SAS Term Chairs: Dr. Waldron, Dr. Weissberg

Dean Samuel H. Preston has announced the appointments of Dr. Ingrid Waldron and Dr. Liliane Weissberg to term chairs in the School of Arts and Sciences.

Shelley Chair: Dr. Waldron, a professor of biology who has taught at Penn for over 30 years, was named to the Donna and Larry Shelley Term Chair in the Women’s Studies Program. A specialist in the social and behavioral causes of socioeconomic, ethnic, and sex differences in health and mortality, Dr. Waldron has published extensively in medical and academic journals, and she serves as an advisory editor of Social Science and Medicine and as a member of the editorial board of Women and Health.

She has been awarded many academic honors, including the Lindback Foundation Award for Distinguished Teaching at Penn. Dr. Waldron received her A.B. in physics summa cum laude from Radcliffe College and her Ph.D. in zoology from UC/Berkeley. After postdoctoral work in physiology at Cambridge University, she joined Penn in 1968 as assistant professor of biology; she became associate professor in 1972 and full professor in 1990. She has been undergraduate chair of the department since 1986. She has also been a Visiting Fellow of Clare Hall, Cambridge University.

The Shelley Term Chair was established by Donna and Larry Shelley in 1998. Larry Shelley graduated from Wharton in 1980 and is a successful managing director at CS First Boston. Donna Reiff Shelley, who graduated from the College in 1982 with a major in psychology, is an internist affiliated with the Mt. Sinai Medical Women’s Health Center and is active in the American Medical Women’s Association. The Shelleys established their term chair to provide support for a faculty member of the School of Arts and Sciences who is associated with the Women’s Studies Program.

Glossberg Chair: Dr. Liliane Weissberg, a professor of German and comparative literature who has several times chaired the program in comparative literature and literary theory, was appointed to the Joseph B. Glossberg Term Chair in the Humanities.

Dr. Weissberg studies and teaches 18th and 19th century German literature, comparative literature, aesthetics, and philosophy of language. She has published over 80 articles and reviews along with major books including Weiblichkeit als Maskerade, Edgar Allen Poe, and Geléstersprache: Philosophischer und literarischer Diskurs im späten achtzehnten Jahrhundert. She has most recently edited and introduced to wide acclaim Hannah Arendt’s Rahel Varnhagen: The Life of a Jewess.

An alumna of the Frei Universität Berlin, Dr. Weissberg took her M.A. and Ph.D. at Harvard and taught at Johns Hopkins before joining Penn in 1989 as associate professor of German and comparative literature. She became full professor in 1994. Among her numerous fellowships and awards are those of the Guggenheim Foundation, ACLS, and American Philosophical Society. She has also been a Voltaire Fellow of Wadham College, Oxford. She currently holds a Samuel Grunfeld Fellowship in the Center for Judaic Studies at Penn.

The Joseph B. Glossberg Term Chair in the Humanities was established in the late 1980s with gifts from Joseph B. Glossberg and Burton X. Rosenberg, both of whom earned undergraduate degrees in economics in 1963 at Penn. Mr. Glossberg is senior managing director of Gofen & Glossberg Inc., a firm of investment counselors in Chicago. He has continued his interest in and support of the University since his graduation and just recently funded a scholarship for students in the College. He is a former trustee of the University and has also served as the 25th Reunion Gifts Chair for the Class of 1963. Mr. Rosenberg is an attorney in the law firm of Seyfarth, Shaw and Fairweather in Chicago who has also given generously to SAS over the years.

Open Meeting: Quad Renovations

On Wednesday, February 3, the Quadrangle College Houses Program Committee will present to the Provost its first recommendations regarding renovations to the Quad. The meeting will be held at 7:30 p.m. in McClelland Hall South Lounge. All are welcome to attend.

Wharton’s $120 Million Plan

At presstime the Wharton School was scheduled to go public with its plans for a $120 million building on 38th Street between Locust Walk and Walnut Street. Construction of the high-tech complex is to start this spring, with 2002 as the target date for opening. Drawings and details are expected for publication in Almanac February 9.
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COUNCIL
Meeting Cancellation

At its January 27, 1999, meeting, the Steering Committee of the University Council voted to cancel the meeting of University Council scheduled for Wednesday, February 10, 1999. At its meeting on January 13, Council had completed action endorsing three major policies on Consultation, Closed Circuit Television Monitoring, and Charitable Giving, and Council Committees need additional time to work on the issues currently assigned to them.

We expect that some will be prepared to report on their deliberations at the March 24, 1999, meeting of Council.
— John C. Keene, Chair, University Council Steering Committee

SENATE From the Senate Of fice

The following agenda is published in accordance with the Faculty Senate Rules. Questions may be directed to Carolyn Burdon either by telephone at 898-6943 or by e-mail at burdon@pobox.upenn.edu.

Agenda
Senate Executive Committee
Wednesday, February 3, 1999

1. Chair’s Report
2. Past Chair’s Report on activities of the Academic Planning and Budget Committee and on the Capital Council
3. Discussion on faculty fundraising for scholarships with Professors Warren Seider and David Williams
4. Discussion on Faculty Club employees with Vice President for Human Resources Jack Heuer
5. Informal discussion with President Rodin and Provost Barchi
6. Other new business
7. Adjournment by 5:30 p.m.
Report of the Office of Student Conduct

To the University Community

The Office of Student Conduct periodically prepares 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. These reports are made, in part, to provide an accurate and informative picture of the kinds of misconduct which are brought to the attention of our office and the variety of ways in which these matters get resolved. At the same time, we are mindful of our obligation under our Charter to protect the confidentiality of individual students.

With respect to the report itself, please note the following: we have separated “Type of Incidents” of misconduct into broad, generally understood categories. It is important to stress that the categories and accompanying numbers represent the kinds of complaints received, not disciplinary charges filed nor individuals ultimately found responsible for misconduct.

Further, please note that many incidents involve more than one student which is why the number of respondents so far exceeds the number of cases.

Finally, we have, pursuant to the mandate of our Charter, increasingly attempted to resolve disciplinary and other referrals through mediation or other informal, constructive means. Those of you familiar with our previous reports to the community will see a greater emphasis placed on these alternative means of solving some disputes, where appropriate.

There is no substitute for student and faculty input, consultation and participation in the disciplinary process. This report, while meant to be informative, ideally should serve only as a catalyst for candid discussion about conduct and academic integrity issues of concern to our community. In that spirit, I welcome any comments or questions regarding this report or any other aspect of our disciplinary process. I can be reached at 898-5651 or by e-mail at goldfarm@pobox.upenn.edu.

—Michele A. Goldfarb, Director, Office of Student Conduct

1997-1998 Statistical Case Report

I. Incidents Received September 1, 1997 to August 31, 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Behavior</th>
<th>Academic Integrity</th>
<th>Conduct</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary Cases (Incidents)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Disputes Referred to the University Mediation Program: 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Type of Incidents (Categories based on initial allegations only; does not necessarily reflect final charge. Also, some respondents are charged with more than one category of behavior.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code of Conduct Incidents</th>
<th>Category of Behavior/Complaints Received</th>
<th>Resolution of Case</th>
<th>Per Individual Academic Response</th>
<th>Integrity</th>
<th>Conduct</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Misuse/Piracy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly Conduct</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail Threats/Unethical Use</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Identity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecent Exposure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propulsion of Object</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespassing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Sanction Information (Information provided for prohibition or more serious sanctions only.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanction</th>
<th>Academic Integrity</th>
<th>Conduct</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension/Withdraw</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Additional cases were imposed for matters which arose in previous years)

In Support of Ken Ray

As members of the Medical School community we are shocked and appalled at what happened to Ken Ray, Graphic Artist in the Department of Biophysics & Biochemistry, as he left work late Tuesday, January 26.

Ken is admired and respected by all who know him for his integrity, his expertise and his willingness to accommodate anyone in the Medical School who comes to him for photographic/graphic arts help and services. He has been a mentor to dozens of Penn work-study students and is a member of the 25-year Club of Penn faculty and staff. He is one of the calmest, kindest, most pleasant people to deal with, especially for panicked lecturers or poster presenters or grant applicants who need a last-minute slide or figure.

Ken almost always works late and sometimes weekends, too, because he has more requests than he can finish in a normal workday and he really cares about all the people who need his services.

If Ken worked 9-5, he would have been comfortably at home Tuesday night instead of unjustly confined to a jail cell for over 24 hours. Unfortunately, he was on his way to the parking garage at 10 p.m., walking a common route through Blockley Hall where a burglary suspect, matching his skin color, had just been reported.

It is incredible to us that at a university like Penn such poor judgment can be used by members of Public Safety in dealing with our community.


Response from Penn Police

The Penn Police Department acknowledges the concerns raised by friends and co-workers of Mr. Kenneth Ray. I can assure you that the Penn Police Department, in conjunction with the Philadelphia Police Department, is conducting a comprehensive investigation of the events leading up to the arrest of Mr. Ray. Statements of all the witnesses involved, as well as physical evidence will be presented to a Municipal Court judge who will determine the ultimate outcome of this case.

—Maureen Rush, Director of Police
HR Training & Development

February/March Offerings

Flexible Work Options: Managing a Flexible Workforce (for managers and supervisors) February 5, 8, 19 and March 1, 9-10:30 a.m.
Flexible Work Options: Flexible Work Arrangement Proposals (for staff) February 5, 8, 19 and March 1, 11:30 a.m.-1 p.m.

New Staff Orientation, Faculty Club, February 16 and March 25, 9 a.m.-12:15 p.m.

Person to Person—Creating Respectful Workplaces: A Workshop in Sexual Harassment Prevention (for managers and supervisors), March 4, 9 a.m.-1 p.m.

Customer Service at Penn (for staff), March 12, 9 a.m.-5 p.m.

TimeQuest: Values-based Time Management, March 26, 9 a.m.-5 p.m.

All training sessions (with the exception of New Staff Orientation) will be held at the Training & Development Center at 3624 Market Street, Suite 1B South.

New Web Site

To better utilize resources for providing information on training and development opportunities, the Human Resources Training and Development Department has moved its brochure of course offerings to an on-line environment. You may now view the program offerings for January through June 1999 on-line at www.hr.upenn.edu. You can also register for all training programs on-line by accessing www.hr.upenn.edu/trainreg/.

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 January 16, 1999 through January 24, 1999. Also reported were Crimes Against Property: 33 total thefts & attempts (including 2 burglaries & attempts, 3 trespassing and loitering, 2 thefts from autos, 5 thefts of bicycles & parts, 6 incidents of criminal mischief & vandalism, and 3 incidents of forgery & fraud. Full reports on the Web (www.upenn.edu/almanac/v45/n19/crimes.html).—Ed.

This summary is prepared by the Division of Public Safety and includes all criminal incidents reported and made known to the University Police Department between the dates of January 16, 1999 and January 24, 1999. The University Police Department patrols 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 882-4482.

Crimes Against Persons

34th to 38th/Market to Civic Center: Simple Assaults—1
01/22/99 10:46 AM University Hospital Complainant assaulted/arrest
01/21/99 5:00 PM Magellan Complainant assaulted

30th to 41st/Market to Baltimore: Rapes (& Attempts)—1; Simple Assaulrs—2
01/18/99 8:36 AM Evans Building Complainant assaulted
01/19/99 7:51 PM 3900 Blk Spruce Complainant reported attempted rape/arrest
01/21/99 11:02 PM 3829 Walnut St Disturbance/assault at residence

41st to 43rd/Market to Baltimore: Robberies (& Attempts)—1
01/20/99 11:05 PM 42nd & Spruce Unknown suspect attempted to rob complainant

30th to 43rd/Market to University: Simple Assaults—1
01/18/99 9:05 AM 3100 Blk Market Male struck complainant with tire iron/No injuries

Outside 30th to 43rd/Market to Baltimore: Aggravated Assaults—1
01/22/99 11:51 PM 2200 Chestnut St 2 complainants struck with pool stick by unknown

Crimes Against Society

36th to 41st/Market to Baltimore: Disorderly Conduct—1
01/20/99 2:29 PM 40th & Walnut St Male became disorderly during car stop/cited

18th District Crimes Against Persons

21 Incidents and 9 Arrests (including 10 robberies, 9 aggravated assaults, 2 rapes) were reported between January 18, 1999 and January 24, 1999 by the 18th District covering the Schuylkill River to 49th Street and Market Street to Woodland Avenue

01/18/99 9:05 AM 3100 Market Aggravated Assault
01/18/99 1:00 PM 323 46th St. Aggravated Assault/aret
01/18/99 11:37 AM 5000 Pine St. Aggravated Assault/aret
01/19/99 7:13 PM 4526 Locust Robbery
01/18/99 1:30 PM 4800 Chestnut Robbery
01/18/99 10:27 PM 3000 Market Robbery
01/19/99 8:00 PM 3908 Spruce Rape/aret
01/19/99 6:09 AM 4845 Pine St. Robbery
01/19/99 1:05 PM 221 46th St. Robbery/aret
01/20/99 2:42 PM 4910 Walton Aggravated Assault/aret
01/20/99 6:23 PM 4809 Trinity Robbery
01/20/99 2:00 PM 4500 Osage Robbery
01/21/99 12:44 AM 5100 Hazel Aggravated Assault/aret
01/21/99 4:00 PM 4900 Walnut Aggravated Assault
01/22/99 7:33 PM 4426 Sansom Aggravated Assault
01/22/99 2:24 PM 4426 Sansom Aggravated Assault
01/22/99 12:51 AM 4730 Hazel Aggravated Assault/aret
01/23/99 11:23 PM 100 42nd St. Robbery
01/24/99 3:30 AM 3199 Chestnut Rape
01/24/99 5:00 AM 5100 Sansom Robbery
01/24/99 1:33 AM 4834 Spuce Robbery

Update

FEBRUARY AT PENN

FILM

4 My Love, My Bride; Korean with English subtitles; 7 p.m.; Sitteler Hall B-21 (Center for East Asian Studies).

MEETING

3 HERS Information Meeting for prospective applicants to Summer Institute; 4-5:30 p.m.; Faculty Club.

RELIGION

Christian Association

3 Early Morning Prayers; 8-8:55 a.m. Every Wednesday throughout the semester.

4 Spirituality and Sharing for Thinking Women—Healing through Sound and Movement; noon-1 p.m. Every Thursday throughout the semester.

8 Holy Communion; noon-12:30 p.m. Every Monday throughout the semester.

TALKS

4 Writing, Literacy and Society in Early Mesopotamia; Steve Tinney, Mesopotamian Language and Literature; assistant curator, Museum; noon; 3732 Locust Walk (Middle East Center).

8 Working Children in 19th Century Industry; Lindy Biggs, Auburn University; 4 p.m.; room 392, Logan Hall (History and Sociology of Science).

9 Media Message Concerning Women’s Bodies and Its Impact on Self-Esteem and Depression, Body Image Disorders, and Victimization; Mary Anne Layden, HUP; 7:30 p.m.; Seminar Room, Kings Court/English House College House (Perspective in Humanities).

Classifieds

Therapy

Shari D. Sobel, Ph.D. Psychotherapy (215) 747-0460.

To place a classified ad call (215) 898-5274.
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The University has recently mailed nearly 28,000 Calendar Year (CY) 1998 W-2 Forms to our employees’ home addresses as they appear on the current Payroll File (Employee Database). Accordingly, it is now appropriate to publish an explanation of some of the amounts and other data that appear on your W-2 Form in order to assist you in preparing your Federal and State Income Tax Returns.

An explanation of the contents of the various boxes on the form is as follows:

A. **Wages, tips, other compensation:** this represents the total amount of Federal Taxable compensation paid or imputed to you during calendar year 1998 through the University Payroll System. This amount includes:
   a. Tax deferred annuity contributions (i.e., TIAA/CREF);
   b. The value of Group Life Insurance coverage for amounts greater than $50,000. The premium payments for this excess coverage, if any, have been included as imputed income (see Excess Insurance Premium—below);
   c. Certain other fringe benefits relating to imputed income. The amount which is shown in Box 13 and labeled (E).

   Amounts which are excluded from this amount are:
   d. Tax deferred annuity contributions (i.e., TIAA/CREF);
   e. Health and Dental insurance premiums that have been sheltered;
   f. Amounts voluntarily contributed to a dependent care or medical reimbursement account.

B. **Federal income tax withheld:** this represents the amount of Federal Income Tax which was withheld from your earnings during the year and paid to the Internal Revenue Service on your behalf, by the University.

C. **Dependent care benefits:** this represents the total amount which you have voluntarily “sheltered” for dependent care expenses, regardless of whether you have been reimbursed by the University for the expenses associated with this “shelter” as of December 31, 1998.

D. **Social security wages:** this represents the total amount of compensation paid to you during calendar year 1998 which was subject to Social Security (FICA/OASDI) tax, including all of your tax deferred annuity contributions and excess life insurance premiums, if applicable, but excluding health and dental insurance premiums and any voluntary dependent care or medical reimbursement account contributions which you have “sheltered”.

E. **Social security tax withheld:** this represents the total amount of Social Security (FICA/OASDI) tax which was withheld from your earnings during the year and paid to the Social Security Administration, on your behalf, by the University.

F. **Benefits included in box 1:** if you have received certain fringe benefits, the value of such benefits is shown here. If you have received any of these benefits the University has recently advised you, individually and personally, concerning their taxability; please refer to the communications specifically.

G. **Medicare wages and tips:** this represents the total amount of compensation paid to you during calendar year 1998 which was subject to Medicare tax, including all of your tax deferred annuity contributions and excess life insurance premiums, if applicable, but excluding health and dental insurance premiums and any voluntary dependent care or medical reimbursement account contributions which you have “sheltered”. This amount includes:

   a. The value of your taxable graduate and/or professional tuition benefits;
   b. The value of Group Life Insurance coverage in excess of $50,000 be imputed as income to the employee. The amount which appears in Box 13 and labeled (C) is the value of the premiums paid for this excess insurance coverage. This amount is based on an Internal Revenue Service (IRS) table which identifies premiums for different age groups.

H. **Medicare tax withheld:** this represents the total amount of Medicare tax which was withheld from your earnings during the year and paid to the Social Security Administration, on your behalf, by the University.

I. **Excess insurance premium:** the Internal Revenue Service requires that the premiums paid by an employer for group life insurance coverage in excess of $50,000 be included as income to the employee. The amount which appears in Box 13 and labeled (C) is the value of the premiums paid for this excess insurance coverage. This amount is included in this box.

J. **Tax deferred annuity contributions:** this represents the total amount of contributions made by an employee to a retirement plan on a tax-deferred basis. The amount is shown in Box 13 and labeled (E).

K. **Excludable moving expense reimbursements:** this represents the non-taxable moving expenditures that were paid to you as a reimbursement or paid directly to a third party. The amount is shown in Box 13 and labeled (P). If any reimbursements or third party payments were deemed to be taxable income you were notified of these amounts under separate cover.

L. **Employee’s social security number:** this is the number that the Federal and State Governments use to identify you with the tax returns that you file, so please review it for accuracy. If the number is incorrect, then the University Payroll system is also inaccurate and you should contact the Payroll Office, immediately, before you file your returns.

M. **State wages, tips, etc.:** this represents the total amount of compensation paid to you during calendar year 1998 which was subject to Pennsylvania State Income Tax, including all of your deferred annuity contributions, if applicable, but excluding health and dental insurance premiums and any voluntary medical reimbursement account contributions which you have “sheltered”.

N. **State income tax:** this represents the total amount of Pennsylvania State Income Tax withheld during calendar year 1998 and paid to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, on your behalf, by the University. If you do not live in Pennsylvania and if you submitted the “Employee Statement of Non-Residence in Pennsylvania” form to claim exemption from Pennsylvania State Income Tax, no amount will be reflected in this box.

O. **Local wages, tips, etc.:** this represents the total amount of compensation paid to you during calendar year 1998 which was subject to Philadelphia City Wage Tax, including all of your deferred annuity contributions.

P. **Local income tax:** this represents the total amount of Philadelphia City Wage Tax withheld from your earnings during calendar year 1998 and paid to the City of Philadelphia, on your behalf, by the University.

When you receive your W-2 form, please review it immediately to ensure that your name is spelled correctly and that your Social Security number is correct. If you feel that any information on your W-2 is incorrect, review your calculations carefully and compare the information on the form with your final 1998 pay stub. If you have availed yourself of certain tax-anything benefits please review any additional information which was provided to you, under separate cover, concerning these benefits and their impact on your tax status. If you still believe that your W-2 is in error, please contact the W-2 Office at 573-3277 or write to W-2 Office, Room 310, Franklin Building/6284. You should have received, via the U.S. Postal Service, your Federal and State Income Tax Forms and related instructions for filing. Federal Tax forms are available at the Internal Revenue Service, 600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, or by calling (800)TAX-FORM. Pennsylvania Income Tax forms are available at the State Office Building, 1400 Spring Garden Street, Philadelphia, or by calling (888)PA-TAXES. Federal and State forms are also available at many libraries and U.S. Post offices.

—Marvin Alexander, Associate Comptroller
On Experimental Education

In an April 1998 report, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching joined in the increasing criticism of the quality of undergraduate education at the large research universities of today. According to the two-and-a-half year study of 125 universities around the country, radical educational reforms are necessary in order to justify ever-increasing tuition costs. It singles out several major problems specific to research schools, including huge and impersonal lecture classes, a failure to engage students with opportunities for research, and a lack of discussion-centered learning.

There are, of course, a number of advantages to attending a large research institution as opposed to a small liberal arts college, which include working with faculty who are ranked among the top few in their fields, having access to incredible research opportunities, and enjoying the luxury of a nearly unlimited diversity of courses in all disciplines. In addition to promoting and maintaining the quality of these positive aspects, the University of Pennsylvania must develop an atmosphere in which small-school benefits, such as extensive student-faculty contact in and out of the classroom and student-focused learning, may also develop.

As Penn approaches the 21st century and undergoes a period of self-evaluation in an extremely educationally-aware climate, it has already initiated some major changes. A number of programs designed to create diverse and unique opportunities for students to pursue knowledge for its own sake are tentatively in place, for example, the new Undergraduate Research Center, the Preceptorial program, the Student-Faculty lunchroom, and the Speaking Across The University program. There are also a number of programs waiting to be formed, but rarely evolve past the theoretical stage because of a lack of space and resources. To give a home to floating pilot programs and create a structure for the development and implementation of new ideas, Penn must lead the way into a new educational era with the introduction of a Center for Innovations in Education (CIE).

The CIE will be a center for the organization of intellectual activities at Penn, both academic and nonacademic. The CIE will bring together resources that are currently absent and create the atmosphere necessary for the development of unique and successful programs.

Programs spawned by the CIE will emphasize six tenets of experimental education:

- Increase student-faculty interaction at the University
- Develop alternatives to traditional learning structures
- Add breadth and depth to the standard curriculum
- Provide purpose and unity across disciplines
- Inspire introspection and new initiatives
- Create opportunities for students to play an active role in shaping education

For three decades, SCUE has enacted educational reform at Penn in the shape of experimental ideas that embody these tenets. In the last two years specifically, three programs have met with extraordinary success: the SCUE lunchroom, Preceptorials, and SATU. In addition, the rest of the University has demonstrated its enthusiasm with the introduction of such programs as the Undergraduate Research Center and the student-and-faculty-initiated Asian-American Studies Minor. This proposal not only details some of the opportunities that are currently lacking, it also describes the programs that have already begun to fill these gaps. The successful launch of these programs has thus displayed the community's desire and support for new experiences.

By integrating the tenets of experimental education into the current academic structure through programs that are initiated and sustained by the CIE, Penn will develop an educational system that produces model students. These scholars will be well-spoken and familiar with the focus needed for exemplary research. They will be comfortable with many different learning environments and will have an appreciation for discourse with the brilliant minds that abound on Penn’s campus. They will be equipped with the skills and experience that no other educational system could have provided. The CIE’s presence on campus will foster an environment of individual responsibility and directed creativity that will distinguish Penn from other research institutions. Student initiatives will aid the University in its continuing efforts to offer students a most challenging and rewarding educational experience.

— Aaron Fidler, W ’00, Chair 1999-2000
— Loren Berman, C ’00, Subcommittee Chair
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The Center for Innovations in Education (CIE)

Once a program is given the support necessary to move forward, organizational tasks are essential to its continuing success. This phase of the implementation process would also fall under the CIE umbrella. Some programs could find a permanent home in the CIE, while others might be temporarily housed there until they are adopted by another department or administrative structure. Each program taken on by the CIE would have a separate committee responsible for handling the duties that accompany the implementation process. These committees should not be difficult to staff, since there will be a vibrant community of experimental education enthusiasts willing to help the cause of any new program in education. Since the committees will all be housed in the CIE, they will create a synergy and assist each other when necessary. The effort to initiate and sustain programming will be extremely collaborative.

The core committee will also be responsible for periodic evaluations of the programs that are being administered by the CIE. Inevitably, there will be programs that are unsuccessful and ultimately drain the CIE’s resources. The core committee will identify these programs and rectify any existing problems. In addition to “streamlining” programs, the core committee will ensure that all programs are being utilized to their full potential. Specific details such as the number of core committee members and how these members are chosen should not be mandated, but rather left to the discretion of the committee. Changes should be made to the internal structure as needed, depending on current demands.

In this paper we will summarize some programs already in existence that would have greatly benefited from a CIE presence on campus over the course of their respective implementations. We will also introduce some programs in their initial stages of development and provide a framework for their implementation. In an Appendix, we describe a potential implementation pathway through the CIE for one of these ideas, the Penn Scholars program. [Please see http://dolphins.upenn.edu/~sceu/index.html]

Future Vision

Here is a vision of what the CIE could look like in the future, once it has gained momentum and become a significant presence on the campus:

It will be housed in a building central to campus, containing office space for the committees that will be run out of the hub as well as the personnel in charge of it, and classrooms used to hold experimental classes and committee meetings. There will be additional space for other programs which encourage the development of an intellectual atmosphere beyond the classroom and/or exemplify other aspects of the experimental education ideology.

In addition to providing a collaborative space for various experimental education projects, the CIE building will also be a permanent information source for students regarding CIE-sponsored opportunities at Penn. A professor offering a course or a committee running a new program will have the option of advertising their program through the CIE. The CIE will evolve into a hub of experimental activity, assisting projects from the creation stages to advertising and implementation.

The CIE will have its own budget for the purpose of funding, advertising, and purchasing necessary supplies. Since the CIE committee will take on the added responsibility of fund allocation, the core committee will have additional faculty and administrative members. The committee overseeing the CIE will be composed of students, faculty and administrators. Administrative presence on the board is necessary for the purpose of continuity as students pass through the system upon matriculation and graduation, but students should have a permanent voice in decision-making. The responsibilities of this core committee will be to advise the CIE committees, in addition to handling the additional administrative weight that comes with having a permanent core membership who wishes to participate, but will have a permanent core membership with voting rights.

The CIE’s presence on campus will cultivate a community of students with an interest in experimental education initiatives who will attend meetings on a regular basis as well as fuel the various committees that are associated with the hub.

In addition to housing various committees that are working in experimental education initiatives, the CIE will also provide a collaborative space for the Undergraduate Advisory Boards (UABs). UABs have already found success working strictly within their departments, but a centralized meeting space would facilitate the sharing of ideas and successful experiences as well as failures so they could learn from one another. At several SCUE-sponsored UAB conferences a major topic has been collaboration among the different departments; by centralizing their locations the UABs will be able to share and create new ideas in a more effective manner. In addition, the CIE will provide a support network for academic departments with interdisciplinary interests.

There is no such thing as an easy route to implementation. Every idea encounters significant obstacles before it becomes a program. The initiation of new academic programs often requires collaboration between administrators, faculty members (who are often in different departments), and students, which does not happen easily. Interdisciplinary initiatives are particularly difficult to manage due to the issue of sharing faculty members from different departments and schools. The CIE will centralize enthusiasm for experimental ideas and create a process whereby many of these obstacles can easily be overcome. Students will be drawn to it as an intellectual center on campus, somewhere to brainstorm or receive feedback on an idea-in-progress; faculty and administrators will be drawn to the CIE as a place to generate and test new educational ideas. Furthermore, it will create opportunities for students to have dialogues with the faculty and administrators who, if they collaborate, have the ability to transform the ideas into viable programs. This dialogue is the first step towards initiation, and the viable plans that are bound to develop.

The CIE will be a “hub” for new ideas in educational programming, functioning in a similar manner to the Writers House and Civic House. Just as Civic House provides an organizational center for various community service groups on campus, the CIE will provide a home base for both permanent and trial programs in experimental education. By centralizing enthusiasm for the improvement of undergraduate education at Penn through innovative programming, the CIE will cultivate a community of students, faculty and administrators who are working towards a common goal. Currently, a student, faculty member, or administrator with a novel idea has nowhere to turn for help in either the refining, development, or implementation of that idea. The CIE will have faculty advisors available for all members of the University community to receive constructive criticism on new ideas from the appropriate faculty and administrators. Since there is currently no such facilitative mechanism at Penn, many ideas float around in various stages of formation but eventually wither away because the creator lacks the resources or administrative support for successful permanent implementation.

There are two main components to the implementation of a new program: administrative power and manpower. Administrative power is needed to recruit appropriate faculty, provide funding, and ease the process of maneuvering through Penn’s bureaucracies. Once this initial task has been accomplished, work is necessary to keep the programs running. Program implementation almost always includes “busy work” that is not glamorous, but nonetheless integral to success. At the core of the CIE will be a committee, composed mainly of students, who work with one or two faculty/administrator advisors. The committee will have two main responsibilities which parallel the components of implementation described above:

1) Fine-tune and then initiate the implementation process of new ideas.
2) Successfully sustain the implementation of programs that are already underway.

The committee will have regular meetings that are announced publicly, to which any student, faculty member, or administrator can bring his/her ideas in experimental education. At these meetings the committee will discuss the idea with the creator, making suggestions, or helping to solve any problems the person may have been experiencing. With the aid of an administrative anchor, the committee will then decide what the appropriate avenues and contacts would be for the formal presentation of the idea. This person, or people as the case would more often be, would be invited to attend one of the discussion panels that the CIE will sponsor on a regular basis. After learning about the idea the administrators and faculty could ask questions or voice concerns or perhaps suggest what changes could be made to the idea to initiate things. The administrative anchor for the CIE committee will have a deep understanding of Penn’s hierarchical structures, and therefore the knowledge to direct ideas to the appropriate individuals or departments. The CIE core committee involvement with the development and implementation process of each idea will be determined on a case-by-case basis. Some ideas will require guidance well into the implementation stages, while others may need a bit of direction and will become self-sustaining relatively quickly. Considering this variation in time commitment to different ideas, the CIE will have the capacity to take on a number of projects at once without becoming overburdened. With time, there will be a multitude of successful programs spawned by the CIE, and a broad network of people with interests in experimental education will develop. The creators of the ideas and the administrative links responsible for bringing them to fruition will all be centralized under the CIE. As this network of students, faculty and administrators grows, the road will be paved for future experimental initiatives.
Penn Scholars: A Hypothetical Implementation Path of a Future CIE Program

In this section we will give an example of how a program could progress from the idea stage to implementation and perpetuation. Penn Scholars is an idea that SCUE has been working on for a while and it is now in the final proposal stage. Within the CIE framework, several interested students could work to create a dynamic interdisciplinary research environment. The CIE core committee would help students develop their ideas into a polished proposal appropriate for presentation to administrators (see Appendix).

The Penn Scholars program will encourage undergraduate research at the University. Under this program, five or six of the University’s brightest undergraduates across all schools and programs will perform a two-credit, year-long study on a common topic that would be carefully selected to span many disciplines (e.g. war, or time). At the end of the year, these Penn Scholars will participate in a large panel presentation of their research. This culmination of work will serve as a dialogue on the Penn Scholars’ findings, as well as an exhibition of undergraduate research performed at Penn. Two to three times each semester, a meeting with the Moderator will ensure that each project stays within the bounds of the predetermined subject. This session will also provide a forum for the scholars to present progress reports of their own findings. This program will be an interdisciplinary approach to a broad subject, with undergraduate researchers from diverse fields learning from each other.

Once the idea has been finalized, incorporating the suggestions of the CIE committee, appropriate faculty members and administrators will be identified to support the project. The CIE core committee members as well as administrative anchors will help to identify potential program sponsors. In the case of Penn Scholars, likely project sponsors would be the Provost or people involved with research at the University, like the Vice-Provost for Research. The Chair of the Humanities Center, which facilitates interdisciplinary research in the humanities, and the head of the Undergraduate Research Center are other potential candidates for this position. The strength of the CIE lies in its ability to foster connections between new programlymphing ideas and those individuals who have the authority to implement new initiatives.

Once the program has gained sponsorship, practical aspects of program implementation must be addressed. A Penn Scholars committee including both the sponsors and its creators, as well as other members of the CIE core committee, will be formed. The responsibilities of the Penn Scholars committee will be to select a topic, advertise it, solicit and evaluate applications, ensure the quality of the forum facilitator, and schedule and handle other logistics of the forum. It will handle these responsibilities indefinitely, until the program is handed off to another entity.

As shown in this example, the presence of the CIE on Penn’s campus will allow for the accelerated communication of ideas between creators and potential sponsors. Since there will be a centralized location for all ideas in experimental education, they will draw strength from each other, sharing resources both in the development and implementation stages. As more successful programs are spawned by the CIE, an increasing number of people with ideas will be attracted to the center and an intricate network of key faculty and administrators will be developed. Penn will lead the way into the 21st century with experimental programming to broaden undergraduate education.

The first three programs described below are recent initiatives whose implementation would have been greatly aided by the presence of a CIE on campus. They are followed by summaries of two program ideas which, like the Penn Scholars program outlined above and shown in more detail in the Appendix, would fit into the CIE framework.

Experimental Education

Already In Effect: Preceptorials

Preceptorials are short, small, non-credit seminars generated by students and led by some of the University’s most lauded faculty and staff. The program promotes student-faculty interaction and learning for its own sake; in this respect, Preceptorials embody a spirit of learning that should be prevalent in all aspects of an extraordinary educational institution.

Freshman year students arrive at the University a bit nervous, slightly intimidated, and usually completely overwhelmed. An immense course load and over-crowded lecture halls do not help to ease a student’s transition to college life. Freshman seminars and New Student Orientation attempt to introduce students to the vast resources of Philadelphia, lively campus life, interaction with professors, and small classes that they will look forward to during the next four years. By sophomore year, however, much of the enthusiasm for learning and exploration that students arrived at the University with becomes lost as they navigate through general and major requirements. Frustrated with large introductory classes and seemingly unapproachable professors, many students redirect their energies towards extracurricular activities and away from academic pursuits.

Preceptorials serve as a reminder to both students and faculty that grades and articles are the results of learning and exploration rather than the purpose or object. This is emphasized by the fact that a Preceptorial meeting is assigned two SCUE liaisons, one Preceptor and one Preceptor liaison to ensure attendance and completion of student evaluation forms.

Since their foundation in 1996, Preceptorials have become immensely popular. Overwhelming numbers of students apply each semester in the hope of being able to participate in this unique experience. This popularity is clear evidence of Penn students’ thirst for intellectual experiences and student-faculty interaction. In this way, a Preceptorial may be seen as the ideal model of a typical class. Its unique qualities should be considered goals for all classes towards which the University administration can work, for example, by beginning to give a higher priority to utilizing the vast majority of Penn classes tend to reflect a one-sided approach to learning, with the professor disseminating knowledge, while providing little time for intellectual conversation.

The classroom provides a foundation of knowledge, but by no means should learning cease at this level. Professors must distill large amounts of information into three hours worth of class time, providing students with only a glimpse of the topic at hand. Assigned readings provide a one-way diffusion of knowledge, but no interaction with the subject can be had. Associated teaching assistants serve as sufficient guides through basic course material, but lack the experience and expertise to answer complex questions. Although some professors encourage e-mail and newsgroups as ways to pose questions and find answers, such means prove very impersonal and, at times, constraining. Often, a very terse conversation on a topic triggers a cascade of questions, which can only be answered in discussion. Professors’ office hours are open to all students enrolled in the course, so extended personal interaction is constantly confined to a brief period of time.

Already In Effect: The SCUE Lunchroom

Preceptorial generation and are responsible for that Preceptorial’s general maintenance and completion. The Preceptor liaison maintains contact with the professor, reserves rooms, and organizes any transportation or purchases that are required by the Preceptorial. The student liaison works in conjunction with the Preceptor and Preceptor liaison to ensure that the Preceptorial meets students’ interests. Responsibilities include answering student inquiries about the Preceptorial, ensuring attendance and completion of student evaluation forms.

As shown in this example, the presence of the CIE on Penn’s campus will allow for the accelerated communication of ideas between creators and potential sponsors. Since there will be a centralized location for all ideas in experimental education, they will draw strength from each other, sharing resources both in the development and implementation stages. As more successful programs are spawned by the CIE, an increasing number of people with ideas will be attracted to the center and an intricate network of key faculty and administrators will be developed. Penn will lead the way into the 21st century with experimental programming to broaden undergraduate education.

The first three programs described below are recent initiatives whose implementation would have been greatly aided by the presence of a CIE on campus. They are followed by summaries of two program ideas which, like the Penn Scholars program outlined above and shown in more detail in the Appendix, would fit into the CIE framework.
After exhausting the various resources available in their pursuit of knowledge, students become frustrated. In addition, students are sometimes intimidated to approach their professors, a renowned scholar in his field, for an appointment or an individual meeting. After encountering so many roadblocks, many students give up their search and placate their inquisitive tongues. Well, I tried my best.

The SCUE lunchroom, currently located in the Faculty Club, facilitates rich undergraduate-faculty interaction every day during the school year by providing a central location on campus for a number of students and faculty to have lunch. It provides a neutral environment, outside of the strict confines of the classroom, away from the intimidating office of the professor. Rather, the SCUE Room is a comfortable place for the Penn undergraduate community to converse informally with faculty and administration members.

The occupancy of the room is large enough so as not to isolate its customers, while at the same time being small enough to hold a conversation without distraction. In addition, the SCUE Room offers an affordable menu, so that frequent use of this room by students should be encouraged. For convenience, students on the Penn Dining meal plan are able to redeem their meals at the SCUE Room. Eventually, students should also be able to purchase meals using their PennCards, with billing sent to the student’s Bursar Bill.

By providing an affordable, convenient, and high-quality eating establishment with an intimate setting in the heart of campus, the SCUE Room effectively facilitates significant undergraduate-faculty interaction.

Already In Effect: Speaking Across the University (SATU)

SATU’s 1995 White Paper discusses the need for the University of Pennsylvania to provide students with opportunities to develop their rhetorical skills. The White Paper states that a key component of effective scholarship is the ability to communicate and express one’s viewpoint. Penn addresses students’ writing needs through the Writing Across The University program, yet lacks any formal program targeted at students’ oral communication skills. Due to the absence of a formal speaking program, SCUE would again like to present the University community with a plan to elevate communication skills across the campus.

Speaking Across The University (SATU) is a University-wide program that enhances Penn students’ oratorical abilities in both formal and informal settings. This program is designed to give students a formal opportunity to practice their speaking skills with the aid of a certified advisor. The advisors for SATU are Penn students who have completed a rigorous four-semester course taught by a faculty member who focus centers around basic speaking skills. Speaking Across The University follows closely in the footsteps of the already successful Writing Across The University (WATU) program, which SCUE helped to implement ten years ago.

SATU has two goals. First, Speaking Across The University will bring greater student participation to the classroom. This intensive program will provide Penn students with the tools needed to succeed both during and after their University careers. Second, it will culminate in the creation of a one-credit (c.u.) speaking requirement which students at Penn would fulfill in a manner similar to the already existing writing requirement. The speaking requirement will assure that all students improve upon their communication skills during their time at Penn.

SATU affiliated classes would include those deemed appropriate the previous semester and various classes which encourage student participation beyond traditional classroom discussions. Freshman writing seminars and senior seminars would be conducive to implementing a program like SATU because they require students to give both formal and informal presentations along with intensive classroom discussion. These classes should be looked at carefully as the possible next phase of classes to be integrated into the SATU program.

This program will greatly enhance the undergraduate experience at Penn by cultivating an essential skill often not addressed in the classroom. SCUE is confident that this program will ultimately benefit all involved. Students will benefit by receiving the tools needed to convey their ideas in a professional manner. Administrators will benefit because this program creates a well-rounded Penn graduate. Finally, faculty will benefit by creating innovative new courses that spark students’ interest through increased participation. If Penn wants to create future leaders, it must give them the tools to succeed. Only with the integration of SATU into the Penn curriculum can students be given the necessary skills to lead in the 21st century.

In the Theoretical Stage: Thematic Semester

The Thematic Semester will be an opportunity for students to take courses in a designated theme for a given semester. Five courses will be offered in each theme each semester, and students participating in the program will be required to enroll in at least three courses. Courses will be offered in a wide range of departments, but will all focus on the same topic; for example, “East vs. West,” “technology,” “medicine,” or “war.” Courses from different departments will approach the theme from unique perspectives, giving students the opportunity to make interdisciplinary connections, as well as to gain a sense of continuity in their education.

The Thematic Semester will create a cohesive learning experience for undergraduates at Penn. Many College students find themselves dabbling in different disciplines for the sole purpose of fulfilling the General Requirement. Occasionally, however, students see the synergies that exist between classes thus bringing a newfound perspective to their educational experience at Penn. The Thematic Semester is designed to maximize academic overlaps, creating continuity among general requirement courses in a small-group setting. The Thematic Semester can create a small-school atmosphere within the structure of a large research institution, bringing the increased discussion and intellectual cohesiveness of small-school education to the University.

Conferences between courses currently offered at Penn exist, however they are not readily apparent from course titles and descriptions. If course curricula were adapted to focus on the connections between disciplines, students could learn about themes and ideas across departments, and more successfully apply these concepts to the world outside of Penn.

Freshmen and sophomores who have not yet decided on a major are ideal for the program, thus providing a sense of direction in the early stages of their experience at Penn. The General Requirement usually dictates the courses taken by students at this stage of their education, and this trend results in a random assortment of courses that rarely have any relevance to each other. In this program, five courses from various departments would be offered, all of which would count towards the General Requirement and be linked by a common theme. Consequently, College students would therefore be able to fulfill requirements while unifying their educational experience.

Juniors and seniors could also effectively take advantage of the Thematic Semester program. Many juniors choose to vary their typical course schedule by going abroad or participating in the Penn in Washington DC program; the Thematic Semester provides another option for those seeking an alternative educational experience. Freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors alike have much to gain from the unification of their intellectual experience. The program would be a challenging, but ultimately very rewarding experience.

In the Theoretical Stage: 1.5-Credit Course

There is a dual responsibility on the shoulders of both the University and its students to create an atmosphere that promotes the pursuit of knowledge. Universities must provide students with the opportunities to learn while students have the duty to take advantage of the possibilities that lie ahead of them. With these beliefs in mind, SCUE would like to propose the One-and-a-Half Credit Course.

One-and-a-Half Credit Course would allow students to take a University seminar and combine it with a half-semester research project. During the first half of the semester, students will have the opportunity to select a topic, covered in class, that will sustain their interest over the semester, those students who have selected the 1.5 credit option will be able to fulfill requirements while unifying their educational experience.

The One and a Half Credit Course emphasizes two of Penn’s curricular needs. First, it will create more interaction between students and faculty at the University and second, it will introduce many students to the research process and spark their intellectual curiosity. This program also provides depth to most students’ curriculums by allowing them to pursue their academic interests beyond the classroom walls.

If more than one student in a class were to take the 1.5 credit option, then at the end of the semester the class would participate in a research forum. All the students would gather for an extra class and those that pursued a half-credit research project would present their findings to the rest of the class. The students would all benefit from the research of their peers and they would gain additional insight into their class topics that fellow students pursued further.

The One-and-a-Half Credit Course provides students with a unique opportunity to learn in both the traditional seminar setting as well as the independent atmosphere of research learning. This program would provide many students who were intimidated by the idea of independent research with a less rigorous introduction to the subject and hopefully develop an interest for future projects. The 1.5 Credit Course would help to promote undergraduate research and would cultivate a spirit of learning at Penn.

To access the Appendix on the web, see http://dolphin.upenn.edu/~scue/index.html. For a hard copy, call Almanac at (215) 898-5274.
The Penn Scholars program will encourage undergraduate research at the University. Under this program, five or six of the University’s brightest undergraduates across all schools and programs will perform a two-credit, year-long study on a common theme. At the end of the year, these Penn Scholars will participate in a large panel presentation of their research. This culmination of work will serve as a dialogue of the Penn Scholars’ findings, as well as an exhibition of undergraduate research performed at Penn. Students will meet with the Provost or a selected moderator two to three times each semester to ensure that each project stays within the bounds of the predetermined subject. These sessions will also provide a forum for the scholars to present progress reports on their own findings. This program will be an interdisciplinary approach to a broad subject, with undergraduate researchers from diverse fields learning from each other.

I. Topic of research

The topic of research will be broad enough so as to ensure the potential participation by undergraduates from any department of the University. Themes will change every year, with the possibility of repetition only after four years.

The CIE will form a special subcommittee for the proposal of a topic for the Penn Scholars program. This sub-committee will submit a proposed theme to the moderator before the beginning of the Spring semester. The moderator will have the authority to approve or reject the proposal. The topic for the upcoming school year will be finalized no later than January 31.

II. Publicity

Notices in The Daily Pennsylvanian and Almanac will run well before advance registration for Fall classes. In addition, internet resources will be utilized. A Penn Scholars webpage will be created, as well as a listserv. This listserv will facilitate communication among the Scholars, and act as a forum for suggestions for future research topics. Discussion in this forum will serve to foster interdisciplinary learning among the Scholars.

CIE members on the Penn Scholars subcommittee and the current participants in the program will conduct information sessions. The current Scholars will present progress reports of their work and provide their perspectives on the program. The selection process will be discussed during these sessions and application materials will be distributed.

III. Application and Selection

Five to six students will be selected for the program each Spring. These students will be chosen from across all schools and departments. To ensure the multi-disciplinary approach to the topic, only one student from a given department may be chosen each year. Preference will be given to rising seniors.

The CIE will administer the admissions process. The selection committee will consist of the following:

- Four CIE members
- Four faculty members

Although it is not mandatory, the CIE suggests that the four faculty members represent the four undergraduate schools at the University.

This committee will select three to five candidates for entry into this program. The criteria will be as follows:

1. Quality of proposed project
2. Relevance to topic
3. Faculty recommendation

The application will be comprised of a description of the proposed project, including an abstract, goals, procedures; an explanation of how the proposed project relates to the theme for that year; and a recommendation from the faculty advisor. The selection of an appropriate faculty advisor is crucial, because the Scholar will work intimately with the chosen mentor.

IV. Research and Credit

Research will begin the following semester. The Scholars will register for the two credit sequence through the independent study program offered by the department in which the student has declared a major. Penn Scholars who perform their research during their senior year will have the opportunity to count the research performed in this program as their senior research requirement or thesis project, as outlined by certain departments. All grading and credit distribution will be handled by the department under which the Scholar’s independent study is registered. Full credit will only be awarded upon completion of the program at the end of the Spring semester.

V. Moderator’s Sessions

The moderator will meet with the Scholars every half semester, amounting to three two-hour sessions. The moderator will make sure that each project stays within the bounds of the prescribed topic, as well as ensure that each student is diligent in keeping up with her work. These meetings will consist of ten-minute progress reports given by each Scholar, followed by a discussion. The dialogue will serve as a brainstorming session where students will be able to learn from each other and perhaps draw from each other’s work for their own projects. This discussion will be informal with the moderator playing only a minimal role.

The moderator will not have to monitor the Scholars outside these sessions. The only time commitments to which the moderator must attend will be the three two-hour sessions as well as the panel discussion at the end of the Spring semester.

VI. Panel Discussion

The culmination of the Penn Scholars program will be a presentation of findings and dialogue with the Penn community on the topic at the end of the Spring semester which will be coordinated by the CIE (e.g., reserving a large lecture room, generating publicity, serving refreshments, and handling invitations). This capstone to the students’ projects will serve to initiate the final segment of the year, during which many departments hold symposiums of undergraduate research projects.

The event will begin with each Scholar briefly presenting his/her work. Discussion of the topic will follow, as the entire University community will be invited. This discussion will serve to encourage both students and faculty to participate in the program.

VII. Honors

As this program seeks to recognize some of the University’s brightest undergraduates, certain articles of merit will be bestowed upon the Scholars:

- Transcript: Participation in the Penn Scholars program will be noted.
- A certificate will be issued upon completion of the program.
- All Penn Scholars will wear a gold drape over their robes upon graduation.

VIII. Implementation for 1999-2000

The CIE would like to run a pilot of the Penn Scholars program starting in the Fall of 1999. Described below is the approximate timeline for implementation.

By March 21, 1999: Anticipated topic approval by Moderator: Aspects of Time
March 21-April 4, 1999: Advertising and publicity campaigns run by the CIE.
April 4-April 11, 1999: CIE subcommittee selects Scholars.
April 12, 1999: Applicants are notified
September 15, 1999: Scholars Tea with Moderator
October 23, 1999: First Moderated session
January 15, 2000: Second Moderated session
February 1, 2000: Begin Scholars promotional campaign
February 9, 2000: First information session
February 16, 2000: Second information session
March 1, 2000: Deadline for proposals
March 5, 2000: Three Moderated Session
March 16, 2000: Decisions mailed
April 21, 2000: First Annual Penn Scholars Panel Discussion