage and maintain the residence halls.

While selective outsourcing will continue to be pursued as one restructuring strategy, many of Penn’s administrative operations will never be outsourced. They will, however, be scrutinized regularly to make sure they are serving the campus community well and managing costs aggressively.

Sincerely,

—John A. Fry, Executive Vice President
Gargling for Science and Other Trials of the Tooth Trade

By Sandy Smith

I get paid to brush my teeth.
You may know someone who does, too. Perhaps it’s that colleague whose teeth suddenly look like she’s drinking a pot of coffee a day.

Be kind to us. Your smile depends on us, for we are the shock troops in the never-ending struggle against plaque, cavities, and many of the other problems that may befall your teeth.

We are also foot soldiers in a war for something even more precious: market share. What was once a relatively mundane item — the toothbrush — has become a multimillion-dollar business, with dozens of manufacturers vying to out-clean the competition with products that Reach a little deeper, Flex a little more, and give your teeth a Total cleaning. And that’s only part of the oral-hygiene market. Toothpaste and mouthwash ads also constantly tout “new and improved” products that are “clinically proven” to remove more plaque or get your teeth their whitest. And then there is the ultimate prize: the American Dental Association’s seal of acceptance.

In order to win that seal and make those claims, someone has to put all those products to the test. And that’s where I and your co-worker with the brown teeth come in.

We are two of about 200 Penn people who participate in clinical trials conducted by the team of Drs. Samuel Yankell and Robert Emling.

The sort of applied research that Yankell and Emling do is not what most dental researchers find appealing, but it is vital to the $3-billion-a-year oral-hygiene products industry. Dental professionals can recommend products bearing the ADA seal of approval — “Your dentist or hygienist is the only health-care professional who can recommend products sold over the counter.”

Yankell notes — but in order to carry the seal, a product needs to pass established benchmarks in trials conducted according to an ADA standard protocol.

It just so happens that Yankell and Emling wrote the basic characteristics of the ADA protocol. “We had developed what we thought was an adequate protocol for testing toothbrushes for ADA approval,” Yankell explained, noting that no product his team has recommended for approval has ever been denied it. “About eight years ago, the ADA announced it was reviewing its entire approval process and asked for suggestions for a new standard test protocol. We submitted ours.

“In 1989, the ADA published its new standard protocol. When we received the letter describing it, we were surprised — it was essentially our protocol, almost verbatim.”

Yankell was not a dentist by training; his Ph.D. is in nutrition. But he spent 14 years in industry, where he learned clinical testing practices such as doing indices for gingivitis and plaque deposits. This sparked his interest in dental product research, and in 1974 he joined the School of Dental Medicine faculty. He has been conducting clinical research trials ever since. (Because Dental School faculty must have clinical degrees, Yankell enrolled in Penn’s dental hygiene program and received his registered dental hygienist degree in 1981.)

Yankell and Emling are almost constantly engaged in trials, varying in size from 12 to 180 participants and in duration from one week to six months. The trials generally fall into one of four main categories:

• The basic toothbrush study for ADA approval.
• Studies to support marketing claims made by manufacturers, or for comparative purposes. These usually follow the ADA protocol, but the results become the property of the manufacturer.
• Experimental studies to determine the effect of a new ingredient or product design.

Yankell and Emling limit their tests of new ingredients to those approved by the FDA for over-the-counter sale.

• Long-term studies to determine the effect of a product over time. These usually involve toothpastes and mouth rinses. One of the main purposes of such studies is to see if microorganisms change in response to regular use of a product.

The two researchers also conduct smaller, more specialized studies, such as “exaggerated use” studies designed to test the safety of a new dental product.

All this brushing and gargling has made Penn’s dental school a leading site for commercial clinical research. Yankell stated that in terms of applied research, Penn rates among the top seven university dental schools in the country.

One of the main reasons for the large amount of applied research is the enormous growth and change in the toothbrush industry since Johnson and Johnson introduced its angled Reach toothbrush in the late 1970s. Since then, Yankell said, “toothbrush sales have exploded” as companies rolled out new brush designs all focused on a single goal: “trying to get the brush to work better in spite of the user.”

As a hygienist, Yankell is thoroughly versed in the proper brushing technique: bristles at a 45-degree angle to the tooth, and short, orbital brush strokes. “I can talk to patients about brushing technique until I’m blue in the face,” he said, “and they will follow it for about two days. Then they slip right back into their old habits.”

Hence all the radical new brush designs with uneven bristles, diamond-shaped heads, bendable handles and (in one design) three small heads designed to surround the tooth. The companies that make these brushes want to make sure they work at least as well, if not better than, anything else currently on the market, and Yankell is happy to put them through their paces.

Some companies come to Yankell’s lab because of the institutional prestige: “They like to have the University of Pennsylvania name associated with their research,” he

(continued on page 7)
Silver Medal for Bike Patrol Officer

By Phyllis Holtzman

While the 1996 Centennial Olympic Games were the focus of enormous media attention this summer, they weren’t the only games in town. Last month, thousands of police officers from around the world gathered in Salt Lake City, Utah, to compete in the Sixth International Law Enforcement Games.

Penn Police Officer John Washington, a member of Penn’s bicycle patrol, was among the officers from some 26 countries who competed at the event. Washington, an experienced long-distance runner and cross trainer, won a silver medal in the 5-mile cross-country run.

Running through scenic fields and across a creek bed, Washington endured the effects of the unaccustomed high elevation of Salt Lake City to maintain his steady silver-medal pace.

“I was surprised I placed so high,” he said, noting that the 5,000-foot elevation caused his nose to bleed throughout the race. “My real interest in attending was the camaraderie and the chance to meet officers from other countries. I didn’t expect to win a medal.”

Washington, who has been on Penn’s bicycle patrol since its inception more than four years ago, also competed in the mountain bike race. Although he didn’t place — he came in fourth — he was pleased nonetheless that he came through as well as he did.

“The course wasn’t what I expected, “ he said. “It was on Antelope Island in the middle of the Great Salt Lake. It was an 18-mile course (nine miles ridden twice), and in the first eight miles you ride up an 800-foot bluff. The last mile you go screaming straight down a crust, gravel and sand path.”

“I was holding on for dear life,” he added.

To prepare for the race, Washington tried to replicate hill training by riding his bicycle up and down the eight floors of ramps in Penn’s parking garage at 38th and Walnut Streets.

His regular running regimen kept him in shape for the 5-mile run — Washington belongs to a running group in Jenkintown, where he typically runs 35-40 miles per week.

“That’s not really a lot,” he said, noting that when he ran cross country while a student at Franklin Pierce College in New Hampshire, he ran up to 80 miles a week.

“I was happy to see that I did pretty well,” he said. “But I didn’t expect to win a medal.”

The silver medal wasn’t Washington’s only victory this summer — in June, he won two gold medals in a state-wide police Olympic competition in Lancaster. The medals were for the 5-kilometer trail run, and for the mountain bike competition.

Washington, a life-long resident of Cheltenham, has been at Penn for eight years. In addition to his position at Penn and his running, he has served for the last 18 years as a volunteer firefighter in Cheltenham Township. His father and brothers are all career firefighters.

While this was Washington’s first time competing in the international police event, he has participated locally in the Broad Street run and the Philadelphia marathon. He and his colleagues in the Penn bicycle unit have also competed as a team against other bicycle units, and placed third at a competition in Baltimore.

While the competition was fun, Washington said the best part of his experience in Salt Lake City came after the events, in the evenings when the officers from around the world spent time together socializing.

“The best part was the opportunity to relate to other officers from foreign countries,” he said. “There were officers from every continent, except South America.”

The next international competition will be held in 1998 in the United Arab Emirates, but Washington doesn’t expect to attend.

“It’s too hot there,” he said.

Dental Cont’d

(continued from page 6)

said. But he also thinks that the institutional safeguards Penn builds into its research and the rigorous standards his research team follows also add value. For example, he notes, “In order to adhere to the guidelines of Penn’s Human Review Committee” — a University-wide panel, on which Yankell sits, that sets criteria for research involving human subjects — “we must get a full medical history for all of our subjects, and they must sign a consent form that describes the experimental procedures in detail, along with the anticipated risks. The requirements are the same for a toothbrush study as for, for example, a complete knee replacement.”

And what happens with the results of these studies? That depends on their purpose. Research done to back up comparative marketing claims is usually proprietary, so a company can choose to keep the results secret. But there is a benefit to publishing the results, Yankell said:

“If the information is published or presented at a conference, dentists can see the source of the study. A company’s ads can also refer to published research, and a good dental professional will go back to read it’ — and perhaps, based on what he or she reads, will recommend the product to his or her patients.
On & Off the Web: Cyberdudes Print Lit

By Jerry Janda

The vast majority of computer wizards may talk only to one another, and express themselves solely through their cybersorcery. Not so the tech support wizards of Penn’s Data Communications and Computing Services (DCCS).

Take David Deifer, for example. A senior network specialist, he is, first and foremost, a writer and poet. Working at Penn pays the bills.

Deifer is just one of the DCCS staff members who, anxious to get their words in print, helped create XConnect (pronounced “cross connect”), a literary journal with a twist.

Most publications start with a printed version before making the jump to the Web. Not XConnect. The national literary publication has been on-line since April of 1995 (http://techl.dccs.upenn.edu/~xconnect); it jumped off the screen to the printed page last week with a run of 1,000 copies. The Penn Bookstore has copies and the Center City Borders will host a reading Sept. 19.

“At present we have over 500 orders,” crowds Deifer, who is marketing the literary review coast to coast to the general public, “to bring poetry and fiction back into the limelight. The web has proved there is a large audience for creative writing, and... the arts will continue with or without government funding.”

XConnect is a success thanks to support from some members of the English Department, and from the University, as well as to the hard work of Deifer and others at DCCS.

XConnect came about as the result of a conversation Deifer had with Leah Sheppard, a DCCS network technician who shares Deifer’s love for writing. Since both were both looking for outlets for their work, they decided to search the ‘Net for Web sites that would post their writing. But they were disappointed by what they found.

“After looking at the many different literary Web sites, we just thought we could just do a much better job,” Deifer says.

And they did — with the help of two more DCCS employees, Mike Dettinger, help desk analyst, chipped in with the HTML coding and design, and Cliff Robinson, operations technician, put together the hardware needed to power the Web site. Marvin Jackson, now from Penn’s new Institute for Medicine and Engineering, came on about the same time as XConnect Editor Alex Edelman (’97). Edelman, an English major, had created an on-line magazine for undergraduate writers.

“He did such a good job and we needed help with our Web journal, so we promoted him to senior editor for our magazine,” Deifer explains.

Edelman came to XConnect through Al Filreis, undergraduate chair of the English department and an early advocate of XConnect. Filreis is just one of the many Penn professors who have been impressed with the on-line publication.

“We had a lot of support from the different professors at Penn in the English department,” Deifer notes. “Now, in the last two issues, maybe a quarter of the contributors are English professors or other types of professors at this, and other, universities.”

Deifer and company are pleased that so many prominent scholars are backing their venture. They’re particularly proud that Penn has been so cooperative, with Penn providing the technological resources necessary to keep XConnect on line.

“We feel lucky to have this opportunity, and it’s all because of Penn,” Deifer says.

As a show of gratitude, the XConnect staff are giving something back to their employer. The electronic and print versions of the publication are bringing positive publicity to the University, and XConnect’s editors are planning courses for the Writer’s House.

“Dave and I are going to be offering seminars on publishing on-line,” Edelman says.

Perhaps these students will be the next crop of XConnect contributors. The first crop came mostly from cyberspace.

“We took people who had really good reputations on newsgroups and listservs and from that we were able to get more contributors because of those names,” he explains.

XConnect still solicits on line, but now also uses snail mail to attract contributors. Four editors from around the country also actively seek out writers and artists.

“Now we’re in a position where we can carve out each issue the way we want to,” Edelman says. “We publish two percent of our submissions.”

Of all the contributors featured in the on-line publication, only 43 made it into the printed version. The 188-page magazine boasts a four-page, four-color insert of original artwork.

Although the on-line version comes out quarterly, XConnect will only print annually. With the right support, it could come out more frequently; however. Deifer, who funded the project himself, doesn’t welcome the creative “advice” financial backers would undoubtedly bring.

“I wanted to do it myself so we have complete control over what goes into the magazine, as well as the marketing,” he says.

Deifer may provide the money, but Dettinger keeps track of it. A Wharton graduate, Dettinger is XConnect’s general manager. A jack of all trades, he does just about anything the publication needs — except write. That could change. Working with Sheppard and Deifer has shown him that DCCS employees are capable of much more than tinkering with computers.

“Surrounded by all this greatness, it’s hard not to try writing,” Dettinger says with a laugh.
Psychology under the Gun — Penn Psychologist to the Rescue

For Martin Seligman, it was time to give something back. A renowned author, teacher and researcher at Penn, he had seen his field, psychology, take a few lumps in the 90s, and decided he wanted to work to make things better.

This past summer, Seligman was elected President of the American Psychological Association by the largest vote in recent history.

“The profession has given a lot to me, and I wanted to give something back,” he said.

There are three areas that need to be addressed, he said, and the first is changes in health insurance.

“Managed care had done serious damage to the practice of psychology,” he said. “It directs patients to abbreviated treatments that cost less; the patient and practitioner are spending fewer hours together. Patients are being routed to the cheapest provider. The whole process is profit driven, and patients are being shortchanged on a nationwide scale.

“The second area that needs to be addressed is that academic jobs and grant availability are at an all time low. We need to reverse this.

“And the third area is how the practice of psychology and the science of psychology can work together to solve both problems. I was elected because I’m trusted by both camps,” he said.

His election comes at one of the busiest and most productive periods of his career. In the past six years he has written three widely selling books, Learned Optimism, What You Can Change and What You Can’t and The Optimistic Child. And received two multimillion dollar grants from the National Institute of Mental Health. He has also maintained a full-teaching and research load.

“I won’t write another book until after my term expires,” he said.

Seligman will serve a three-year term of office. He previously was head of the APA’s division of clinical psychology.

Seligman said his new post will require “a new set of muscles for me to have,” which he’ll use to persuade health insurers, the public and the Congress that any short-term fiscal gains made by quicker therapies and research cutbacks will have serious health-care consequences in the long run.

Seligman received his Ph.D. from Penn in 1964, and joined the faculty that year. He has written 13 books and published more than 150 scholarly articles. Recently, he was the leading consultant to Consumer Reports magazine for its recent membership survey on the effectiveness of psychotherapy.

The American Psychological Association, based in Washington, D.C., is the largest scientific and professional organization representing psychologists in the United States, with more than 142,000 members.

College Rankings Released

The University of Pennsylvania is ranked 13th among national universities in the annual U.S. News & World Report survey of colleges and universities with an overall score of 95.2.

It was tied for 11th a year ago (with the University of Chicago) with an overall score of 94.4.

The magazine also ranks business schools, giving top honors, jointly, to Penn’s Wharton School and the University of Michigan School of Business. Penn’s undergraduate engineering program is tied for 24th with Duke, Ohio State, Maryland and Colorado.

There is a difference of only 1.6 points in the overall score of the 229 institutions ranked between Stanford (No. 6) and Penn (No. 13) in the U.S. News survey. Some colleges and universities in this group are separated by one-tenth of a point in the overall score. Columbia, for example, receives a score of 95.4 while both Northwestern and Cal Tech score a 95.5.

In what is arguably the most important category in the magazine’s survey, academic reputation, Penn ranks No. 11, up three points from 1995.

U.S. News, now in its 15th year of rankings, is one of many publications that offer guidance to high school students trying to choose among hundreds of colleges and universities.

This year’s rankings, available on newsstands this week, ended Harvard’s six-year streak at No. 1. It finished third behind Yale and Princeton.

The magazine uses several statistical measures to rank the nation’s universities and liberal arts colleges. Their reputations, based on a survey of college presidents, deans and admissions officers, count for 25 percent of the score. Other factors are selectivity, 15 percent; faculty resources, 20 percent; financial resources, 10 percent; retention, 20 percent; and alumni giving, 5 percent. A new criterion called “value added” and worth 5 percent compares the number of students expected to graduate with those who actually did.

Penn is 19th among national universities in “Best Value: Discount Price.” Other Ivy League institutions listed in this ranking are Dartmouth (5), Yale (13), Princeton (16), Columbia (18), Cornell (21), Harvard (25), and Brown (31). U.S. News’ “Best Value” rankings are on newsstands Sept. 16.
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Bearden Prints Show American Experience

By Kirby F. Smith

Growing up in the South, studies in Paris, the Harlem Renaissance — these and the whole American experience are the stuff of Romare Bearden’s art. Known for his paintings and collages, Bearden (1914-1988) also produced a great variety of prints. Fifty of these, from the Bearden Foundation and other private collections, are on display at the Arthur Ross Gallery through Oct. 24. A part of the exhibition will be displayed concurrently at Philadelphia’s Brandywine Workshop.

“Bearden’s life and work reflect the influences he grew up in the United States and those he sought out in Europe,” said Dilys Winegrad, director of the Arthur Ross Gallery. “Bearden was equally familiar with life in the rural American South and cosmopolitan Paris, where he associated with artists such as Brancusi and Braque. He was influenced by the Bible and Greek mythology and created vivid images of life in rural America and the Caribbean that arouse a sense of their own myth and mystery.”

Born in Mecklenburg, N.C., in 1912, Bearden commemorated life through art, depicting the rituals, customs and cycles essential to it in 20th-century America. In his works Bearden reconstructs his life’s history and the African-American experience.

“One sees in Bearden’s work a recurrent set of themes,” said Herman Beavers, associate professor of English at the University of Pennsylvania and director of its Afro-American Studies Program, “that have ... to do with ... how does one create and maintain structure in the face of soul-killing forces like discrimination, segregation and violence; ritual, music and family, therefore become instruments that provide a way for Bearden.”

In his youth Bearden studied at the Art Students League in Harlem. His mother, Bessye Bearden, was an activist, and family friends included W.E.B. DuBois and Paul Robeson, and painters Aaron Douglas and Charles Alston. In 1950, he traveled to Paris and while in Europe, visited museums and mingled with artists, poets and, perhaps most importantly, musicians. For a period after his return, he abandoned painting to try his hand as a songwriter.

As a visual artist, Bearden started out as a Social Realist and depicted the human figure and the human condition. He later experimented with abstract expressionism. During the civil rights movement, in association with other African-American artists, he reassessed his style as well as his artistic responsibilities. He spent years as a social worker in Harlem encouraging young black artists. Turning to collage and the use of photographic enlargements of popular-media reproductions, he was invited to present his first solo show at the Corcoran Gallery in Washington, D.C., in 1964.

For Bearden, printmaking was an important medium that complemented his paintings and collages and provided an outlet for experimentation as well as a new approach to broadening his audience.

In conjunction with the exhibition, a symposium on Bearden will take place 3 p.m. to 6:15 p.m. on Friday, Sept. 13, at Penn’s Annenberg School for Communication, 3620 Walnut St., Room 110.

The symposium brings together leading scholars to discuss “The Life and Work of Romare Bearden,” and celebrate the African-American tradition in the visual arts. The keynote address will be delivered by Dr. David Driskell, distinguished university professor of art, University of Maryland-College Park.

Beavers will make the opening remarks and the panel includes Dr. Elizabeth Alexander, assistant professor of English, University of Chicago; Dr. Sharon Patton, associate professor of art history and director of the Center for African American Studies, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor; and Dr. Paul Rogers, assistant professor of art history, University of Chicago. A reception at the Arthur Ross Gallery follows the symposium. Both events are free and open to the public.

Those interested in attending the symposium should call the gallery at (215) 898-2083.

This traveling exhibition was curated by Gail Gelburt and Alex Rosenberg. Its presentation at the Arthur Ross Gallery is dedicated to the memory of the artist’s widow, Nanette Rohan Bearden, who died this summer. An accompanying catalogue that contains the first comprehensive listing of all of Bearden’s graphic works, is distributed by the University of Pennsylvania Press.

Other related events include free jazz performances in the gallery on Sunday, Sept. 22, and a free children’s workshop with storyteller Linda Goss at 11 a.m., Saturday, Sept. 28.

At the Arthur Ross Gallery: “Falling Star,” lithograph by Romare Bearden
Restructuring Internal Audit

By Phyllis Holtzman

In large and complex organizations such as Penn, taking sensible risks is a key component of effective management. Whether seeking new revenue sources or implementing a new financial management system, the risks inherent in such ventures must continually be identified and assessed.

At Penn, anticipating and identifying such risks, as well as assuring that management controls and systems are in place to manage them, has assumed a prominent role in the University’s strategic planning. The University’s strategic plan, Agenda for Excellence, identifies managing risk and increasing accountability as one of its key strategic initiatives.

To that end, the Office of Internal Audit, under the leadership of Managing Director Rick Whitfield, has undertaken a broad-based restructuring designed to position Internal Audit as a business partner with the University and Health System management to anticipate and aggressively manage business risks, ensure strong stewardship and management accountability at all levels, and ensure the integrity of operational and financial information.

“We are shifting Internal Audit to a model of a partner in business practice with the University and Health System managers, rather than enforcers of rules and regulations,” Whitfield said. “We want to take a problem solving approach to issues related to internal controls and risks. Over time, I’d like managers to view our department as a key resource for management advice at Penn.”

The restructured Office of Internal Audit will develop the expertise needed to make the transition to business partner with the schools and administrative units. To achieve this, staff changes have been made, several positions have been eliminated, and the resulting resources have been reinvested in upgrading certain key positions and obtaining access to technology. In addition, new positions have been created to provide the growing audit services required in the Health System.

“We intend to provide on-going training and professional development for our staff, both current and new,” Whitfield said. “We are trying to develop a core of superb people who can be positioned to transition to key management positions elsewhere within the University and the Health System.”

In an environment full of risk and complexity, it is imperative that the University build a high quality internal audit capability, noted Executive Vice President John Fry. “We intend to create an internal audit function as capable as any first-class corporate model,” he said. “We want to provide real value by helping Penn’s managers function in today’s complex world.”

Whitfield identified five types of business risks which continually confront institutions. They are: strategic risks, which affect the overall direction of the organization; financial risks, which involve safeguarding assets; operational risks, which impact the processes that govern daily operations; regulatory risks, which apply to compliance with laws and regulations; and reputational risks, which affect the institution’s public image.

“We are trying to get people to look at these issues, and, when making decisions, ask, ‘What are the risks to us, and to the institution?’” Whitfield said. “Our role will then be to provide the tools to assess those risks, and monitor their effectiveness.”

A key component of the department’s plan is the deployment of new technologies designed to improve productivity and develop automated self-assessment tools which can be shared with management. The idea, Whitfield said, is to use technology that “allows us to do more with less.”

This is particularly critical as Internal Audit moves forward with its mandate to integrate the Health System audit needs more fully into its area of operation. With the University moving to further decentralize some of its administrative services in order to improve response time, while the Health System is beginning to centralize certain functions that carry a high degree of risk, the challenge is to “develop highly cohesive professional teams to serve both sides,” Whitfield said. Implementing technologies that integrate connectivity to comprehensive information systems will be a significant step toward realizing that goal, he added.

“As we proceed with this long-term process, we will continually focus on minimizing and controlling risk at the beginning of a venture, rather than just stepping in after a problem has been found,” Whitfield said.

This heightened emphasis on managing risk is especially critical now, he said, as the University positions itself for the future by developing new educational tools, such as distance learning; deploying new and more complex information systems and technologies changing traditional business processes and internal control systems; seeking new business opportunities; and enhancing the University’s compliance program.

In carrying out its new mandate, the department will be guided by an annual audit plan. A key component of the plan is to identify the “audit universe,” that is, all those areas within the University and the Health System that should be served by the department. Internal Audit staff will then work with senior management to develop both short and long-term audit plans, with the goal of providing management with the expertise and tools it needs to make sound business decisions, enhance cost effectiveness and realize strategic goals.

“We want to provide managers with the tools to recognize, assess and manage risk,” Whitfield said. “We want to help managers identify cost savings, and revenue enhancement opportunities. And we want to be positioned to provide management services to units who need them.”

“And under the best of circumstances, however, we can never provide absolute assurance that we are free of risk,” he added. “A certain amount of risk will always be present.”

Over time, I’d like managers to view our department as a key resource for management advice at Penn.

— Rick Whitfield
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ARTS AND SCIENCES
Specialist: Susan Curran
ADMIN. ASST. II (081025SC) Provide administrative support for the Center; assist with daily operations & budget; monitor enrolments in language classes; supervise work-study students; maintain hardware & software: act as liaison between Center & other departments.
Qualifications: Completion of high school & related post-hs. training or equiv.; BA/BS in language-related discipline preferred; at least 2 years at AAI level or comparable background; excellent interpersonal skills, familiarity with PC/AM soft, word good processing skills.
Grade: G10: Range: $19,261-23,999 9-4-96 Penn Language Ctr.

INST. STERILIZATION ATTENDANT II (07730CP)
Grade: G9; $17,614-21,991 7-31-96 Central Dental

DENTAL SCHOOL
Specialist: Clyde Peterson
COORDINATOR I (08901CP) P1: $20,219-26,368 8-13-96 Biochemistry

OFFICE MANAGER II (08946CP) P2: $22,351-29,098 8-21-96 Periodontics

ADMIN. ASST. I (40 HRS) (08902CP) G9: $20,130-25,133 8-13-96 FISOPS

ADMIN. ASST. II (07730CP) G10: $19,261-23,999 7-31-96 Pediatric Dentistry

DENTAL SCHOOL (40 HRS)(07098CP) G7: $17,068-21,247 7-24-95 Dental Medicine

INST. STIPEND ATTENDANT II (40 HRS) (07750CP) G6: $14,008-17,201 7-9-96 Central Dental Svs.

INST. STERILIZATION ATTENDANT II (07780CP) G6: $14,008-17,201 7-9-96 Central Dental Svs.

RESEARCH L-TECH III (07831CP) G7/G8: $14,935-18,592 6-1-96 Microbio.

ENGINEERING/APPLIED SCIENCE
Specialist: Clyde Peterson
SECRETARY IV (081003CP) Provide secretarial support for faculty; type, proofread &/or edit reports, proposals & manuscripts, which utilize technical terminology; organize, develop & maintain word processing filing systems; pick up & distribute mail; act as liaison to students regarding dept. & University policy.
Qualifications: Completion of high school; min. two yrs. secretarial exp.; use of Macintosh/Microsoft Word required; type at least 70 wpm; solid organizational & proofreading skills; knowledge of specialized/technical terminology a plus; ability to take initiative & use good judgment.
Grade: G9: Range: $17,617-21,991 9-6-96 Mechanical Engineering

ENGINEERING ANALYST II (08905SC)
Grade: G8; $18,872-23,562 9-6-96 Mechanical Engineering

BUSINESS ANALYST II (07833SC) P4/P5: $26,986-35,123 $29,664-38,677 8-12-96 Systems

LEGAL AFFAIRS
Specialist: Ronald Story/Janet Zinser
ADMIN. ASST. III (08905SC) P2: $22,351-29,098 8-12-96 Biology

SYSTEMS PROGRAMMER I (08916SC) P6: $32,857-42,591 8-16-96 Linguistics/IDC

SECRETARY TECH/MD (07755SC) G9: $17,614-21,991 7-17-96 Chemistry

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT
Specialist: David Smith/Susan Curran
FINANCIAL ANALYST (081037SC) Assist in preparation & analysis of internal & external financial reports; complete ad hoc projects as required; perform analysis of financial trends impacting the University. Qualifications: BA/BS in Accounting/Economics; 3-5 years of accounting experience; solid understanding of accounting standards & practices; knowledge of Financial Systems preferred; strong analytic skills; excellent written & oral communications skills; ability to work with limited supervision.
Grade: PG: Range: $29,664-38,677 9-4-96 Comptroller’s Office

MANAGER, FINANCIAL REPORTING/BUDGET ANALYSIS (081038SC) Direct preparation & analysis of internal & external financial statements & ad hoc reports; serve as liaison with independent accountants; generate information relating to operation of various areas of University on historical, current & projected basis; prepare reports based on analysis performed; assist in control of budgets during fiscal year; maintain analyses of revenue sources; perform review & analysis of Health Systems operations; direct analysis of financial trends impacting University. Qualifications: BA/BS in Accounting; MBA or CPA preferred; minimum 5 years progressively responsible managerial experience in public accounting, corporate environment or research university; knowledge of spreadsheet & word processing software; knowledge of Oracle financial systems & health care industry preferred.
Grade: P9: Range: $43,569-57,217 9-4-96 Comptroller’s Office

CUSTOMER SERVICE REPRESENTATIVE (37.5 HRS) (081024SC) Provide essential public relations & customer services for Human Resources; welcome visitors; determine customer needs & direct to appropriate department or person; courteously & professionally respond to telephone & in-person inquiries; receive, sort & accurately direct mail; type, proofread &/or edit reports, proposals & manuscripts, which utilize technical terminology; organize, develop & maintain word processing filing systems; pick up & distribute mail; act as liaison to students regarding dept. & University policy.
Qualifications: Completion of high school; min. two yrs. secretarial exp.; use of Macintosh/Microsoft Word required; type at least 70 wpm; solid organizational & proofreading skills; knowledge of specialized/technical terminology a plus; ability to take initiative & use good judgment.
Grade: G9: Range: $17,617-21,991 9-6-96 Mechanical Engineering

LIMITED SERVICE (ADMIN. ASST. II) (081004CP)
Support the Assistant to Chair & Department faculty; type journal articles, book chapters, class materials, proposals & equations; utilize knowledge of Latex, WordPerfect, Microsoft Word & Excel; assist with student information maintenance, coordination of recruiting interviews, conference management & special events, coordination of student orientation & course scheduling.
Qualifications: Completion of high school; minimum two yrs. of AA or equiv. exp.; use of Macintosh, Microsoft Word required; ability to type at least 65 wpm; solid organizational & proofreading skills; knowledge of specialized/technical terminology a plus; ability to take initiative & use good judgement.
Grade: G10: Range: $14,446-17,999 9-6-96 Systems Engineering

BUSINESS MANAGER II (07833Z) P4/P5: $26,986-35,123 $29,664-38,677 7-13-96 IME

RESEARCH SPECIALIST JR. I (08962RS) P1/P2: $20,291-26,368 COMPTROLLER 521-29,098 8-22-96 IME

P-T PROFESSIONAL (COORDINATOR) (07855SC) P5: $14,833-19,338 8-28-96 MEAM

SECY IV (08867CP) G9: $17,614-21,991 8-6-96 CIS

TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES ASSIST. II (08991SC) G9: $19,261-23,999 8-27-96 Penntrax

GRAD SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Specialist: Clyde Peterson
RESEARCH SPECIALIST I (07785CP) (On-going contingent upon funding) P2: $22,351-29,098 7-19-96 GSE/NCOFF

ADMIN. ASST. II (07730CP) (On-going contingent upon funding) G10: $19,261-23,999 7-19-96 NCOFF

LAW SCHOOL
Specialist: Clyde Peterson
ADMIN. ASST. I (08929CP) G9: $17,614-21,991 8-21-96 Law School

ADMIN. ASST. III (08870CP) G11: $20,497-26,008 8-7-96 Medical School

MEDICAL SCHOOL
Specialist: Ronald Story/Janet Zinser
BUSINESS MANAGER I (081082Z) Administer all grant applications for university approval; oversee processing of all University & CPUP purchasing requests; responsible for all payroll & specific personnel functions; coordinate facility & space changes; generate reports for use in preparing budgets. Qualifications: BA/BS required, college level coursework in account-
P-T (SCIENTIFIC EQUIP. STERIL. ATTENDANT) (20 HRS) (07843RS)G: $7,074-8,687 5-8-96 Microbiol.
P-T (SECURITY OFFICER-SOM) (22HRS) (08962JZ) Grade: $20,133-24,999 7-12-96 Security/HD. & Facilities
P-T (SUPERVISOR-SOM SECURITY UNIT) (22HRS) (08957JZ) Grade: $20,133-24,999 7-12-96 Security/HD. & Facilities

NURSING

Specialist: Ronald Story

ADMIN. ASS'T. II (40 HRS) (07814RS)G: $20,013-25,427 7-22-96 Nursing
ADMIN. ASS'T. III (40 HRS) (07814RS) (On going dependency on viability of practice) G: $20,013-25,427 7-22-96 CARE Program
ADMIN. ASS'T. III (40 HRS) (7827RS) (End date: end of 7-20-97) G: $20,133-24,773 7-13-96 Nursing
ADMIN. ASS'T. II (40 HRS) (07894RS)G: $20,133-24,773 7-13-96 Nursing
ADMIN. ASS'T. III (40 HRS) (7809RS) (On going dependency on viability of practice) G: $23,425-29,723 7-22-96 CARE Program
SECRETARY IV (40 HRS) (78010RS)G: $19,133-23,537 8-13-96 Nursing
P-T (ADMIN. ASS'T.) (08982RS)G: $9,678-12,083 7-30-96 Nursing

PRESIDENT

Specialists: Susan Curran/Janet Zinser

ASS'T. DIRECTOR IV/ASSOC. DIRECTOR V (12653JZ) Working with Director, coordinate and implement fundraising activities in New England and northeastern United States; cultivate and solicit alumni and friends for major gifts ($25,000 or more); manage prospect pipeline; design and administer events; monitor prospect pool in regions; recruit, maintain and motivate volunteers. ASSOC. DIR V: Manage your own prospect pool in regions above; work with Director to set priorities and devise cultivation and solicitation strategies. Qual.: BA/BSc; excellent organizational and interpersonal skills; excellent oral and written communication skills; willingness to travel frequently; valid driver’s license; familiarity with University and its constituents helpful. ASSIST. DIR IV: Three or more yrs. progressively responsible development exp. ASSOC. DIR IV: Five or more yrs. progressively responsible development exp. Major gifts fundraising. Grade: P5/P7 Range: $25,664-38,677 $36,050-46,814 9-3-96 Regional Programs
ASS'T. DIRECTOR IV (09105JZ) Plan, organize & administer cultivation & stewardship events; plan, arrange & execute general alumni activities; assist in developing major cultivation programs; develop & maintain program budgets; act as liaison with University offices impacting on alumni special events; create three newsletters, reunion special events guide, yearbook & directory; oversee copy, design, printing & mailing of program related materials; supervise students/staff volunteers; work closely with campus closer and Alumni director & volunteers; act as consultant to other departments, schools & centers on planning & execution of special events; prepare detailed time lines & flowcharts. Qualifications: BA/BSc; at least 5 yrs. progressively responsible experience in special events management, alumni relations, public relations, marketing &/or similar activities; excellent oral & written communication skills; demonstrated ability to work effectively with various constituent groups; project mgmt. skills & adherence to strict deadlines essential; willingness to work some evenings & weekends, travel & valid driver’s license req. Grade: P5/Range: $25,664-38,677 $36,050-46,814 9-3-96 Regional Programs

PROVOST

Specialist: Clyde Peterson

ASSOC. DIRECTOR, LIBRARY INFO SYSTEMS (08102CP) Provide management for information systems department of the University Library: recruit, develop & lead team of professional & staff in the design, development & implementation of digitized digital academic library of the future; plan, implement, install, support & maintain hardware & software; responsible for operation, maintenance & upgrading of Library computer labs & other public workstations; develop & manage effective staff, analyze systems; identify new products & technologies with potential value to scholarly info. services; participate on teams planning & oversee University wide computer systems projects; act as liaison with other Penn apps. & other universities in collaborative projects & programs. Qualifications: BA/BSc required; demonstrated initiative & leadership preference. Assn.: Academic setting exp.; effective leadership, teamwork & interpersonal skills; familiarity with current info. system development; previous exp. with installation of major computer system or large-scale info. tech. application; knowledge of library & info. systems; demonstrated knowledge of: WAN & LAN systems, Z39.50 applications design, SGML & HTML design & application, UNIX, C++, Java, Javascript, Active X, Desktop operating systems, incl. Apple, Oracle, Digitizing technologies, tiered client-server system design, Natural language, relevance search engines & relational database; telecommunications tech.; networking tech.; electronic publishing apps. Grade: P1 Range: $56,135-70,246 9-6-96 University Libraries
VETERINARY SCHOOL

Specialist: Ronald Story

RESEARCH SPECIALIST JR (081015RS) Performs procedures in cellular immunology including tissue culture and mouse assays; may conduct experiments with established protocols; participate in development of new protocols; order supplies; prepare reagents; record & analyze experimental results; attend meetings; confer with other scientists & scientific or related field or equivalent training; exposure to sterile tissue culture techniques. Grade: P1; Range: $20,291-26,208 9-8-96 Pathobiology

RESEARCH SPECIALIST II (081016RS) Perform administrative clerical duties in support of the departmental business office; prepare records, maintain & monitor financial forms, budget actions, personnel & payroll actions; prepare reports & type & proofread budget for proposals; maintain computerized office systems. Qualifications: High school diploma & related business clerical training or equiv.; familiarity with University administrative & financial procedures desirable; knowledge of microcomputer (Lotus 1-2-3) & WordPerfect. Effective: Grade: P1; Range: $20,291-26,208 9-8-96 Pathobiology

TECH, VET ANESTHESIA TRAINEE (081016SC) Trainee under direct supervision, learn veterinary anesthesia, pharmacology, animal physiology & restraint; anesthetize various specimens of animals for various purposes for use in supporting medical research; maintain efficiency of functions of patients under stress; manage chemical restraint, pain relief & recovery; maintain equipment & supplies. Tech I: under general supervision, anesthetize animals & maintain emergency duty; assist with instruction of jr. & sr. Vet students & AHT students; perform cardiac & respiratory resuscitation. Qual.: Tech I: completion of accredited Animal Health Tech prog. exp. Tech II: completion of accredited Animal Health Tech prog. or equiv. exp.; one year exp. as Vet Anesthesia Trainee, 1-2 years medical &/or animal exp. (Hrs.: 7:30 a.m.-4 p.m.) (Grades: G11/G10; Range: $14,481-21,132; $23,021-27,427 9-9-66 VHP UVE TECH, VET, VISION IMAGING II (40 HRS) (081017RS) Perform routine & special diagnostic imaging procedures on animals; operate diagnostic imaging equipment; follow radiation safety standards & rules; teach students & technicians; perform routine radiology clerical duties. Qualifications: Tech I: completion of high school & accredited eligibility for certification as animal health technician or radiologic tech program; Tech II: 2 years of animal medical experience or 1 year professional level experience in imaging flight. (As signed: all evening, weekends, holidays & holidays may be assigned to weekend) Grade: G8/G10; Range: $18,481-21,132, $23,021-27,427 9-9-66 VHP UVE TECH, VETERINARY NURSE (40 HRS) (081018RS) (On-site housing is available) P4; $26,986-35,128 12-19-96 NBC RESEARCH LAB TECH, VET (40 HRS) (07767RS) G11; $23,021-27,427 9-7-96 Clinical Studies TECH, VET, VETERINARY NURSE (40 HRS) (081019RS) (May include rotating shifts, weekends, holidays, plus over-time & on-call) (Position in Kennett Square; no public transportation) G8; $18,481-21,132 9-28-86 Large Animal Hospital-NBC TECH, VET, VETERINARY NURSE (40 HRS) (081020RS) G8/G10, $18,481-21,132, $23,021-27,427 9-8-96 VHP-UVE Oncology TECH, VET, VET IMAG. II (40 HRS) (08884RS) (May incl. evex., weekends, holidays & emergency on-call) G8/G10, $18,481-21,132 $23,021-27,427 8-9-96 VHP-Surgery TECH, VET, VET IMAG. II (40 HRS) (08885RS) (May incl. evex., weekends, holidays & emergency on-call G8/G10, $18,481-21,132 $23,021-27,427 8-9-96 VHP-Surgery P-T, TECH, VET III (26 HRS) (08886RS) (Wed. -Thurs. 8 a.m.-7 p.m., & Fri. 8 a.m.-6 p.m.) $9,656-11,588 12-19-96 VHP-Emergency

VICE PROVOST/UNIVERSITY LIFE

Specialist: Clyde Peterson

COORD. (08932PC) $22,351-29,098 9-8-96 OSIS DIRECTOR, GREENFIELD INTERCULTURAL CENTER (06707PC) P7; $36,050-46,817 7-3-96 Greenfield Intercultural Center

INFO MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST II (08922PC) P6; $32,857-42,591 8-19-96 OSIS PLACEMENT COUNSELOR, SR. (07864PC) P5; $29,664-38,677 7-19-96 OSIS PROGRAMMER ANALYST II (08921PC) P6; $32,857-42,591 8-16-96 OSIS STAFF ASS'NT. V (05424PC) P5; $29,664-38,677 7-24-96 OSIS P-T PROFESSIONAL (STAFF PSYCHIATRIST) (15 HRS) (08999PC) (End date: 6/30/97) Blank 8-29-96 Counseling & Psychiatric Services ADMIN. ASS'NT. II (08917PC) G11; $20,497-26,008 7-25-96 International Programs ADMIN. ASS'NT. III (08917PC) G11; $20,497-26,008 8-16-96 International Programs STAFF WRITER II (08917PC) P6; $22,351-29,098 9-6-96 Internal Affairs STAFF WRITER II (08934PC) Write proposals & grants; generate proposals including project identification, research, text & budget for school funding opportunities; develop template for gift & pledge agreements; work closely with administrators & faculty; assist stewardship coordinator with related activities. Qualifications: BA/BS; two yrs. minimum exp.; knowledge of resources & procedures to conduct research; excellent communication skills; organizational ability to synthesize data from various sources; computer literate; work closely, Access. Grade: P2; Range: $22,351-29,098 9-6-96 Internal Affairs

WHARTON SCHOOL

Specialist: Janet Zinser

STAFF RESEARCHER (081035JZ) Identify new prospects; conduct research; compile & synthesize information; write research profiles; pro-actively search for new funding sources; monitor existing projects; route clipping & articles of interest; file. Qualifications: BA/BS or two yrs. related exp.; knowledge of resources & procedures to conduct research; excellent communication skills; organizational ability to synthesize data from various sources; computer literate, work closely, Access. Grade: P3; Range: $24,617-31,986 9-6-96 External Affairs

STAFF WRITER II (08934PC) Write proposals & grants; generate proposals including project identification, text, research & budget for school funding opportunities; develop template for gift & pledge agreements; work closely with administrators & faculty; assist stewardship coordinator with related activities. Qualifications: BA/BS; two yrs. minimum proposal/grant writing experience; research skill, including on-line sources; computer literate: Word, Excel, Access, Project; excellent oral & written communication skills. Grade: P3; Range: $24,617-31,986 9-6-96 External Affairs

ASS'T. DIRECTOR IV/ASSOC. DIRECTOR V (08934JZ) PS/P7; $29,664-38,677 8-12-96 MBA Admissions

ASSOC. DIRECTOR V (08978JZ) P7; $36,050-46,814 8-26-96 External Affairs

BUDGET ADMINISTRATOR (08888JZ) P8; $29,664-38,677 8-12-96 Finance & Administration

COORDINATOR II (08908JZ) P2; $22,351-29,098 8-27-96 External Affairs

COORDINATOR II (08881JZ) P2; $22,351-29,098 8-27-96 Executive Education

COORDINATOR II (080015JZ) P2; $22,351-29,098 8-28-96 Avery Institute

GRAPHIC DESIGNER/TECH SPECIALIST (07072JZ) P6; $32,857-42,591 5-7-96 External Affairs

MANAGING DIRECTOR WHARTON FINANCIAL INSTITUTE CENTER (08955JZ) P1; $56,135-70,246 8-6-96 Financial Institute Center

PLACEMENT COUNSELOR II/ASS'NT. DIR. IV (08941JZ) P4/P5; $26,986-35,128 8-21-96 Career Development & Placement

PROGRAMMER ANALYST II (07874PC) P6; $32,857-42,591 G11; $25,595-32,208 8-23-96 WCIT

SYSTEMS PROGRAMMER I/II (08954JZ) P6/ P7; $32,857-42,591 $36,050-46,814 8-23-96 WCIT

TECHNICAL WRITER (09411JZ) Final candidates may be asked to submit a writing sample) P6; $32,857-42,591 7-18-96 External Affairs

ADMIN. ASS'NT. II (40 HRS) (08892JZ) G10; $21,013-27,427 8-27-96 External Affairs

ADMIN. ASS'NT. III (07762JZ) G11; $20,497-26,008 7-16-96 Management

OFFICE ADMIN. ASS'NT. I (08943JZ/G10; $19,261-25,999 8-22-96 Avery Institute

SUPERVISOR II (08873JZ) (Position requires periodic overtime on evenings, Saturdays, Sundays, University holidays; production cycle of department requires that availability for overtime may be taken on 1-1-97; Wed., Sat. & Sun.; availability for overtime is required) G11; $19,090-24,913 8-9-96 WCIT
Computer Training Classes at the Computing Resource Center

The Office of Information Systems and Computing, Technology Learning Services, offers computer courses to Penn faculty, staff and students with a valid PENNcard. All classes and seminars are held at the Computing Resource Center, 38th & Locust Walk (across from the Penn Bookstore).

Registration is required for all hands-on courses and some Bits & Pieces seminars. Individuals must register themselves (no registration by third party). For registration and information by phone: 573-3102; by email: tls@isc.upenn.edu, or on the web: http://www.upenn.edu/TLS. Registration is open for September classes, Registration for October classes begins on September 23. All prerequisites must be satisfied before registering for any course.

Prerequisites:

**DOS:** Working knowledge of elementary DOS commands is required for all training courses on application software for IBM PCs and compatibles. You can fulfill this prerequisite by completing one of our DOS tutorials or completing the “What You Really Need to Know about DOS” class.

**Windows:** Working knowledge of using the mouse, pull-down menus, file and folder structure is required. A knowledge of elementary DOS commands is also required for Windows courses in order to learn the important concepts of these programs at the pace at which they are presented. In order to fulfill this prerequisite, complete one of the Windows tutorials or the “Introduction to Windows” course.

**Macintosh:** Working knowledge of using the mouse, pull-down menus, file and folder structure is required. The minimum acceptable experience level is completion of the Macintosh Basics tutorial, which comes with most Macintosh systems and is also available at the CRC.

**Cancellation:** Required 48 hours in advance; failure to do so will prohibit registration for other ISC-TLS courses that semester.

---

**Hands-On Courses for DOS/Windows Users**

- **What you really need to know about DOS:** Covers basic system parts, terms, and commands needed to get started using DOS. Includes hands-on practice session. Fulfills DOS prerequisite. September 17 or October 2, 12-1:30 p.m.
- **Introduction to Windows 3.1:** Prerequisite: DOS Seminar or Tutorial. Covers basic Windows concepts including: using program manager, working with menus and dialog boxes, manipulating windows and using the task list. Fulfills Windows prerequisite. September 19 or October 3, 9:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m., or October 24, 1:30-4:30 p.m.
- **Introduction to Word 6.0 for Windows:** Prerequisite: Windows Course or Tutorial. Covers the basic elements of word processing using Word for Windows. Includes creating, saving, retrieving, editing, and printing files. October 8, 9:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.
- **Introduction to WordPerfect for Windows:** Prerequisite: Windows Course or Tutorial. Covers the basic elements of word processing using WordPerfect for Windows. Includes creating, saving, retrieving, editing, and printing files. September 26 at 1:30-4:30 p.m. or October 29, 9:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.
- **Introduction to Excel For Windows:** Prerequisite: Windows Course or Tutorial. Covers the basic elements of creating and using Excel spreadsheets. Topics include entering data, formatting ranges, using Excel functions, writing formulas, and printing spreadsheets. This course is given only upon departmental request. October 14, 1:30-4:30 p.m.
- **Introduction to HTML:** Prerequisite: Netscape, Fetch or Winsock FTP. Covers the basic elements of word processing using Word on the MAC. Includes hands-on experience in creating, saving, retrieving, editing, and printing files. October 11, 9:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.
- **Introduction to Excel For MAC:** Prerequisite: Familiarity with the Macintosh. Covers basic functions of an electronic spreadsheet. Includes entering, editing, and formatting data and formulas; using pre-defined statistical functions and lookup tables; using Boolean logic within formulas and linking worksheets. October 16, 1:30-4:30 p.m.
- **Introduction to HTML:** Prerequisite: Netscape, Fetch or Winsock FTP. Covers the basic elements of HTML formatting, creating links, and moving files to and from a World Wide Web server. Working knowledge of software prerequisites is necessary. PennNet ID and Password used in class should be obtained at the Computing Resource Center. October 22, 1:30-4:30 p.m.

**Hands-On Courses for Macintosh Users**

- **Introduction to Word for MAC:** Prerequisite: Familiarity with the Macintosh. Covers basic elements of word processing using Word on the MAC. Includes hands-on experience in creating, saving, retrieving, editing, and printing files. October 11, 9:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.
- **Introduction to Excel for MAC:** Prerequisite: Familiarity with the Macintosh. Covers basic functions of an electronic spreadsheet. Includes entering, editing, and formatting data and formulas; using pre-defined statistical functions and lookup tables; using Boolean logic within formulas and linking worksheets. October 16, 1:30-4:30 p.m.
- **Introduction to HTML:** Prerequisite: Netscape, Fetch or Winsock FTP. Covers the basic elements of HTML formatting, creating links, and moving files to and from a World Wide Web server. Working knowledge of software prerequisites is necessary. PennNet ID and Password used in class should be obtained at the CRC. September 24, 9:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.

**Bits & Pieces Seminars**

- **Accessing The Internet via Penn Net:** Brief overview of PennNet services and a demonstration of how to access popular Internet resources via PennNet. September 20 or October 16, 12-1 p.m.
- **Introduction to Netscape:** Introduction to Internet browsers using Netscape. Covers configuring Netscape to launch Penn’s home page, setting preferences, creating bookmarks, and navigating to popular Internet sites. September 24, October 11, or October 22, 1-2 p.m.
- **Introduction to Fetch:** Introduction to file transfer over the Internet using Fetch. Covers starting Fetch, connecting to a host, short cuts, and viewing and downloading files. October 8, 1-2 p.m.
- **Introduction to WS_FTP:** Introduction to Internet file transfer using WS_FTP. Covers starting WS_FTP, connecting to a host, short cuts, viewing and downloading files. September 30 or October 25, 1-2 p.m.

---

**Relative Investment Performance on Tax-Deferred Annuities**

The Benefits Office regularly receives inquiries on the relative performance of investment funds offered under the University’s tax deferred annuity program. Below is a table which shows the performance of the various funds for the period ending June 30, 1996. The first column shows an abbreviation for the investment philosophy of the fund. (Abbreviations are described below.) The second column shows the overall asset size of the fund in millions of dollars. Columns three through seven show the performance of the funds over various time horizons. Columns eight and nine show the best and worst year for the last five years.

The Benefits Office will periodically publish this information in Almanac to assist faculty and staff in monitoring the performance of their tax deferred annuity investments. Any faculty or staff member who would like additional information on these benefit programs may call the Benefits Office at 908-7281.

—Albert Johnson
Acting Manager of Benefits

**Philosophy Key**

**Domestic:**
- D Diversified Common Stock Fund
- DI Diversified Common Stock Fund With Some What Higher Growth Potential
- SC Speciality Fund With Small Company Orientation

**Bonds:**
- B Balanced Fund
- FIS Fixed Income Fund (Short-Term Maturity)
- FII Fixed Income Fund (Intermediate-Term Maturity)
- FIL Fixed Income Fund (Long-Term Maturity)
- FISG Fixed Income Fund (Short-Term Maturity — Government Obligations)
- FIIG Fixed Income Fund (Intermediate-Term Maturity — Government Obligations)
- FILG Fixed Income Fund (Long-Term Maturity — Government Obligations)
- FIM Fixed Income Fund (Mortgage-Related Securities)
- FJU Fixed Income Fund (Low-Rated Bonds)
- MM Money Market Fund
- AA 30:40:30 Asset Allocation 30% Stocks:40% Bonds:30% Cash Benchmark Fund
- AA 60:35:5Asset Allocation 60% Stocks:35% Bonds:5% Cash Benchmark Fund

**International:**
- ICS International Common Stock Fund
- EM Emerging Markets Fund
- GC Global Common Stock Fund

Source: Lipper Analytical Services and fund families.

* Total Return: Dividend or interest plus capital appreciation or depreciation.

(1) CREF Equity Index Account was introduced on April 29, 1994.
(2) CREF Growth Account was introduced on April 29, 1994.
(3) Vanguard Horizon Funds were introduced on November 1, 1993.
(4) Vanguard International Equity Index Fund Emerging Markets Portfolio was introduced on May 4, 1994

---

**Almanac**

September 10, 1996
## Social Responsibility Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Latest Quarter</th>
<th>1-Year Averg.</th>
<th>3-Year Averg.</th>
<th>5-Year Averg.</th>
<th>10-Year Averg.</th>
<th>For the last 5 years</th>
<th>Best</th>
<th>Worst</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Calvert Funds:

- **Social Investment Bond Portfolio**
  - FII 62
  - 0.3
  - 4.2
  - 8.4
  - 3.9
  - 5.2

- **Social Investment Equity Portfolio**
  - D 97
  - 4.1
  - 9.0
  - 7.1
  - 24.1

- **Social Investment Managed Growth**
  - B 579
  - 1.2
  - 10.6
  - 8.8
  - 25.9

- **Social Investment Money Market**
  - MM 169
  - 0.3
  - 5.0
  - 4.5
  - 5.2

### CREF Funds:

- **CREF Bond Market Account**
  - FII 883
  - 0.4
  - 4.5
  - 8.3
  - 17.8

- **CREF Equity Index Account (1)**
  - D 97
  - 4.0
  - 25.4
  - 8.1
  - 18.2

- **CREF Global Equities Account**
  - GCS 3,709
  - 4.6
  - 18.3
  - 15.5
  - 29.5

- **CREF Growth Account (2)**
  - D 1,350
  - 2.7
  - 16.9
  - 11.3
  - 29.5

### Vanguard Funds:

- **Asset Allocation Fund**
  - AA 60:35:5 2,174
  - 2.6
  - 19.7
  - 14.4
  - 35.4

- **Bond Index Fund**
  - **Intermediate-Term Bond Portfolio (1)**
    - FII 463
    - 0.1
    - 4.3
    - 8.3
    - 17.0

- **CREF Bond Market Account**
  - FII 3,316
  - 0.6
  - 5.0
  - 11.9
  - 29.5

- **CREF Equity Index Account (1)**
  - D 97
  - 4.0
  - 14.4
  - 7.5
  - 29.5

- **CREF Growth Account (2)**
  - D 1,350
  - 2.7
  - 16.9
  - 11.3
  - 29.5

### Fixed Income Securities Fund:

- **GNMA Portfolio**
  - FIM 6,998
  - 0.7
  - 5.8
  - 5.5
  - 8.8

- **Intermediate-Term Corporate (1)**
  - FII 463
  - 0.0
  - 4.3
  - 8.3
  - 17.0

- **Total Bond Mkt Portfolio**
  - FII 3,316
  - 0.6
  - 5.0
  - 11.9
  - 29.5

### Index Trust:

- **500 Portfolio**
  - DI 23,622
  - 4.5
  - 25.9
  - 17.1
  - 37.5

- **Extended Market Portfolio**
  - D 1,958
  - 4.0
  - 26.2
  - 16.4
  - 36.0

- **Growth Portfolio**
  - D 510
  - 6.9
  - 27.1
  - 18.2
  - 36.0

### International Equity Index Fund:

- **Emerging Markets Portfolio (4)**
  - EM 507
  - 4.2
  - 15.4
  - 13.5
  - 37.5

- **Europe Portfolio**
  - ICS 1,278
  - 3.2
  - 14.8
  - 16.6
  - 36.0

- **Pacific Portfolio**
  - ICS 1,021
  - 1.1
  - 12.6
  - 5.8
  - 45.6

### Money Market Reserves:

- **Federal Portfolio**
  - MM 2,807
  - 1.3
  - 5.4
  - 4.6
  - 5.8

- **Prime Portfolio**
  - MM 20,834
  - 1.3
  - 5.4
  - 4.6
  - 5.8

### Trustees' Equity Fund:

- **U.S. Portfolio**
  - DI 144
  - 3.3
  - 22.7
  - 13.4
  - 33.2

### Sector Funds:

- **Energy**
  - S 609
  - 7.0
  - 27.9
  - 13.2
  - 37.1

- **Health Care**
  - S 2,195
  - 2.4
  - 38.1
  - 26.7
  - 45.2

### Indexes to Compare Performance Against

- **S&P 500**
  - 4.5
  - 26.0
  - 17.2
  - 37.6

- **Lipper Capital Appreciation Funds Average**
  - 5.0
  - 24.4
  - 14.8
  - 30.9

- **Lipper Growth Funds Average**
  - 4.4
  - 22.3
  - 14.7
  - 30.6

### Notes:

- **Horizon Fund:**
  - **Aggressive Growth Portfolio**
    - D 115
    - 4.9
    - NA
    - NA

- **Wellington Fund B:**
  - 14,113
  - 1.5
  - 18.3
  - 13.3
  - 32.9

- **Windsor II:**
  - DI 13,181
  - 3.0
  - 28.6
  - 16.8
  - 38.8

### 403(b) Performance Update Periods Ending June 30, 1996 Total Returns*

*Data represents total returns for the specified periods ending June 30, 1996. Performance metrics include size, latest quarter, and several years of average returns for various financial funds and indexes.
INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

Lady Davis Fellowships in Israel: November 30 Deadline
Awards for study, research or teaching on graduate, post-doctoral or professorial levels at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem or the Technion-Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, are available for the 1997-98 academic year.
Lady Davis Fellows are selected on the basis of demonstrated excellence in their studies and promise of distinction in their chosen fields of specialization, as well as on qualities of mind, intellect and character.
Graduate Fellowships—only students, who are enrolled in a Ph.D. program overseas, are eligible to apply for the Fellowship at the Hebrew University. Applicants to the Technion must have completed their studies with excellent marks.
Post-Doctoral Fellowships—candidates may apply not later than 3 years after completion of their Ph.D. dissertation. The grant is intended to defray the cost of the Fellows’ travel, tuition (where applicable) and to meet reasonable living expenses.
Visiting Professorships—are intended for candidates with the rank of Full or Associate Professor at their own institutions. They are tenable for one or two semesters. The grant includes a professorial salary and travel.
All Fellows are subject to acceptance and approval by the respective institutions.
Applications forms can be obtained from:
Lady Davis Fellowship Trust
Hebrew University, Givat Ram Campus
Jerusalem 91904 ISRAEL

Completed applications for all levels of the Fellowship must reach the office of the Trust not later than November 30, 1996.

Fulbright Visiting Scholar Programs; U.S. Special Programs
November 1 Deadline
Fulbright Scholar-in-Residence Program—U.S. colleges and universities are invited to submit proposals for a Fulbright grant to host a visiting lecturer in the arts, humanities, social sciences, and related fields from abroad for one or both terms of the 1997-98 academic year.
The European Union Scholar-in-Residence Program—U.S. institutions are invited to submit proposals to host a European Union (EU) official or an academic from an EU member country who specializes in EU affairs as a resident fellow for one or both terms of the 1997-98 academic year.
For information and applications for these two programs, please write or call Anita Caplan at the USIA Fulbright Senior Scholar Program, Council for International Exchange of Scholars.
Address: 3007 Tilden Street, NW, Suite 5M, Washington, DC 20008-3009
Phone: 202/686-6283
Internet: la4@ciesnet.cies.org

Fulbright German Studies Seminar—Faculty in German studies, communication, history, sociology and political science are invited to participate in a three-week seminar on German society today in Bonn, Leipzig, Munich, and Berlin during June and July 1997. Application materials may be obtained from the USIA Fulbright Senior Scholar Program, Council for International Exchange of Scholars.
Address: 3007 Tilden Street, NW, Suite 5M, Box F-GERS Washington, DC 20008-3009
Phone: 202/686-6244 Internet: we7@ciesnet.cies.org

January 1 Deadline
NATO Advanced Research Fellowships and Institutional Grants for research on political, security, and economic issues directly affecting the health of the NATO alliance. Special Fulbright application materials may be obtained by contacting:
USIA Fulbright Senior Scholar Program
Council for International Exchange of Scholars, 3007 Tilden Street, NW, Suite 5M, Box F-NATO, Washington, DC 20008-3009
Phone: 202/686-6244
Internet: we7@ciesnet.cies.org

Penn/Leuven Faculty Exchange: October 14 Deadline
Applications are invited from all Penn faculty interested in participating in Penn’s exchange with Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (K.U. Leuven) in Belgium. Round-trip economy airfare and a modest per diem are provided for teaching and research visits of at least one month and not more than one semester. Knowledge of Dutch is not required. A faculty host at K.U. Leuven must be identified.
The application deadline for spring 1997 short-term and fall 1997 semester-long faculty exchanges is Monday, October 14, 1996. Inquiries concerning later visits are welcome.
For an application form and further information, contact
Dr. Joyce M. Randolph, director,
Office of International Programs,
133 Bennett Hall/6275
Phone: Ext. 8-4665
e-mail: randolph@pobox.upenn.edu.

OF RECORD

University Policy on Secular and Religious Holidays
(Effective July 1, 1996)
1. No secular or religious holidays are formally recognized by the University’s academic calendar. However, in setting the academic calendar for each year, the University does try to avoid obvious conflicts with any holidays that involve most University students, faculty, and staff, such as Thanksgiving, Labor Day, Christmas and New Year’s.
2. Other holidays affecting large numbers of University community members include Martin Luther King Day, Rosh Hashanah, Yom Kippur, the first two days of Passover, and Good Friday. In consideration of their significance for many students, no examinations may be given and no assigned work may be required on these days. Students who observe these holidays will be given an opportunity to make up missed work in both laboratories and lecture courses. If an examination is given on the first class day after one of these holidays, it must not cover material introduced in class on that holiday.

Faculty should realize that Jewish holidays begin at sundown on the evening before the published date of the holiday. Late afternoon exams should be avoided on these days. Also, no examinations may be held on Saturday or Sunday in the undergraduate schools unless they are also available on other days. Nor should seminars or other regular classes be scheduled on Saturdays or Sundays unless they are also available at other times.

3. The University recognizes that there are other holidays, both religious and secular, which are of importance to some individuals and groups on campus. Such occasions include, but are not limited to, Memorial Day, Sukkot, the last two days of Passover, Shavuot, Shemini Atzerat, and Simchat Torah, as well as the Muslim New Year, Ram’s al-sana, and the Islamic holidays Eid Al-Fitr and Eid Al-Adha. Students who wish to observe such holidays must inform their instructors within the first two weeks of each semester of their intent to observe the holiday even when the exact date of the holiday will not be known until later so that alternative arrangements can be made.

2. Other holidays affecting large numbers of University community members include Martin Luther King Day, Rosh Hashanah, Yom Kippur, the first two days of Passover, and Good Friday. In consideration of their significance for many students, no examinations may be given and no assigned work may be required on these days. Students who observe these holidays will be given an opportunity to make up missed work in both laboratories and lecture courses. If an examination is given on the first class day after one of these holidays, it must not cover material introduced in class on that holiday.

Faculty should realize that Jewish holidays begin at sundown on the evening before the published date of the holiday. Late afternoon exams should be avoided on these days. Also, no examinations may be held on Saturday or Sunday in the undergraduate schools unless they are also available on other days. Nor should seminars or other regular classes be scheduled on Saturdays or Sundays unless they are also available at other times.

3. The University recognizes that there are other holidays, both religious and secular, which are of importance to some individuals and groups on campus. Such occasions include, but are not limited to, Memorial Day, Sukkot, the last two days of Passover, Shavuot, Shemini Atzerat, and Simchat Torah, as well as the Muslim New Year, Ram’s al-sana, and the Islamic holidays Eid Al-Fitr and Eid Al-Adha. Students who wish to observe such holidays must inform their instructors within the first two weeks of each semester of their intent to observe the holiday even when the exact date of the holiday will not be known until later so that alternative arrangements can be made.

— Stanley Chodorow, Provost

ALMANAC September 10, 1996
The University of Pennsylvania Police Department
Community Crime Report

**About the Crime Report:** Below are all Crimes Against Persons and Crimes Against Society from the campus report for **August 19 through September 1**. Also reported were Crimes Against Property, including 83 thefts (including 14 burglaries, 7 thefts of auto, 28 thefts from autos, 16 of bikes and parts); 7 of criminal mischief and vandalism, and 2 of trespassing and loitering. Full crime reports are in this issue of Almanac on the Web (http://www.upenn.edu/almanac/v43/n3/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 August 19 and September 1, 1996. The University Police actively patrol from Market Street to Baltimore Avenue and from the Schuylkill River to 43rd Street in conjunction with the Philadelphia Police. In this effort to provide you with a thorough and accurate report on public safety concerns, we hope that your increased awareness will lessen the opportunity for crime. For any concerns or suggestions regarding this report, please call the Division of Public Safety at 988-4842.

**Crimes Against Persons**

**38th to 41st/Market to Baltimore: Robberies (& attempts)**—6, Threats & harassment—2

- 08/19/96 2 52 PM 101 S. 39th Unwanted phone calls received
- 08/21/96 4 16 PM 216 S. 40th St. Robbery of undetermined amount of cash
- 08/22/96 12 38 AM 4000 Blk. Spruce Robbery by 2 suspects/1 arrest
- 08/23/96 11 39 PM 40th & Pine Robbery of cash w/simulated weapon
- 08/26/96 1 34 AM 3927 Walnut St. Phone threat to employee
- 08/26/96 3 10 AM 40th & Sansom Robbery by 2 males who fled in vehicle
- 08/26/96 11 17 PM 4007 Pine St. Robbery by 2 males in vehicle
- 08/31/96 9 27 PM 200 Blk. 40th Attempted robbery/arrest

**41st to 43rd/Market to Baltimore: Robberies (& attempts)**—1, Threats & harassment—1

- 08/30/96 3 40 AM 301 S. 43rd St. Obscene phone calls received
- 09/01/96 10 32 PM 42nd & Spruce Robbery by 2 males

**Crimes Against Society**

**41st to 43rd/Market to Baltimore: Disorderly conduct**—1

- 08/21/96 2 40 AM 4201 Walnut Male cited for disorderly conduct

---

**Penn Calendar and Planner**

The Penn Student Agencies’ Penn Calendar for 1996-97 is off the press and available for pickup at PSA’s headquarters in the lower level of Houston Hall. The new edition has a then-and-now theme linking historic black-and-white photographs with full-color pictures of the University today. Major University dates for the coming year are already entered. It costs $9.95. Also on sale is the 1996-97 Penn Planner, which highlights a different attraction in the city each week. It is $8.95, and can also be picked up at the PSA office in Houston Hall.

The new ProCurd and University budget codes are accepted at PSA. For more information: 898-6815.

---

**Update**

**SEPTEMBER AT PENN**

**FITNESS/LEARNING**

**12 Stop Smoking Workshop:** 7-9 p.m.; Bishop White Room, Houston Hall (Latter Day Saints Students Association).

~ Computer Training Courses at the Computing Resource Center (various dates beginning September 17; see schedule, page 16).

**Deadlines**

The deadline for the October at Penn calendar is Tuesday, September 10. The deadline for the Update is each Monday for the following week’s issue.

---

**Almanac**

The University of Pennsylvania’s journal of record, opinion and news is published Tuesdays during the academic year, and as needed during summer and holiday breaks. Its electronic editions on the Internet (accessible through the PennWeb) include HTML and Acrobat versions of the print edition, and information may be posted in electronic-only forms. Guidelines for readers and contributors are available on request.

**EDITOR** Karen C. Gaine
**ASSOCIATE EDITOR** Marguerite F. Miller
**EDITORIAL ASSISTANT** Mary Scholl

**ALMANAC ADVISORY BOARD:** For the Faculty Senate, Martin Pring (Chair), Jacqueline M. Fawcett, Phoebe S. Leboy, Peter J. Kuriloff, Ann E. Mayer, Vivian Seltzer. For the Administration, Ken Wildes. For the Staff Assemblies, Berenice Saxox for PPSA, Diane Waters for the A-3 Assembly, and Joe Zucca for Librarians Assembly.

---

**The Compass stories are written and edited by the Office of University Relations, University of Pennsylvania.**

**ACTING MANAGING EDITOR** Libby Bold
**NEWS STAFF:** Barbara Beck, Jon Carolis, Phyllis Holtzman, Carl Maugen, Esaul Sanchez, Kirby F. Smith, Sandy Smith
**DESIGNER** Jenny Friesenhahn
**CLASSIFIEDS** Ellen Morawetz
---

The University of Pennsylvania values diversity and seeks talented students, faculty and staff from diverse backgrounds. The University of Pennsylvania does not discriminate on the basis of race, sex, sexual orientation, religion, color, national or ethnic origin, age, disability, or status as a Vietnam Era Veteran or disabled veteran in the administration of educational policies, programs or activities; admissions policies; scholarship and loan awards; athletic, or other University administered programs or employment. Questions or complaints regarding this policy should be directed to Anita J. Jerens, Executive Director, Office of Affirmative Action, 1133 Blockley Hall, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6021 or (215) 898-6993 (Voice) or 215-898-7863 (TDD).
Schmoozing: Interaction Beyond the Bounds of Academic Disciplines  
by Arnost Kleinzeller and Zoltan Domotor

In articulating the guiding principles for research at Penn, the Rodin administration has not only revived the earlier theme of research excellence but also it asks faculty members to look beyond the interests of their departments, to uphold the wider interests of Schools and of liberal knowledge as a whole. Despite many influencing attempts, we contend that some of these messages have not trickled down to actual research and classroom levels. In this column we describe how Penn’s Schmoozers Group tries to implement the foregoing principles in biology.

“Schmoozing” is not merely a snappy title term; it refers to a scientific activity of a group of Penn faculty members and graduate students who share across varied academic disciplines a common goal of studying, analyzing and understanding some of the most important and challenging foundational and methodological problems facing biological sciences.

The Schmoozers Group—so baptized by The Penn Gazette—was born in the middle of 1980s, when a small circle of biologists, biochemists and philosophers at Penn conceived the idea of meeting for two hours every other week. Initially, the idea was to select readings from biology, physiology, biochemistry and philosophy of science with special regards to foundational questions prompted by these disciplines, and examine and discuss the reading material from various interdisciplinary points of view. Some of these readings addressed the recurring themes of reductionism vs. autonomy, organizations vs. machines, evolution vs. creationism, order vs. chaos, models vs. metaphors, serendipity vs. discovery, brain vs. mind, hypotheses vs. data, and so on. The thought of multidisciplinary interaction is not new. College systems at Cambridge and Oxford have played a central role in the development of British science.

The term “Schmoozers” is really a misnomer; perhaps it would be better to call our conversazione an Informal Interdisciplinary Research Group in the Foundations and Methods of Biological Sciences, except that the latter is far too much of a mouthful. There is an amusing story regarding Schmoozers, told about Elizabeth Flower’s memorial at the beginning of this year. When the last memorial speaker mentioned that Professor Flower was an active member of the Schmoozers Group nobody seemed to know much about, and when it was explained that this group is comprised of Penn faculty working in rather disjointed traditional disciplines, sharing a common object of study—scientific method and foundations—one guest was heard saying: “Now you will understand just how bad academic interaction has become at Penn. To do interdisciplinary research, one must go underground.”

Upon hearing this, some guests had frozen grins on their faces but there is some truth in this observation. We contend that all disciplines in natural science share a number of common underlying methodological and foundational patterns. These patterns are more successfully identified when approached in two complementary ways: by looking at complex systems from inside—using highly specialized means of an autonomous discipline, and by looking at systems from the outside in a multidisciplinary manner that transcends the existing research boundaries between academic departments. Cross-fertilization of ideas in the second alternative is easy to document. We are all aware of scientific progress that often occurs at the interface of two or more seemingly unrelated disciplines. For example, in the traditional domains of physics and chemistry the shared underlying patterns have led to a virtually unparalleled development of quantum mechanics and thermodynamics.

Our discussion group was a tangential outcome of a graduate course Biochem/Physiol 560 (Methods of Inquiry in Biological Sciences). This course is intended for graduate and medical school students with diverse backgrounds and it aims at transcending some of the narrowly specialized and compartmentalized contents of traditional graduate curricula. The goal is to introduce students to a broader class of foundational, methodological and also professional ethics problems, encountered in the practice of modern biomedical research. Currently, this is the only graduate course we are aware of that explicitly and in detail addresses the question of how to do scientific research in biology.

After our first offering of the seminar during the spring of 1979, we quickly noted that the instructors themselves had a lot to learn. This embarrassment has led us to organize the Schmoozers Group. Initially the Group was quite small but a year or so later, its membership grew steadily. At present, its most active participants hail from the Medical School, SAS, Wharton, and the Wistar Institute. However, due to growing academic pressure, many participating faculty members’ attention is now focused on grant proposals, on administrative responsibilities and on ever growing academic chores, leaving schmoozing more and more to emeritus professors.

What is schmoozing good for and why is our focus on biology? We briefly touched upon two of the prevailing approaches in the traditional fields of natural science: autonomy and interdisciplinary paradigms. These methodologies are not inconsistent; rather, they are complementary. Complex systems can be viewed from inside—relative to their levels of organization, and from the outside, enabling to tackle problems prompted by complexity considerations. Schmoozers assume that modern science is not an assemblage of isolated bodies of knowledge but a grand system to produce knowledge. Such a system is well served by a recursive interaction of research groups in which scientists in one field obtain information from another field and produce something new that counts as information for others. This kind of activity—call it sciencing—has a strong cognitive feedback component that is ideal in overcoming conservatism of a narrowly specialized research group, in opening up new landscapes for scientific problem solving, and in designing alternative paths for future research.

Explosive growth of modern biology provides a fertile ground for the study of extremely complex structures and mechanisms, involving many closely linked levels of organization, dynamics and evolution. Understanding the structure and functioning of biological systems presents a particularly strong challenge both in finding the correct theoretical frameworks that properly emphasize both biological unity and diversity, and in developing a successful experimental methodology.

Members of the Schmoozers Group feel that the foundational and methodological aspects of biological sciences require alternative approaches. They are confronted with the problem of defining their subject matter in such a way that it is sufficiently concrete to attract the right kind of specialists, yet broad enough to meet the requirements and basic philosophy of interdisciplinary research: it is therefore of interest to faculty members from traditional disciplines, including those in biochemistry, biology and physiology on the one hand, and social sciences and philosophy on the other. In this manner, Schmoozers have emerged as a successful group whose approach is able to encompass theorists working on biological structures and methods. The duality between acquiring knowledge from inside—provided by the specialists in biology, and information coming from the outside—from economists, communication theorists, and so on, goes beyond the existing boundaries between traditional disciplines and offers great opportunities for research to all participants.

Are Schmoozers advocating a brand new methodology for the study of biological systems? Not exactly; but their general strategy can be summarized as follows: Much of natural science in general, and biological science in particular, shares a common foundational and methodological framework, including concept and hypothesis formation, experimental design, and empirical testing. These research activities should be properly identified and studied further, and one should learn about the ways of communicating these activities to our students and colleagues. We find this of particular importance in light of a floating perception among many that science is no longer fun: it is too hard on the one hand and is devoid of mysteries on the other.

In light of Penn’s quest for research excellence, we believe that it is incumbent on the leaders to encourage further growth of Schmoozers-style interdisciplinary discussion groups, both in seminars and academic research.
Code of Academic Integrity

and

Charter of the Student Disciplinary System

of the

University of Pennsylvania

Effective July 1, 1996
The development of the Code of Academic Integrity and the Charter of the Student Disciplinary System grew out of a recommendation from the Commission on Strengthening the Community, which called for a revised student disciplinary system that made greater use of mediation services to resolve disputes, and a new code of integrity that placed greater attention on educating students and faculty about issues of academic integrity.

The two documents that follow are the result. Based initially on the work of the Student Judicial Reform Oversight Committee, development of these documents also included input from such groups as the Undergraduate Assembly, GAPSA, the Senate Executive Committee, the Committee on Pluralism, the Women’s Center, the First Amendment Task Force, and the University Council, as well as individual students, faculty, and staff.

The new code and disciplinary system have been adopted by the four undergraduate schools as well as by several of the graduate and professional schools (see listing below). They went into effect on July 1, 1996. We are now in the process of developing the mediation program that is called for under the new charter.

— Stanley Chodorow, Provost

Applicability of the New Code and System

The Code of Academic Integrity and the Charter of the Student Disciplinary System will apply to all undergraduates in the School of Arts and Sciences, including CGS; the School of Engineering and Applied Science; the Nursing School; and the Wharton School, including the Evening School.

They also will apply to all graduate students in the School of Arts and Sciences and the Nursing School and to Ph.D., MBA and Executive MBA students in the Wharton School in whatever instances may arise when their own codes of conduct and disciplinary procedures do not apply.

The Schools of Law, Medicine, Dental Medicine and the graduate programs of SEAS have their own codes and disciplinary systems.

The Graduate School of Education has its own Code of Academic Integrity and applicable procedures but will use the University’s disciplinary system for conduct infractions.

The remaining schools—Annenberg, Fine Arts, and Veterinary Medicine—have not yet decided whether to accept the new code and disciplinary system, while the Biomedical Graduate Studies program has accepted the code and is considering the adoption of its own disciplinary system.
Code of Academic Integrity

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

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

A. Cheating: using or attempting to use unauthorized assistance, material, or study aids in examinations or other academic work or preventing, or attempting to prevent, another from using authorized assistance, material, or study aids.
Example: using a cheat sheet in a quiz or exam, altering a graded exam and resubmitting it for a better grade, etc.

B. Plagiarism: using the ideas, data, or language of another without specific or proper acknowledgment.
Example: copying another person’s paper, article, or computer work and submitting it for an assignment, cloning someone else’s ideas without attribution, failing to use quotation marks where appropriate, etc.

C. Fabrication: submitting contrived or altered information in any academic exercise.
Example: making up data for an experiment, fudging data, citing nonexistent articles, contriving sources, etc.

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

E. Misrepresentation of academic records: misrepresenting or tampering with or attempting to tamper with any portion of a student’s transcripts or academic record, either before or after coming to the University of Pennsylvania.
Example: forging a change of grade slip, tampering with computer records, falsifying academic information on one’s resume, etc.

F. Facilitating academic dishonesty: knowingly helping or attempting to help another violate any provision of the Code.
Example: working together on a take-home exam, etc.

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

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

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

The Code of Student Conduct sets forth the responsibility of all students at the University of Pennsylvania to exhibit responsible behavior regardless of time or place. This responsibility includes, but is not limited to, the obligation to comply with all provisions of the Code of Student Conduct; with all other policies and regulations of the University, its Schools, and its Departments; and with local, state, and federal laws. The Code of Academic Integrity, and similar codes adopted by some of the University’s Schools, set forth the standards of integrity and honesty that should be adhered to in all student academic activities at the University of Pennsylvania. Violations of the Code of Academic Integrity or School regulations are also violations of the University’s Code of Student Conduct. Further, violations of local, state, and federal laws may be violations of the Code of Student Conduct. Therefore, throughout the Charter references to violation(s) or alleged violation(s) of the Code of Student Conduct include violations of these other policies and laws.

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

- Bringing a Complaint to the Office of Student Conduct
- Resolving a Complaint by Mediation
- Investigating a Complaint
- Filing Charges by the University Against a Student
- Resolving Charges by Voluntary Agreement to Sanctions
- Resolving Charges by Disciplinary Hearing
- Appealing the Decision of a Hearing Panel
- Imposing Sanctions on a Student
- Fulfilling Sanctions Imposed by the University

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

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

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

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

B. Jurisdiction of the Student Disciplinary System
1. Through the Office of Student Conduct (OSC), the Student Disciplinary System handles complaints from members of the University community—trustees, faculty, staff or registered students—about alleged violations of the Code of Student Conduct, the Code of Academic Integrity, or other University policies.
2. Except as provided below, the Student Disciplinary System has jurisdiction in all disciplinary matters arising under the regulations of the University against registered students, whether they be undergraduates, graduate or professional students, or others, including students who are on unexpired leaves of absence. Approved or unapproved absence from the University is not a bar to the conduct or completion of disciplinary proceedings under this Charter.
3. In general, a student is any individual who has been admitted, matriculated, enrolled, or registered in any academic program or other educational activity provided by the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania.
4. The Student Disciplinary System does not handle complaints against graduate and professional students when such cases lie within the jurisdiction of a hearing board or other disciplinary body established by the School of the University in which the student is enrolled. When such a School-based disciplinary procedure exists, it should be the recourse of first resort for the resolution of an alleged violation of University or School regulations, unless the OSC decides, in consultation with the Provost, that it is appropriate in light of the circumstances for the Student Disciplinary System to handle the matter. Schools with such procedures are encouraged to refer disciplinary matters (excluding academic integrity matters) to the University Mediation Program whenever appropriate. When an alleged violation of University regulations by a graduate or professional student is not within the jurisdiction of a disciplinary system established by the student’s School, the Student Disciplinary System will have jurisdiction over the matter.
5. The Student Disciplinary System does not handle alleged violations of the University’s parking regulations.
6. Alleged violations of the University’s Residential Living policies and contracts are ordinarily handled under the procedures of the Department of Residential Living but, if serious enough to warrant sanctions beyond those which the Department of Residential Living is authorized to impose, may be referred by the Director of Residential Living to the OSC. The fact that proceedings have been held and sanctions imposed under Residential Living policies does not preclude proceedings under this Charter.
7. The Director of the Office of Student Conduct decides all questions of jurisdiction of the Student Disciplinary System arising under this Charter, consulting with the Provost (or designee) and with the University’s General Counsel when necessary. When appropriate, the OSC may refer a complaint to another University office or disciplinary process.

C. General Principles of the Disciplinary System
1. The University’s Student Disciplinary System is not a legal system, and University disciplinary proceedings are not civil or criminal litigation. Thus, they operate under different rules, standards, and procedures, and seek to achieve ends different from criminal or civil proceedings.
2. Any member of the University community—trustees, faculty, staff or registered students—may bring a complaint about student conduct or academic integrity to the attention of the Office of Student Conduct. Doing so in no way limits a complainant(s)’s rights or obligations to bring such matters to the attention of other University offices, officers, or resources, including the Office of the Ombudsman and appropriate Deans, or to seek recourse outside the University through civil or criminal legal proceedings.
3. In all cases, the University reserves the right to determine how to process a disciplinary complaint. Once a complaint is brought to the attention of the Office of Student Conduct, the OSC, on behalf of the University, will decide how the complaint will be handled, including whether disciplinary charges should be brought against a student.
4. It is expected that most matters brought to the OSC can and should be resolved through mediation and will not result in charges or disciplinary hearings. However, because of their seriousness within an academic community, alleged violations of the Code of Academic Integrity will not be referred for mediation. Thus, except in academic integrity matters and matters that warrant treatment as serious violations of the Code of Student Conduct or other University policies, the initial response by the OSC may be to refer the complainant and respondent to the University’s Mediation Program. Only if mediation fails or is inappropriate will the OSC begin the more formal disciplinary processes outlined in this Charter.
5. All members of the University community—trustees, faculty, staff or registered students—are required to cooperate with the Student Disciplinary System. Those individuals who may be interviewed or called as witnesses in a disciplinary matter (including respondents and complainants) are obligated to provide honest and complete statements to the OSC and to the Hearing Panel. While in some circumstances a respondent may choose not to answer questions or provide information because of pending civil claims or criminal charges arising out of the same or other events, the respondent’s decision not to answer questions or provide information will not be a reason to delay or defer an investigation or proceedings under this Charter. A student who fails, without good cause, to appear for a hearing after receiving notice, or to cooperate with the investigation conducted by the OSC, may be charged with a violation of the Code of Student Conduct. Repeated disruption of disciplinary hearings or the disciplinary process by a student or the student’s advisor may result in charges against the student of non-cooperation with the Student Disciplinary System or exclusion of the student or advisor from disciplinary proceedings, including disciplinary hearings. Such exclusion is not a bar to the completion of disciplinary proceedings involving that student.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

d. In disciplinary matters involving both undergraduate and graduate respondents, the panel will consist of one undergraduate student, one graduate student, and three faculty members.

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

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

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

8. Advisors

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

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

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

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

II. The Disciplinary Process

A. Bringing a Complaint to the Office of Student Conduct

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

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

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

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

B. Resolving a Complaint by Mediation

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

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

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

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

C. Investigating a Complaint

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

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

D. Filing Charges by the University Against a Student

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

E. Resolving Charges by Voluntary Agreement to Sanctions

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

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

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

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

F. Resolving Charges by Disciplinary Hearing

1. Scheduling Disciplinary Hearings

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

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

c. The DHO may expedite a Disciplinary Hearing in appropriate circumstances, including disciplinary matters involving students who have been placed on mandatory temporary leave of absence or conditional attendance, graduating students, or students who are about to take a leave of absence or to leave campus to study elsewhere.

2. Disqualification of Hearing Panel Members

a. Members of the Hearing Panel selected by the DHO should disqualify themselves from hearing a disciplinary matter if they believe in good faith that their capacity for making an objective judgment in the disciplinary matter is, or may reasonably appear to be, impaired. Members should not disqualify themselves for any other reason.

b. The respondent(s) or the OSC may object for specific cause to any panel member selected by the DHO. The objection must be in writing and must be received by the DHO at least 48 hours in advance of the date and time set for the hearing.

c. The DHO will rule upon all disqualification requests and objections to panel members. If the DHO decides that a challenge is valid, or if there is a voluntary disqualification, the DHO, after notifying the respondent(s) and the OSC, will replace the disqualified member with another panel member randomly selected from the same category.

3. Pre-Hearing Exchanges and Testimony

a. Before the hearing, the OSC and the respondent(s) will exchange among themselves and with the DHO copies of all exhibits to be presented, the names of witnesses to be called, and a brief summary of the substance of testimony expected to be presented to the Hearing Panel.

b. When the DHO believes that it will contribute to the expedition and fairness of a Disciplinary Hearing, he or she may (but need not) ask the OSC to prepare a written statement of its case against the re-pondent(s) and give the respondent(s) a reasonable opportunity to prepare a written response. The OSC and respondent(s) also may submit statements at their own initiative. The statements and any accompanying exhibits may be considered by the Hearing Panel, in addition to testimony, arguments, or evidence presented at the actual hearing.

c. In exceptional circumstances, when a witness or exhibit does not become known or available until immediately before the hearing, the DHO may, at her or his discretion, permit the evidence to be presented or may reschedule the hearing to a later time.

d. If a respondent or the OSC anticipates that a key witness will not be available for a hearing, they may ask the DHO to preserve the testimony of the witness on tape and present it as evidence at the hearing. The OSC and the respondent(s) must be notified in ad-
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of the date, time and place of the taping. All parties who would be permitted to question such a witness at a hearing may question the witness at the taping.

4. Conduct of Hearings

a. Disciplinary hearings are not trials, and they are not constrained by technical rules of procedure, evidence, or judicial formality. They are designed to encourage open discussion among the participants that promotes the hearing panel’s understanding of the facts, the individuals involved, the circumstances under which the incident occurred, the nature of the conduct, and the attitudes and experience of those involved. The rules of evidence applicable to legal proceedings do not apply to disciplinary hearings. Information, including hearsay evidence, may be considered if it is relevant, not unduly repetitious, and the sort of information on which responsible persons are accustomed to rely in the conduct of serious affairs.

b. The DHO presides over all hearings and decides all questions about the admissibility of evidence and the conduct of hearings. While the DHO may be present for the Hearing Panel’s discussions to answer procedural questions, the DHO does not deliberate or vote with the Panel regarding its findings or its recommendation of sanctions.

c. Disciplinary hearings are held in private unless the respondent(s) and the complainant(s) agree in writing to an open hearing. The DHO may limit attendance at a hearing to ensure fair and orderly proceedings. If a hearing is opened in accord with this procedure, the DHO may, when necessary to maintain order or to protect the rights of participants, declare the hearing closed to the public. In a case involving important privacy interests, the DHO may close a hearing or part of a hearing that has been opened upon determining that the privacy rights of a participant may be jeopardized.

d. Upon a showing that the required notice was provided, the hearing against a respondent(s) may proceed in her or his absence.

e. At the hearing, the OSC presents the results of the OSC’s investigation of the complaint, calls witnesses to testify and presents the University’s evidence against the student(s). Members of the Hearing Panel may also call witnesses to testify and may question any witness appearing before it. Respondents may also call witnesses to testify and ask questions of all witnesses.

f. A respondent is responsible for presenting his or her own case before the Hearing Panel. However, at the discretion of the DHO, the respondent’s advisor may be permitted to question witnesses on behalf of a respondent or to address the Hearing Panel. The DHO’s exercise of discretion in this matter will be guided by the principles that govern disciplinary hearings, specifically, fairness, the need for orderly procedures, and the Hearing Panel’s duty to understand the facts and parties in the disciplinary matter.

g. Complainants may attend the hearing, testify if they wish to do so, and may be accompanied by an advisor. Neither complainants nor their advisors may call witnesses or present evidence or arguments.

h. At the conclusion of the hearing the OSC and the respondent(s) or their advisor(s) may make brief statements. At the discretion of the Disciplinary Hearing Officer, the complainant(s) or their advisor(s) may be permitted to make a brief statement. The time allowed for such statements will be set by the DHO.

i. The OSC will arrange for a verbatim transcript or recording to be made of all disciplinary hearings. The transcript or recording is the property of the University of Pennsylvania and becomes part of the record of the disciplinary proceedings.

5. Findings and Recommendations of the Hearing Panel

a. Only evidence presented at the hearing will be considered by the Hearing Panel. The Hearing Panel will consider the respondent innocent unless proven responsible for a violation by clear and convincing evidence. All decisions of the Hearing Panel require a majority vote.

b. Following the hearing, the members of the Hearing Panel meet to discuss in private their findings, which consist of two parts: 1) a determination of whether the respondent is responsible for any violation; and 2) if so, a recommendation of sanction(s).

c. The OSC may recommend to the Hearing Panel a sanction to be imposed if the Hearing Panel finds the respondent(s) responsible for a violation. The respondent(s) may respond to the OSC’s proposed sanction(s). Before the Panel makes its recommendation on sanctions, it will review any previous disciplinary offenses and sanctions against the respondent(s).

d. If the Hearing Panel determines that the respondent(s) is not responsible for a violation, no sanction may be recommended against the respondent(s) and the respondent may not be subject to further proceedings under this Charter on the same charge(s).

e. If the Hearing Panel finds that a student is responsible for a violation of University rules or regulations, it will recommend to the Provost appropriate sanctions. Only the Provost (or designee), acting on behalf of the University, may actually impose a sanction on a student. The Provost (or designee) will not impose a sanction until after any appeal of the Hearing Panel’s decision has been decided by the DAO.

6. Notice of Hearing Panel Decision

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

G. Appealing a Hearing Panel’s Decision

1. The Disciplinary Appellate Officer (DAO) has exclusive jurisdiction to decide appeals. Appeals are based solely on the record of the disciplinary hearing and the written submissions and responses of the respondent(s) and the OSC.

2. Only respondent(s) may appeal the Hearing Panel’s findings of responsibility except where applicable laws or regulations may extend this right to complainants. Both the respondent(s) and the OSC may appeal the Hearing Panel’s recommendation of sanction(s). An appellant must submit any appeal to the DAO in writing within 10 days after the Hearing Panel has rendered its opinion. The appeal must state in detail the specific grounds upon which it is based and must be sent to the OSC or respondent(s), as appropriate.

3. When the appeal is received, the OSC provides the Disciplinary Appellate Officer with a copy of the respondent’s charge letter, a copy of the Hearing Panel’s findings, a verbatim transcript or tape recording of the Disciplinary Hearing, and any exhibits considered by the panel in reaching its recommendations. The respondent and the OSC have 10 days from the date of the appeal to submit to the DAO a written response to the appeal.

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

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

H. Imposing Sanctions on a Student

1. Sanctions recommended against a respondent by a Hearing
Panel or the DAO are imposed by the Provost, or his designee, and may include any reasonable sanction, including, but not limited to, the following:

- **Warning**
  A Warning is a written admonition given by the OSC on behalf of the University in instances of minor misconduct.

- **Reprimand**
  A Reprimand is written censure for violation of the University’s rules, regulations, or policies, given by the OSC on behalf of the University, which includes notice to the student that continued or repeated conduct violations will result in the imposition of more serious sanctions.

- **Fine**
  A monetary Fine may be levied as a disciplinary sanction and is payable to the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania. (Not appropriate in cases of academic integrity violations).

- **Restitution**
  Restitution is reimbursement for the damage, loss, or misappropriation of University, private, or public property or compensation for injury to individuals. Restitution may take the form of monetary payment, property, or appropriate service. (Not appropriate in cases of academic integrity violations).

- **Disciplinary Probation**
  Disciplinary Probation may be imposed for a specified period or indefinitely (i.e., for as long as and whenever a student is a full- or part-time student at the University of Pennsylvania). Probation may be imposed for a single instance of misconduct or for repeated minor misconduct. Any future conduct or academic integrity violation by a student on Disciplinary Probation, found to have occurred during the probationary period, may be grounds for suspension or, in especially serious instances, expulsion from the University.

- **Withdrawal of Privileges**
  Withdrawal of Privileges is the denial of specified privileges or the ability to participate in specified activities for a designated period of time.

- **Suspension**
  Suspension is the termination of student status and separation from the University until a specified date. Suspension means the loss of all rights and privileges normally accompanying student status. While on disciplinary suspension, students may not obtain academic credit at Penn or elsewhere toward completion of a University of Pennsylvania degree. Students are eligible to return to the University after the specified suspension term has elapsed. Suspension is imposed in instances of serious misconduct; it is generally the minimum sanction imposed for a violation of the Code of Academic Integrity.

- **Indefinite Suspension**
  An Indefinite Suspension is termination of student status and separation from the University for an unspecified period, without an automatic right of return to the University as a student (though specific conditions for return as a student may be specified). When the conditions of an Indefinite Suspension have been fulfilled, the student must make a formal request, as specified in the conditions, to return to student status. Indefinite suspension is imposed in instances of extremely serious misconduct or in instances of continued serious misconduct following the imposition of probation or suspension for a specified period.

- **Expulsion**
  Expulsion is a permanent termination of student status and permanent separation from the University of Pennsylvania. Expulsion is imposed in instances of the most serious misconduct or in instances of continued serious misconduct following the imposition of probation or suspension.

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

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

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

## I. Fulfilling Sanctions Imposed by the University

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

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

### III. Additional Matters

#### A. Administration of the Disciplinary System

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

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

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

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

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

C. Disciplinary Holds

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

D. Mandatory Leave of Absence and Conditional Attendance

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

E. Civil or Criminal Proceedings

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

F. Disciplinary Records

1. Maintenance of Records

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

2. Confidentiality

Except as may be otherwise provided by applicable law, all disciplinary proceedings, the identity of individuals involved in particular disciplinary matters, and all disciplinary files, testimony, and findings are confidential, in accordance with University policies and federal law concerning the confidentiality of student records. However, no provision of this Charter or the University’s policies on confidentiality shall be interpreted as preventing a student from seeking legal advice.

3. Violation of Confidentiality

Failure to observe the requirement of confidentiality of a disciplinary hearing by any member of the University community, other than the respondent, constitutes a violation of University rules and may subject the individual to the appropriate procedures for dealing with such violations. The respondent may disclose confidential information pertaining to him- or herself but may not violate the confidentiality of others. If the respondent discloses, causes to be disclosed, or participates in the disclosure of information that is confidential, any person whose character or integrity might reasonably be questioned as a result of such disclosure shall have the right to respond in an appropriate forum, limited to the subject matter of the initial disclosure.

G. Release of Information on Disciplinary Proceedings

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

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

H. Reportability of Sanctions

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

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

I. Amendment of the Charter

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

The Student Disciplinary Charter is based on the assumption that it is the obligation and right of faculty members to assign grades for academic work submitted to them by students under their supervision and that faculty members should grade student work, using their best judgment about the quality and propriety of that work, independently of disciplinary procedures. The present statement is presented to clarify the relationship between grading and disciplinary action in cases in which a faculty member believes that a student did not fulfill an assignment in accord with the Code of Academic Integrity.

The Disciplinary Charter rests on the principle that faculty members have wide authority to judge the academic work of students and have a general responsibility for the academic progress of students, so much as lies within the power of faculty. Furthermore, the charter assumes that violations of the norms of academic integrity fall along a continuum from minor to major and that not all violations need to be treated as disciplinary cases. The authority and responsibility of faculty members require them to judge the relative severity of a violation. Good individual judgment and institutional practice will help faculty members make the judgment about when to treat a case as requiring disciplinary action.

The distinction between academic evaluation and disciplinary action is also important. Faculty members have the authority to make academic judgments in relation to their students and to make decisions in the interests of furthering their students’ education. Only the institution, acting through its formal processes, may discipline a student. Grades are not sanctions, even if they arise from a judgment that a student has violated a norm of academic integrity. In such cases, the grade may reflect the faculty member’s view that a piece of work was done inappropriately, but it represents a judgment of the quality of the work, not a record of discipline for the behavior. There are many ways to do work inappropriately or badly, resulting in low or failing grades. The policy of the charter is to preserve the faculty member’s right to grade work on the basis of all of its qualities and to make the decision to pursue disciplinary action a separate matter.

Students who believe that they have been graded unfairly have recourse of appeal through the grade appeal procedures established by each school. The charter explicitly recognizes the right of students to appeal grades. The appeal of a grade given because a faculty member believed that the student violated the norms of academic integrity is, for the purposes of the charter, no different from other grade appeals.

— Stanley Chodorow, Provost