Huntsman Hall: April 16

With groundbreaking set for April 16, the Wharton School has announced that it will name its new building on 38th Street for Jon M. Huntsman, an alumnus and overseer whose family has given more than $50 million to the School to date. The $120 million academic center will be called Jon M. Huntsman Hall. It is believed to be the only such project of its size in academia to be funded entirely by donations from alumni, corporations and friends. Mr. Huntsman, chairman and CEO of the Huntsman Corporation, will be at the invitational groundbreaking along with Dean Thomas P. Gerrity, President Judith Rodin and Mayor Ed Rendell. (For more on the new building, please see Almanac February 9, 1999.)

Two Planning Documents

In this issue, two major documents are released, one by SAS and the other by senior administrators of the University.

Campus Plan: On pp. 4-5, the President, Provost and Executive Vice President present guidelines for campus physical development in relation to program initiatives in the coming years. The document notes that they do not address specific issues such as resource allocation or the assignment of space to particular schools or programs, but set a perspective within which specific decisions will be made. “Thus, we expect that the campus plan and its guidelines will serve as a framework for conceptual development and future planning and, once completed, will be revisited routinely for updating and revision,” the statement says. It calls for setting up five University-wide committees, whose make-up is expected to be announced next week.

SAS Strategic Plan: In a center Supplement, Dean Samuel Preston presents For Comment his School’s strategic plan as it prepares to enter the 21st Century. The School will “secure a position of pre-eminence in every endeavor it undertakes,” the plan says, and this will require identifying and investing new resources in “targeted academic initiatives.”

Correction: March 23 and 31 Issues

Tuition: This year’s increase for tuition per se is 4.2%, not 4.1% as given in the front-page story March 23. The overall increase figure of 3.7% is correct.

Council: In the overview of the March 24 Council meeting, published March 31, it was Angie Liou, not Erin Healy, who introduced Associate Vice Provost Barbara Cassel during the Q & A period following Public Safety Vice President Seamon’s report. A transcript of the presentation and the Q & A starts on page 6 of this issue.

Five Honorary Degrees at Commencement May 17

The University will award five honorary degrees at its 243rd Commencement, to be held Monday, May 17 at Franklin Field. In addition to U.S. Secretary of the Treasury Robert Rubin, whose selection was announced by President Judith Rodin in the March 23 issue of Almanac, the recipients and the degrees they will receive are:

- Dr. Isabella Lugoski Karle, head of the X-ray Diffraction Section of the Laboratory for the Structure of Matter, Naval Research Laboratory; Doctor of Science.
- Billie Jean King, director and co-founder of WORLD TEAM TENNIS, Doctor of Laws.
- Dr. Gerda Lerner, Robinson-Edwards Professor of History Emerita, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Doctor of Humane Letters.
- Dr. Earl R. Stadtman, chief, Section on Enzymes, Laboratory of Biochemistry, National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, NIH; Doctor of Science.

Settlement in Ray Case

The following statement was issued last week by the University Relations Office.

The January 26, 1999, incident involving Mr. Kenneth Ray and police officers of the Division of Public Safety has been the subject of discussion as well as media coverage within the University. Mr. Ray, a long-standing member of the University community, and the University have amicably and mutually resolved the issues which arose as a result of this unfortunate incident. The criminal charges which had been filed against Mr. Ray have been dropped and there will be no further legal actions taken in connection with this incident. No monetary settlement is involved. Mr. Ray and the police officers involved look forward to continuing their association with the University, and will continue to provide their vital services to the University community.

Pullout: A Strategic Plan for the School of Arts and Sciences

For profiles of the 1999 honorary degree recipients, please see the back page of this issue.
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A Joint Statement on Alcohol Abuse

Dear Colleagues,

As you know, the campus has recently experienced a number of disturbing alcohol-related incidents, including, most tragically, the death of alumnus Michael Tobin. We join with President Rodin, Provost Barchi, and others, in expressing our deep concern over these events, and we join with them as well in our determination to work toward appropriate responses.

Alcohol abuse has been, and remains, a serious problem at American colleges and universities, including Penn. Too many of our students have embraced a culture of drinking, in which social satisfaction is linked to the excessive consumption of alcohol. The faculty cares about the welfare of our students, and wants to assist them to behave as successful members of their several communities, persons who value their own health and safety, and accept responsibility for the well-being of others. We know that students are often influenced by faculty attitudes and example. We should take care not to acquiesce in, condone, or encourage alcohol-induced behavior that puts our students’ future at risk.

Over the past couple of years, Penn’s faculty, students, and administration have collaborated on a variety of programs that have raised awareness of the dangers of alcohol abuse and have promoted alternative social activities for students. We can all be proud of those efforts, which have gained national attention as models of collegiate practice.

In spite of that good work, additional strategies and mechanisms may be required. The faculty will join energetically with other members of our campus community in determining what those next steps should be. Specifically, Senate chair-elect Peter Conn is serving on the Provost’s Working Group on Alcohol Abuse, which has already begun to meet, and will continue to meet intensively over the next few weeks. In addition, and in consultation with the Senate Executive Committee, the Senate Chairs will explore concrete steps the faculty might undertake to discourage alcohol abuse among students.

Penn enjoys well-earned prestige as one of the pre-eminent universities in the United States. All the members of this remarkable institution owe it to each other to behave with good judgment and mutual respect. Alcohol abuse has no place in the community we share.

Peter Conn, Chair-elect
John C. Keene, Chair
Vivian C. Seltzer, Past chair, of the Faculty Senate

Update on Alcohol Policy Issues

On Tuesday, March 30, a student demonstration on College Green protested the ban on alcohol at registered events announced last week in the wake of an alumnus’s death and three other incidents (as reported in The Daily Pennsylvanian March 29, these were an alcohol poisoning case where the student was treated and released, and two Liquor Control Board raids on off-campus locations). At the rally, a crowd of Hey Day proportions chanted “Beer, beer” as speakers from the UA, IFC, the Committee for Tangible Change and other organizations spoke to aspects of the ban and its adoption. In line with various statements in D.P. articles and op-ed pieces during the week, most speakers objected either to the process or to the perceived dangers of a policy they said would relocate problem drinking to off-campus locations.

That evening, the Working Group on Alcohol Abuse, made up of students, faculty and staff, held its first meeting. A Provost’s Office summary of the two-hour session said in part:

“Provision did ask the committee to bring conclusions forward as they are reached so that they can make timely progress on the group’s recommendations. The working group identified a list of problems that contribute to alcohol misuse. The members quickly agreed that the issue at hand is alcohol abuse, not alcohol use.

“The group began to search aggressively for alternative solutions to the temporary ban on alcohol at registered undergraduate parties and will meet intensively until such solutions are reached. The group expressed its commitment to meet as frequently and as long as possible to arrive at a mutually acceptable solution to this and the more complex issue of alcohol abuse. The working group’s next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, April 6 at 6 p.m. “The group strongly agreed that its individual members need to immediately consult their constituencies to generate substantive suggestions on how to help combat alcohol abuse, broadly and to develop alternatives to the temporary ban on alcohol at registered undergraduate parties, specifically. Penn students are encouraged to submit their ideas to members of the committee or to peers@pobox for suggestions, ideas and recommendations.”

Nominations for Deputy Provost: By May 1

Nominations and applications for the position of Deputy Provost are now being solicited by the search committee. Candidates must be tenured members of the faculty.

The Deputy Provost is the Provost’s chief advisor with duties covering much of the range of responsibilities of the Provost. In conjunction with the Provost, the Deputy Provost will play a particularly important role in undergraduate education. The Deputy Provost also carries major responsibility for programmatic oversight of the resource centers reporting to the Provost.

Nominations and applications due by May 1, 1999, and should consist of a letter with as much detail as possible as to why the nominee or applicant should be considered for the position. Nominations should be sent to the chair of the search committee, James O’Donnell, Professor of Classical Studies, 230A, 3401 Walnut. Please feel free to contact either Professor O’Donnell (898-1787 jod@tsc) or Mrs. Linda Koons (898-7227 koons@pobox) who is staffing the committee, about the search process.

— Office of the Provost

Fire & Occupational Safety: Mr. Cusick

Harry Cusick, a nationally-recognized critical incident and disaster management executive, is Penn’s new Director of the Fire and Occupational Safety, succeeding James M. Miller in the post late last fall. His appointment was announced by Vice President Thomas Seamon of Public Safety.

Mr. Cusick came to Penn after an extensive career that included command positions in the Philadelphia Fire Department; national responsibilities with the Roy Weston Company, an environmental firm; directing a graduate program at St. Joseph’s University; and extensive consulting experience. “Harry has a national reputation in the field of critical incident and disaster management and is a leader in the area of fire service, emergency medical and police cooperation and coordination,” Mr. Seamon said. “We are fortunate to have him here at Penn, and I look forward to working with him as he moves the department forward into the next century.”

Mr. Cusick is overseeing the integration of the Fire and Occupational Safety Department into the Division of Public Safety, and will develop the University’s critical incident and disaster management plans to meet the challenges of the next millennium. Mr. Seamon added.

[Please see additional Staff Changes on page 5.—Ed.]
Alcohol Screening: April 8

The Treatment Research Center of the University of Pennsylvania Health System is offering free, anonymous screenings for alcohol problems as part of the first National Alcohol Screening Day—April 8, 1999.

The free screenings will be held from 12-2 p.m. and 4-6 p.m. at 3900 Chestnut Street, on 39th St., between Spruce and Sansom Sts.

Participants can hear an educational presentation on alcohol problems, complete a written self-test, and talk one-on-one with a health professional. There are also an educational video, pamphlets, brochures and flyers, and, for those who need them, referrals to local treatment and support resources.

National Alcohol Screening Day—being presented as part of Alcohol Awareness Month—is a program of the nonprofit National Mental Illness Screening Project in partnership with the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA), a part of the National Institutes of Health. It is being held across the country at 2000 screening sites, including hospitals, alcohol and addiction treatment centers, and colleges.

According to Dr. Helen Pettinati, division director of the Treatment Research Center and associate professor in psychiatry at Penn’s School of Medicine, “This is an important program. Problems from excessive drinking affect all areas of life. It can damage the physical and emotional health of a person, as well as affect the people around this person. Drinking problems may manifest as fights, accidents, and loss of job or family.”

Dr. Joseph Volpicelli, senior associate director at the Treatment Research Center and an associate professor in psychiatry at the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine adds, “We hope that the first-ever National Alcohol Screening Day will increase public understanding of alcohol abuse and alcoholism, and the need for treatment. One of America’s most serious and persistent health problems, alcohol abuse and alcoholism cost society more than $167 billion each year and affect 14 million people in the United States—one in every 13 adults—abuse alcohol or are alcoholic.”

Attendees at the Treatment Research Center will learn about the full range of alcohol problems including: craving, loss of control, failure to fulfill work, school, or home responsibilities, drinking in situations that are physically dangerous, and recurring problems that occur when drinking.

The program is open to all. Based on the model used for the successful National Depression Screening Day, it tries to help people in a way that is “nonthreatening, easily accessible, and offers direct connection with treatment sources in the community,” its planners say.

Major support has been provided by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism with additional funding from the American Psychiatric Foundation, Charter Behavioral Health Systems, Eli Lilly and Company, Solvay Pharmaceuticals, Inc. and The Center for Substance Abuse Treatment (CSAT) of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.

The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation is providing a major grant to support the college component of the program.

For more information, please call (215) 898-1319 or send e-mail to monir@isc.upenn.edu.

PPSA Call for Nominations for Officers for 1999-2000

In addition to inviting nominations for the positions given below, the Penn Professional Staff Assembly seeks volunteers to serve on the nominating committee who will review the nominees and present the slate for election at the open meeting May 20. Volunteers for this committee should respond to ppsa@pobox.upenn.edu no later than Wednesday, April 9, 1999.

The PPSA is an organization of administrative and technical staff who serve the teaching, research and business missions of the University. PPSA accomplishes its mission by providing a forum where staff can express their opinions; seminars and programs to broaden and expand staff’s background and knowledge; representation on major University committees; and a supportive network to work toward achieving the University’s goals and objectives and enhancing professional status of staff.

The following positions on the PPSA Executive Board will be available for the coming year:

Chair-Elect: The Chairperson is the principal executive officer who calls meetings, prepares agendas, presides over meetings, and provides leadership and representation at the University Council and other meetings.

Vice-Chair Elect: The Vice-Chairperson records the proceedings of the Executive Committee and also functions as treasurer. After one year, the Vice-Chair elect automatically succeeds to the office of Vice-Chair.

Members at Large: 3 positions are available. The Members at Large participate in Executive committee meetings, and can serve on other University committees.

Current members are asked to self-nominate or submit names for consideration to ppsa@pobox.upenn.edu no later than April 30, 1999.

The home department and campus extension of the nominee should be included. A supporting statement can be included, if desired. The nominating committee will review the names and contact the nominees. A list of candidates will be prepared and distributed to the PPSA membership prior to the election.

The election will occur on Thursday, May 20, from noon until 2 p.m. at Logan Hall, Room 17, during the annual meeting.

Questions on the nominating and election process can be directed to ppsa@pobox.upenn.edu.

From ISC: Networking Service and Rate Changes for FY 2000

On July 1, 1999, several networking service and rate changes will go into effect. These changes are a result of recommendations made by the Network Planning Task Force (www.upenn.edu/computing/group/nptf/1999/index.html), the cross-campus team that meets to discuss and resolve issues surrounding the planning and funding of PennNet.

Information Systems and Computing (ISC) is making the following networking service and rate changes based on the Network Planning Task Force’s recommendations:

- On July 1, 1999, ISC will discontinue asynchronous desktop connections.
- E-mail accounts on Dolphin are no longer supported by the ResNet construction budget and so Schools and centers who rely on this service will be billed $17 per account per year. It will be up to the Schools and centers to determine whether to pass these charges on to end users.
- 10Base2 monthly connection rates will increase from $26 to $30. Users are encouraged to switch from 10Base2 to 10Base-T connections through ISC’s conversion program (www.upenn.edu/computing/news/1999/10base.html).
- 10Base-T monthly connection rates will decrease from $19.25 to $16.45. The table below shows a breakdown of the monthly fees for a 10Base-T connection in FY 1999 and FY 2000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISC-Maintained 10Base-T Connection Fee (Monthly)</th>
<th>FY 1999</th>
<th>FY 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Service Fee</td>
<td>$11.50</td>
<td>$10.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of operating the central electronic infrastructure, including planning, capital for central electronics, operation and maintenance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection Maintenance Fee</td>
<td>$4.15</td>
<td>$3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of keeping a port operational, including costs associated with customer service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Rental Fee</td>
<td>$3.60</td>
<td>$2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of renting one 10Base-T connection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Monthly Fee</td>
<td>$19.25</td>
<td>$16.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes to the Central Service Fee

IP addresses are the basis for central service charges. In the past, many kinds of IP addresses were not billed. ISC, with the help of the Network Planning Task Force, is moving towards billing all IP addresses equally. Following are three changes for FY 2000:
- There will be central service fee charges for the use of networked printers.
- Classrooms connected to the network will pay central service fees, but central pool classrooms will not be charged.
- Central service fees will be charged for non-public network connections. No central service fees will be charged for public lab, library and kiosk connections. However, connection maintenance fees and port rental fees are applicable.

Central service fees for FY 2000 are as follows:

- For ISC-maintained connections, IP addresses will cost $10.70 per month per connection.
- For locally-maintained connections, IP addresses will cost $8.94 per month per connection.
- A 5% discount will be given to any department using a single budget code to pay for more than 99 connections.

For more information, please call (215) 898-1319 or send e-mail to monir@isc.upenn.edu.
Campus Development Plan

Introduction

The University of Pennsylvania has clearly articulated its commitment to being “one of the premier research and teaching universities in the nation and the world.” It was with this goal in mind that the University initiated a comprehensive planning process of which the strategic plan, Agenda for Excellence, was the first step. As the next chapter within this comprehensive planning process, we propose the development of a campus development plan. The primary purpose of such a plan is to assure that the University’s physical environment fulfills the needs of its academic mission.

The University of Pennsylvania campus, located for the most part in West Philadelphia, covers about 260 acres of land dedicated primarily to academic, administrative, medical, student facilities including recreational, and retail use. Facilities range from the historic buildings of the 1800s to the new structures designed for Sansom Common and the Wharton School. The land and facilities that comprise the campus are estimated at a worth of $5 billion. Despite its rich heritage and value, for the most part the development of the physical campus has not proceeded from an advanced planning initiative as proposed herein.

We begin with the premise that an effective and attractive physical environment is vitally important to the faculty, students, administrators and staff of the University. The physical environment of the University is also important to the community that surrounds Penn, to the city of Philadelphia, and to the thousands who visit the campus each week. While Penn’s current environment is in an overall sense both effective and attractive, there are elements of the environment that continue to need our attention. In addition, much of the available space on campus has already been allocated for academic or other uses; use of the remaining space must be carefully planned. Finally, as is the case with all of its other vital resources, Penn will need to skillfully manage the totality of its physical environment in the years to come.

Objectives

With the academic mission as its overriding concern and within the framework established by Agenda for Excellence and the schools’ academic plans, the campus development plan will provide general guidelines for the development of Penn’s physical environment for both the short- and long-term future. We do not expect that these guidelines will address specific issues such as resource allocation or the assignment of space to particular schools or programs. These will continue to be handled through the University’s existing structures and processes. We do expect, however, that once the plan is developed, these specific decisions will be made within an overall campus perspective. In addition, we recognize that the campus has and will continue to evolve, that it will continue to be dynamic and not static. Thus, we expect that the campus plan and its guidelines will serve as a framework for conceptual development and future planning and, once completed, will be revisited routinely for updating and revision.

In order to clarify the intent of this development plan, it will be useful to enumerate specific examples of what the plan is or is not intended to accomplish.

The campus development plan will:

- provide a flexible but integrated framework for future decisions on specific site use that can be regularly revised and updated.
- provide general guidelines for building size and massing in different areas of the campus.
- recommend general classes of use for various campus regions (e.g. academic, recreational, residential, parking, etc.).
- provide specific suggestions regarding green space, landscaping standards, and campus visual gateways.
- develop alternatives for improving vehicular, pedestrian and commercial traffic flow on the campus.

The campus development plan will not:

- involve specific decisions on capital projects or the commitment of resources.

Areas of Focus

Within this overall context, we propose two primary objectives in order of their priority:

1. Examine the academic and scholarly environment of the campus and the extent to which this environment meets the teaching and research needs and the support requirements of faculty, students, and staff.

In order to address this objective, the Agenda for Excellence and the schools’ own strategic plans will be examined to explore the impact of these pre-existing plans on the University’s physical environment. Some of the issues that will need to be addressed include: a) how current pedagogical trends might affect the use of academic space in and across schools; b) whether the plans, taken separately or together, suggest common approaches to the configuration of faculty and administrative offices, research facilities, and classroom space; and c) whether anticipated technological advances will, in the near term, alter our teaching methods and our approach to the use of academic space.

2. Examine student, faculty, and administrative life; neighborhood and community life; and campus amenities.

Over the past several years the University has undertaken a number of initiatives to create a more fully integrated living and learning environment for students and faculty such as the creation of College Houses and the Hubs. The continued evolution of this environment for all campus constituencies must include consideration of academic, living, working, dining, recreation, shopping, services and cultural activities. We must examine, for example, a) what are the available opportunities to enliven the campus and surrounding environs? b) how can these various options be integrated so that scarce physical and environmental resources are best utilized? and c) where should the University provide the opportunity for planned and routine activities for its constituents versus chance encounters?

While subsumed under these two main objectives, there are three other aspects of the physical environment that we believe must be addressed, at first separately, and then in an integrated fashion. We propose to:

3. Examine the unique opportunities and challenges of Penn’s large number of historic buildings.

We need to address, for example, a) what is the importance of historical buildings to the campus and community? b) how can historic buildings be creatively used or re-used? c) what are the University’s legal and ethical obligations surrounding historic buildings? d) should the University acquire historic buildings and, if so, what are the guidelines for their renovation or demolition?

4. Examine access, circulation, transportation, and service for their impact on the campus environment.

These are issues that impact every member of the University community. Within this context we will need to examine travel to and within campus, parking, campus gateways, streetscape/furniture guidelines and mass transportation. We need to address, for example, a) how does the University interface with the city? b) how can inter- and intra-campus circulation be improved? c) how can vehicular and pedestrian safety be maximized? and d) how can service and delivery be accomplished most effectively?

5. Examine maintenance and operations for their impact on the physical environment.

Because continued quality of the environment depends on continued upkeep of the buildings and land, maintenance and operations must be an integral part of campus planning. We need to address, for example, a) what are the trade-offs between continued and deferred maintenance? b) what are the costs of continued maintenance vis a vis the resources? c) what are the life-cycle costs of continued maintenance?

(continued next page)
Process

The University has hired Olin Partnership, Ltd., a leading landscape architectural and urban design firm based in Philadelphia, to assist the faculty and administration in preparing the campus development plan. Their extensive campus work includes campus plans for Yale, M.I.T., Harvard Business School, Duke University, and the University of Southern California among others. In addition to numerous projects at Penn, they have also completed projects at such universities as Ohio State University, Case Western Reserve University and the University of Washington. Their work in the public realm includes the J. Paul Getty Center in Los Angeles, Bryant Park and Wagner Park in New York City, and Canary Wharf and Exchange Square in London. Currently they are the lead consultant for the Master Plan of Independence National Historic Park.

Olin Partnership has achieved their national and international reputation under the leadership of founding partner Laurie D. Olin, a former chair of Harvard University’s Department of Landscape Architecture. Olin resides in West Philadelphia and is currently Professor in Practice in Penn’s Graduate School of Fine Arts. He was a member of the Faculty Design Team that undertook, produced and implemented the University’s Landscape Master Plan of 1976. His partners in the firm have equally strong ties to Penn as alumni and adjunct faculty in the Department of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning.

In order to conduct a careful, thorough review of Penn’s campus and its future development and to receive advice we will:

1. Seek the advice of the Council of Deans and the Academic Planning and Budget Committee as we initiate the process and routinely as the plans begin to unfold. We also will update the University Council Committee on Facilities and the Faculty Senate leadership on a routine basis. Prior to final approval of a plan, the advice of the University Council and the Senate Executive Committee will be sought. The proposals also will be published in Almanac. For Comment by the community-at-large.

2. Appoint several working committees to coordinate activity and analyze data. The Steering Committee will refine the objectives and charge of each committee. It will receive preliminary proposals from the other committees to be established and coordinate the overall effort. Each of the other five committees will be asked to focus on one of the plan’s five objectives. These groups will meet regularly throughout the process to synthesize and consider the information gathered in open fora, provide further input into the plan, and generate and review proposed solutions as they are developed. [Ed. Note: Committees are to be announced shortly.]

The membership of each committee will depend heavily on its focus, but it is our intention to involve faculty, students, staff and administrators in the process. We will include individuals who represent the University Council Committee on Facilities and faculty who are recommended by the Faculty Senate. In addition, these committees will rely on the expertise of various faculty members in such areas as planning, architecture, and engineering and administrators with responsibility for functional areas pertinent to each group. Each of the committees will be supported in its efforts by planning consultants under the direction of Practice Professor Laurie Olin. It is anticipated that Professor Olin’s team will gather input from the committees and develop for their consideration alternative ways of addressing the committees’ issues. The committees will consider these alternatives as they move toward the development of recommendations.

3. Begin the consultative process with a series of open fora designed to solicit broad-based input from all community constituencies. It is anticipated that each forum will center on one of the above objectives so that focused community input can be achieved.

4. Meet with the leadership of the various campus constituencies to gather their views about the overall campus planning initiative and the more specific questions to be addressed under each of the objectives.

5. Synthesize findings and develop recommendations. Professor Olin and his consulting team will coordinate the integration of information from each of the fora and from each committee. This process will be overseen by the Steering Committee.

6. Generate final suggestions for endorsement. After review and input from each of the participating groups, the findings and recommendations will be presented to the President for her consideration. The Board of Trustees will then receive and consider the recommended plans.

7. Establish a mechanism for periodically reviewing and updating the campus development plan. We will seek the advice of the Council of Deans and the Academic Planning and Budget Committee in developing this review process.

Judith Rodin, President
Robert Barchi, Provost
John Fry, Executive Vice President

Office of the Secretary:
Two Appointments and a Promotion

The Secretary of the University, Rosemary McManus, has announced the appointments of a Director of Trustee Affairs and a University Council Coordinator, and the promotion of the former manager of events to Associate Director of the Office.

Trustee Affairs: Dr. Judith Krieger Rogers will join the Office as Director of Trustee Affairs full-time on May 24. She will work with the Secretary in planning and executing strategies to promote the effective governance of the University through its Board of Trustees.

Dr. Rogers has been director of student affairs in the Wharton Graduate Division for 12 years. “She has received great reviews for her work with the students on their co-curricular activities, her management of the Zweig Executive Dinner Series, and her leadership role in community building at Wharton,” said Ms. McManus. She previously worked in public relations for Hershey Entertainment and Resort Company and for Creative Images Advertising. Dr. Rogers holds a B.A. in sociology from Bucknell University, an M.Ed. Higher Education from William and Mary, and Ed. D. in Higher Education from Penn.

Council: Tram Nguyen, who recently joined the Office of the Secretary as University Council Coordinator, manages preparations for University Council meetings and provides administrative support to Council Committees. She functions as the main contact for all Council business within the Office of the Secretary where, Ms. McManus said, “The introduction of a full-time Council Coordinator will enable better communication among various constituencies and Council and facilitate Council’s role as a forum for the discussion of matters affecting the common interests of faculty, staff and students.”

Ms. Nguyen, a 1996 alumnus of Penn, holds a B.A. in the history and sociology of science. She came to her Penn post from Deloitte & Touche LLP.

Associate Director: Meryl Marcus, newly named to the post of Associate Director in the Office of the Secretary, joined the office as manager of events July 1998 after coordinating two of Penn’s Commencements. She currently manages all of the ceremonial functions of the Office and the diploma process. “Meryl has made major strides in revamping the Commencement process, building our partnerships with the twelve schools, and protecting our reputational risk by bringing increased attention to the diploma process,” said Ms. McManus.

Ms. Marcus holds a B.A. in history and music from SUNY, and a Master of Public Administration degree from NYU. Prior to joining the Office of the Secretary she was the clinical department administrator at the Institute for Environmental Medicine at Penn’s School of Medicine and served as administrator of the Pediatric Neurology Faculty Practice at Temple’s medical school.

To Pew Charitable Trusts: Michael Burton

Michael Burton, who has been a special assistant to the president since 1996, will join the Pew Charitable Trusts on April 12 as an associate of the Venture Fund—the largest of the seven Pew trusts and the one that initiates its own outreach to fund opportunities outside the six closely-defined funds (Arts & Culture, Health and Human Services, etc.). Mr. Burton served as President Rodin’s representative to numerous University committees and projects, including the Affirmative Action Council, the Annenberg Center and ICA reviews, and the Information Technology Working Group.
Public Safety: A Three-Part Report with Questions and Answers

Vice President Seamon: I was asked this afternoon to provide information on multiple issues to the Council. Those issues are—and I’ll take them in the order that they were presented to me:

— follow-up on the December open forum issues regarding safety that were brought by a number of special interest groups, especially women’s groups, on campus;
— information about public safety’s practices and policies regarding the arrest of Penn faculty, staff or students; and
— the report on the minority representation by rank in the Department of Public Safety.

December Topics: Following up on the Open Forum, there were four issues that were presented to Council in the form of demands and/or requests from those special interest groups. The first issue was a request for emergency alarms in each stall in every bathroom at all University buildings. We’ve looked at this, and unfortunately there are no standards regarding bathroom panic alarms in the security industry. The reason is that there are almost no institutions, except for medical and nursing home facilities, that feel the need to have alarms in bathrooms. The purpose for the alarms in those facilities is usually to summon aid in a medical emergency. We inquired over our national networks—IACLEA, the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators—regarding panic alarms in universities and college bathrooms across the country: Were there any standards? Most institutions do not have any type of bathroom panic alarms. Those that do have them either in specific locations such as bathrooms in athletic facilities or in a bathroom where they’ve experienced a previous incident.

However, taking into account the history of restroom alarms at Penn, we believe that a reasonable standard is to place one alarm device near the door in each bathroom and one in every handicap stall. In very large bathrooms, we might suggest that we also install an additional alarm device at the far end of the bathroom. We have a very high number of false alarms from the existing bathroom panic alarms throughout the campus. In many respects this is more dangerous than having no alarms at all. The people—both people within the building (students and staff) and the responding police officers and security officers—obviously become used to these false alarms, and human nature being what it is, people assume then that the alarms are never real alarms, they’re always false alarms. And of course as you multiply the number of devices, the opportunities for mechanical malfunction or for a false alarm begin to multiply.

Also, we do not have a history—thankfully—of attacks in our restroom facilities across the campus. Now obviously, last November’s incident in Wharton was very high-profile, but that was a real aberration when we go back into our statistics. We believe that security money is better spent on our current program of securing the perimeter of all our buildings. Realizing that there’s a finite amount of money that can be spent in any particular year on safety and security on the campus, what we’re first trying to do is secure the buildings so that only authorized staff, students and visitors are in the buildings at any one time. To do that first, rather than worrying about an unauthorized person getting into a room inside a building. We are installing the new alarms as new facilities are brought on line throughout the University, and when there are major renovations in existing facilities, then we are upgrading the restroom alarms that are in those facilities.

The second request by the group was on multiple advocacy resources beyond the Penn Police and CAPS. This issue has been discussed, and continues to be discussed, by the Safety and Security Committee. Frankly, I am not in a position to provide resources beyond, obviously, what the Division of Public Safety has. So I think that the proper venue would be for the special interest groups to continue their ongoing dialogue with the Office of the Vice Provost for University Life regarding this matter.

The third request was more frequent publication of the step-by-step procedures for reporting crimes, for publicizing crime statistics, and a list of campus resources regarding safety and security. The publication of crime statistics and notifications of crimes is governed by law, and we think the crime statistics are an additional resource for information regarding policies, and also the crime alerts that we send around about specific instances that are of interest to the entire community. So what we intend to do in the future is not only continue to send those crime alerts by fax and by other means, but also to put them on our web site.

The fourth request was for a mandatory workshop specifically addressing interpersonal violence, violence prevention, resources for crimes and victims—especially with sensitivity to women’s needs—and that those mandatory workshops be integrated into all new student orientations. The Division of Public Safety is given a limited time slot at the beginning of the year to provide a wealth of information on a host of safety and security issues. I discussed this with several of the representatives in the various interest groups, and unfortunately, we have no time to give up in that orientation to other groups. And certainly it’s not within our purview in Public Safety to make any mandatory sessions mandatory. We do support the concept of some mandatory orientation sessions—certainly we would like our own Public Safety’s to be mandatory, and I’m sure you could pick some others that are of great importance to the entire student body that perhaps ought to be mandatory, and we should continue to discuss that. And certainly we would be happy to assist or groups who want to put on workshops regarding specific safety issues.

Arrests: To the request for information regarding Public Safety’s practices and policies regarding the arrest of Penn faculty, staff or students, I thought it would be of interest just to tell you, for instance, last calendar year, from January 1, 1998, to the end of 1998, Penn Police made a total of 571 arrests; 42 of those arrests were of students; 14 of those arrests were of employees. So far this year, calendar year ’99, I’m happy to report that there have been no arrests of students through almost three months, and there have been six arrests of employees on and around the campus.

In regard to the notification procedures when a student or staff member is arrested, we’ve done some research; and there’s very little in the way of written policies or procedures on any type of notification on the arrest of student, staff or faculty. The procedure that we follow with an arrest of a student—whether we make the arrest or we’re notified by another law enforcement agency that a student has been arrested—is that we immediately notify the staff of the Vice Provost for University Life, who then makes necessary notifications to residence halls, any academic advisors, etc. With an arrest of a staff or a faculty member, notifications really are governed by the criminal law. So for instance, when someone is brought into custody by the Penn Police or the Philadelphia Police, it is their option to decide whom they want to notify or they would like the police to notify—the police do not automatically notify anyone. Obviously there are people who would rather that their friends and family not know of the arrest. What we do is—on the next business day or at least within one or two business days as it is possible—we notify the staff member’s supervisor and notify Human Resources of the arrest.

Minority Representation: To answer the request for a report on minority representation by rank, I chose data for the period that I’ve been here at Public Safety. I took over the Division on September 25, 1995, so we’ve researched the Human Resource statistics for the Division since that date. We have moved buildings several times and the administration before me kept records in a different fashion, so I wanted to bring statistics that I’m confident are accurate. If we look at the period of September 25, 1995, to September 26, 1996, 33.9% of the employees in Public Safety were minority employees. The next year, ’96 through ’97, 37.3% of the employees were minorities. The following year, ’97 through ’98, 39% of the employees in Public Safety were minorities. In that minority group, the overwhelming number are African-American, with a small number of Asian and other ethnic groups reflected. For September ’98 to the present, 38.8% of the staff in Public Safety are minority.

Regarding hiring statistics for that same period of time, from September 25, 1995, through the following year, 33.3% of the hires by Public Safety were minority. The year after that, ’96 through ’97, 48% of the hires were minority. From ’97 through ’98, 48.2% of the employees hired were minority. And this year, from September 25 to the present, 28.5% of the hires were minority. This year we’re only probably in the middle of this year and, as normal with Public Safety, we will probably be hiring a large group of people in the summer, so those statistics are not complete for the year yet.

Looking at supervisory and professional personnel, the percentages of minorities by race in the Division of Public Safety, and to go over that same time period, from September 25, ’95, until the following September of ’96, 30.4% of the supervisory personnel in Public Safety were minorities. The
following year, ‘96 through ‘97, 28.5% of the supervisory staff were minorities. 1997 through ‘98, 28.5% were minorities, and September 25 to the present—once again, the year is not done—22.2% of the supervisors in Public Safety were minorities. And finally, in regard to promotional statistics, and I lumped this into the entire period from when I took over Public Safety in September ‘95 to the present, 29.4% of all of our promotions in Public Safety were minorities.

**Question and Answer Period**

**Dr. Phoebe Leboy:** With respect to the request for information on minorities by rank, I don’t really understand what supervisory professionals are, so let me try to get that in another way. Could you tell us something about history of minority representation at ranks above sergeant among the police officers for the ‘96 to ‘98 period?

**Mr. Seamon:** When I first came, in 1995, there were two minority sergeants in Public Safety; there was one captain and one director. At the present time there are three sergeants who are minority within the Police Department. And I might add, the three sergeants were all promoted during my tenure.

**Terri White:** I have a couple of concerns about the response to the open forum issues, and one is on referring to the students who spoke as special interest groups. I’m a little offended by that and I really do take issue with describing them in that way. I think they represent the interest of students—they happen to be women—but I would not label them as special interest because it tends to minimize the importance of their concerns.

Let me speak specifically about one of your recommendations. The question of access to multiple advocacy resources beyond Public Safety and CAPS. As I understand it, your response was to refer them to the Vice Provost for University Life. If students are going to be informed and referred to other resources, then that needs to start with Public Safety, and Public Safety needs to work with the other resources. I think that was the concern that was being expressed. So sending them back to the Vice Provost, I really don’t understand as an adequate response.

**Mr. Seamon:** Certainly there’s no disrespect meant by me by labeling some of the groups that were here special interest groups. I take that as something that is very important and very beneficial around the campus; as a matter of fact, we deal with special interest groups all the time and we think that they do great work. Certainly I didn’t mean it at all as any type of derogatory term—actually, I see it as a compliment.

To your second point, regarding other resource groups: Public Safety does not set the protocol for how students should have access to the multiple resources around the campus. We provide service to victims who come to us; if they are victims of crime we try to urge them to use the criminal justice system. At the same time, whether they enter into that system or decline to use the system, we support them in every way possible, including making them aware of all the other resource groups on campus and how they can have access to those resource groups. But we do not set the protocol of where a victim or someone in need of services should go regarding any of the resource groups, or in what order they should go to those groups.

**Dr. Valerie Swain-Cade McCoullum:** I just wanted to make a clarification—I wanted to let everyone on Council and all guests know that VPUL did follow up in great detail with the members of the women’s community who came forward at the Open Forum and, in addition to the VPUL resources that we already have in place, we recruited and will be trained in April, which makes them available.

**Ms. Liou:** Thank you. My name is Angie Liou and I’m one of the co-chairs of the President and the Provost send a letter to deans and departmental chairs advising them of safety issues and the campus-wide resources. In addition, the Penn Women’s Center has included outreach to the College Houses as part of their on-going programming.

(Implementation: Currently, there is a pilot program with Health Education and the College Houses that places a health advisor in each college house. These “HealthLinks” advisors will facilitate student’s understanding of policy issues and conduct programs on health and safety issues. In addition, the Penn Women’s Center has included outreach to the College Houses as part of their on-going programming.)

(Implementation: A new preceptorial, “Sex at Penn: When is it Consensual?” will be offered on Tuesday, September 14, 1999 from 4 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. Co-instructors are Dr. Peggy Reeves Sinday of the Department of Anthropology, and Kurt Conklin of Student Health.)

(Implementation: STAAR should deliver programs to students earlier in the fall semester.

(Implementation: Health Education has begun a new workshop, “Sex Jeopardy” in which the game Jeopardy is adapted to cover categories dealing with sexual violence and sexual health. Both STAAR and FLASH will conduct these workshops; these health educators have been recruited and will be trained in April, which makes them available earlier in the fall semester.)

The implementation plans for the remaining recommendations are being developed:

- The Penn Reading Project should address quality of life issues, such as alcohol use and abuse, sexual and relationship violence and campus cultural climate, etc.
- Each bathroom on campus, Women’s and Men’s, should have a listing of emergency resources.
- There needs to be on-going educational programming opportunities for The Daily Pennsylvanian staff, which would help sensitize them to quality of life issues with respect to their report. Additionally, these types of programs may encourage their interest in doing periodic OP-ED articles addressing campus safety issues.
- Offer an undergraduate research seminar similar to the new alcohol seminar through the General Honors Program.
- Periodically place safety messages on payroll stubs.
- Have the President and the Provost send a letter to deans and departmental chairs advising them of safety issues, and the campus-wide resources.

In addition to this reading into the record of the students’ recommendations above, I want to clarify for the record a few points regarding Vice President Seamon’s response at Council on March 24:

**On bathroom alarms:** In response to their expressed need for improvements in campus-wide bathroom alarms, Mr. Seamon said that there is no...
Speaking Out

Safety: ‘Them’ and ‘Us’

“We will use every available resource of this University to identify and prosecute those intent on victimizing us. We have got to send a message: ‘Stay away from us here’.”

— Judith Rodin, D.P. 9/27/96,
“New Safety Initiatives Announced”

This is the University’s view on campus crime: All of Penn’s problems are not our fault, but the fault of those out there. Crimes committed by students against students are almost never reported, and never treated as serious threats to the Penn community. Unfortunately, with sexual assault and rape, this myopia criminals endanger all of us because we are denied our right to be informed of the crimes that threaten us most. Without knowledge, we are unable to protect ourselves from those within our community intent on victimizing us.

To most, the thought of sexual violence brings to mind the image of some West Philadelphia thug hellbent on victimizing helpless Penn women walking home after a late-night, off-campus party. The University fosters this image by failing to address student-on-student sexual violence. By creating new safety measures designed to keep others out, and disregarding measures which protect us from all sexual predators, the University pits “us” against “them.” At Penn, there is a long tradition of an “us vs. them” mentality.

Since 1994, The Daily Pennsylvanian has reported on 14 incidents of sexual violence that occurred on or around campus. In 13 of these, arrests were made, and the University responded immediately with heightened security. In the remaining incident—the only report of student-on-student sexual violence reported to the D.P.—the University denied that any incident was ever reported. Are we to believe that Penn sexual violence does not occur—that Penn students just don’t do that?

In 1995, student-on-student sexual violence at Penn was so underreported that, after investigating the University’s crime reporting policy, the Department of Justice ordered the University to inform the Penn community of all sexual violence. In 1996, a former student filed suit against the University alleging that the University mishandled her allegation of rape (the unsolved incident above) and attempted to cover it up. As a result, the Department of Justice reopened its investigation at Penn and concluded the University had failed to inform the community of this incident, violating campus crime reporting laws.

The UA was the first to react to the attempted rape of a Penn student earlier this year. By handing out “we are a target” stickers, the UA stressed that “we” are often targeted by “them.” This theme was emphasized by the University when security patrols were added inside buildings and when Penn Police increased campus patrols. Additionally, the University has ordered students to wear ID’s inside Penn buildings to help us identify those who don’t belong.

The assaulted student also claimed the first alarm she activated failed and she had to fight her way to a second alarm to summon help. Police responded to her claim, “All of the alarms were tested on Monday and none were broken,” and “We believe both of the alarms were working,” but the assistant stuck around as if to be involved if the problem persisted. Disregarding any concerns regarding the reliability of alarms, installed to protect us from those within the Penn community. Several student groups researched the condition of all rape alarms and found 15 women’s bathrooms not equipped with alarms, several more were visibly inoperable, and a majority of men’s bathrooms had no alarms. Rodin responded to these findings. “If we find other buildings continuing to prop doors open, then no action that our Public Safety Department can take will ensure all of our securities.” The truth is that with every door closed and every outsider outside, sexual assault would still exist at Penn. The truth:

— 34% of women are sexually assaulted by age 24.
— 16% of men are sexually assaulted by age 23.
— 92% of rapists are acquainted with their victim (boyfriend, girlfriend...)
— 72% of rapists have said it more than once.

We must realize that we are partially responsible for the silence surrounding student-on-student sexual violence. Sexual assault and rape are frightening issues to address, and therefore we easily allow the University to divert our attention from it. We also fail to have our voices heard when the University ignores our concerns. Yet, if we don’t address this issue, student-on-student sexual violence will never stop, and victims will always need to fight to be heard. If ignored, we must fight to keep our voices heard. If you believe that sexual assault and rape don’t exist at Penn, listen to what others have to say. Let victims teach you about pain, sorrow, shame, and about innocence lost. Let survivors show you strength, courage, and about innocence lost. Let survivors show you strength, courage, and what it means to fight to survive. Maybe by listening to what victims/survivors have to share, we would never allow the truth to be silent. Maybe we could finally start working to end sexual violence at Penn.

— Name Withheld

[Ed. Note: Almanac does not accept anonymous letters but the Guidelines provide for withholding a name under some circumstances, with the writer’s identity and affiliation known to two members of the University. This writer identified himself to the editor and to the chair of the Almanac Advisory Board.]
Leaving Skinner Hall

I face the prospect of vacating the Faculty Club’s premises with some trepidation. Not only my physical body is involved, but also the Faculty Club Art Gallery which bears my name.

The plan, as announced, calls for the Club to move across Walnut Street to the Inn At Penn, and to occupy certain designated spaces. The Club’s Art Gallery has also been assigned a location.

Contemplating the attendant trauma usually associated with a move of this kind, I’ve been rastering the Faculty Club’s past, present, and future role in the University — its raison d’être.

The Faculty Club, originally called the Lenape Club when it was founded 100 years ago, was conceived as an instrument to promote collegial fraternization. Membership was limited, at first, only by invitation to the professorial male elite. Later, eligibility was extended to include members of all branches of the University community except undergraduate students.

The Club offers not only a variety of dining options, but it provides a place for meetings — small and large. Whether it be for a small group exchanging ideas in an intimate setting, or for a colloquium of 100 participants discussing scholarly or other matters, all can be accommodated.

Homecoming Alumni find a welcoming place at the Faculty Club where fond memories of student days are revisited. It is also neutral ground for “town and gown” where outside community leaders can meet with Penn administrators to discuss plans.

I could cite a wide variety of social, academic, and business functions that take place on a given typical working day. To explain the Faculty Club’s image one could describe it as a shining example of democracy in action, devoid of class distinction. Having made a favorable case for the Faculty Club’s presence on campus, let us examine the liabilities.

As many other academic institutions have learned, there is a price tag involved in providing the amenities listed above.

The assets presumed to accrue are constantly under scrutiny by the administration and weighed in the balance against the dollar cost factor. Revenue producing events and modest membership fees do not begin to cover the costs. It is an accepted economic fact that, while contributing considerably to campus gemütlichkeit, faculty clubs are necessarily considered economic deficits.

Of present concern is the kind of future in store for Penn’s Faculty Club. Will its present membership dwindle as the Club’s physical image changes, from that of “Homeowner” to “Tenant”? Will its image lose what luster it presently enjoys once the honeymoon in its new quarters is over?

As one examines the architects’ floor plans, it is hard to predict whether the spaces earmarked for the Faculty Club will satisfy present needs.

Looking at the positive side, perhaps the move will attract a new breed of members who previously, for whatever reason, were reluctant to join.

— Maurice S. Burkson
Director, Faculty Club Art Gallery

Housing: A Bigger Picture

As a community member for nearly 10 years, and a board member of a local community association, I was bewildered by the letter from Mr. Lukasiak that took the University’s housing assistance programs as its target. The University’s housing assistance programs have been providing a vital resource to combat its struggle against housing abandonment, low homeownership rates, declining property values, and the deterioration of the housing stock.

Moreover, as Ms. Wormley’s report indicated, the primary beneficiaries have been non-faculty affiliates of the University. While I am sure the new buyers include some “middle and high level administrators” (and fortunately so), most of the beneficiaries are exactly the people Mr. Lukasiak thinks should be helped: staff at the University and Health System seeking affordable housing. Indeed, the data indicate that most of the buyers were renters from the neighborhood who became homeowners through the plan.

I found it puzzling that Mr. Lukasiak would criticize the “single family home” focus of the program, while decrying a “dangerously” low homeownership rate. Moreover, from a factual standpoint, the program does not preclude buyers from buying a multi-family unit, so long as they live in it — just as Mr. Lukasiak recommends they should.

And why he would criticize the University for buying abandoned houses, rehabbing them and selling them to new owners is beyond me. What neighborhood wouldn’t want their abandoned homes renovated, and occupied by new homeowners?

He also criticizes the expanded mortgage program, which provides a cash grant to new homebuyers from the University, as artificially driving up real estate prices, noting a $15,000 increase in the average sale price. First, as I understand it, the program does not preclude buyers from buying a multi-family unit, so long as they live in it — just as Mr. Lukasiak recommends they should.

Finally, Mr. Lukasiak is missing the bigger picture. According to recent Census statistics, the City of Philadelphia suffered a net loss of 150,000 people since 1990. That means that about 50,000 housing units were vacated, many of them in West Philadelphia.

For any neighborhood to be able to hold back the forces of housing abandonment is a major victory for all city dwellers, and, not incidentally, for opponents of the poverty concentration and racial isolation that have resulted from population out-migration.

Unfortunately, Mr. Lukasiak seems more interested in hurling invective, than in promoting a genuine observance of that obligation.

— Dennis Culhane, Associate Professor
School of Social Work

Speaking Out welcomes reader contributions. Short, timely letters on University issues can be accepted by Thursday at noon for the following Tuesday’s issue, subject to right-of-reply guidelines. Advance notice of intention to submit is appreciated.— Ed.
Open Enrollment: April 19 through April 30, 1999

Look for Open Enrollment materials to be arriving at your home address during the week of April 12, 1999. This year’s Open Enrollment offers you some new programs to consider. OptiChoice Vision Care coverage available through Clarity Vision allows you to obtain care from a network of providers, including Scheie Eye Institute, or go to a non-network provider and receive a fixed reimbursement. For in-network care, the plan pays 100% for exam and lenses and 100% (up to $60 retail value) for frames every 12 months. In-network, contact lenses are paid at 100% for prescription and fitting, 100% for standard lenses and 100% (up to $75 retail value) for specialty lenses. Visit the Benefits Fairs on April 19 and 21 to talk to the OptiChoice representative or call 1-800-541-2039.

There are two changes to the dental plan this year. First is the discontinuation of the three-year waiting period for family dental coverage. In addition, MetLife replaces Prudential as administrator for the Dental Plan. The level of coverage in the MetLife Preferred Dentist Program (PDP) will be the same as that provided under the Prudential Dental Plan. This program offers an optional network of providers that you can use to reduce your out-of-pocket expenses. You also have the freedom to use the dentist of your choice.

—Division of Human Resources

Dental Plan Comparison Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Penn Faculty Practice (PFP) Plan</th>
<th>MetLife Preferred Dentist Program (PDP)</th>
<th>Non-PREFERRED PROVIDER (UCR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deductible</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diagnostic Care (e.g., exams, x-rays)</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** Preventive Care (e.g., cleanings)**</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Periodontics (treatment of gums)</strong></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prosthodontics (e.g., bridges, dentures)</strong></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oral Surgery (extractions)</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Endodontics (e.g., root canal therapy)</strong></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orthodontics</strong></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>for children under age 19</strong></td>
<td>$1,000 lifetime max. per child</td>
<td>$1,000 lifetime max. per child</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Annual Maximum**

- Unlimited
- $1,000
- $1,000

*MetLife is limited to two visits per plan year 7/1/630

**Note:** Please be advised that there is a correction to the dental comparison chart on page 15 of the Open Enrollment Guide that you will be receiving shortly. The Penn Faculty Practice (PFP) Plan provides an orthodontics benefit with No Lifetime Dollar Limit for Each Child. The $1,000 lifetime maximum benefit for each child applies to the MetLife Plan only.

The following table shows the 1999-2000 plan year healthcare rates for full-time University faculty and staff. This information will also be included in the information packet sent to your home during the week of April 12, 1999.

1999-2000 Health Care Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Contributions (per pay period)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medical</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC/BS Plan 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNCare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPHS POS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aetna US Healthcare - PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aetna US Healthcare - DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aetna US Healthcare - NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keystone HMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dental</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn Faculty Practice Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MetLife Preferred Dentist Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vision</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OptiChoice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Human Resources Web site Address Change

Please change your bookmarks to reflect the new web site address for Human Resources: www.hr.upenn.edu.

EHRs Training—April

The following training programs are required by Occupational Safety & Health Administration (OSHA), the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), and The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (DEP), for all employees who work with hazardous substances including: chemicals, human blood, blood products, fluids, and human tissue specimens and radioactive materials. These programs are presented by the Office of Environmental Health & Radiation Safety (EHRs). Attendance is required at one or more sessions, depending upon the employee’s potential exposures.

Laboratory Safety—Annual Update. Required annually for all laboratory employees who are not exposed to human source material. Faculty and Staff who work with human source material, HIV or hepatitis viruses must attend Laboratory Safety and Bloodborne Pathogens—Annual Update. April 7, 9:30 a.m., John Morgan, Class of 1962.

Radiation Safety Training—Annual Update. This program updates radioisotope users on current Radiation safety laws and practices. It is required of all personnel who work in areas where radioisotopes are used or stored. April 7 and 14, 10:30 a.m., John Morgan, Class of 1962.

Introduction to Occupational Exposure to Bloodborne Pathogens. This course provides significant information for lab employees who have not previously attended Bloodborne Pathogens training at the University and have a potential exposure to human bloodborne pathogens. Course oriented toward research laboratory exposures. April 13, 9:30 a.m., John Morgan, Class of 1962.

Laboratory Safety and Bloodborne Pathogens—Annual Update. This program is required annually for all faculty and staff who work with human source material, HIV or hepatitis viruses and have previously attended Occupational Exposure to Bloodborne Pathogens. Participation in Laboratory Safety—Annual Update is not required if this program is attended. April 14, 9:30 a.m., John Morgan, Class of 1962.

Occupational Exposure to Bloodborne Pathogens (In a clinical setting). Required for all University faculty and staff who have potential clinical exposure to blood and other infectious material. It is intended for employees with direct patient contact, or those who handle clinical specimens, and administrators who routinely work in a clinical environment. Registration is required for this course: 898-4453. April 21, 9:30 a.m., 104 Logan Hall.

Radiation Safety Training—Irradiator Users. Individuals interested in becoming authorized to use an irradiator must first receive operational training from the irradiator licensee and radiation safety training from EHRs. April 21, 10:30 a.m., 1412 Blockley Hall.

Radiation Safety Training—New Worker. Required of all personnel working in laboratories where radioactive materials are present. April 15, 3 p.m., EHRs conference room, Blockley Hall. Or, on-line at our website, www.oehs.upenn.edu under Radiation Safety Programs, Training for Credit.

Check the EHRs website, www.oehs.upenn.edu for additional programs, dates and time. If you have any questions, please call Bob Leonzio at (215) 898-4453.

OPPORTUNITIES

All open positions at Penn for qualified applicants in office support, research, computing, professional, and financial areas, among others, are posted on the Human Resources web site at www.hr.upenn.edu. Penn’s Job Application Center, at 3550 Market Street, Suite 110, is open 8 a.m.-6 p.m. weekdays where computer stations are available for you to browse the openings and/or apply on-line.
Volunteers for Christmas in April House Rehabilitation

Volunteers are needed to help restore homes of disadvantaged residents of Philadelphia. Every April, an increasing number of volunteers from Penn and other organizations across the city turn out to help restore the home of an elderly, disabled or low-income neighbor. The Philadelphia chapter of Christmas in April was founded by Penn graduate students and Physical Plant staff in 1988. Since then, CIAP has helped almost 300 families rehabilitate their homes. In 1999, we expect more than 1,000 volunteers to lend a hand in restoring more than 40 homes in West and North Philadelphia.

The houses we select may be without working plumbing in the bathroom. Others are not handicap accessible. Many have chunks of plaster falling off the walls. We work to make these houses homes once again. Tasks range from installing kitchens to rebuilding porches and from replacing windows to hanging sheetrock. Come out and swing a hammer, wield a paintbrush and plant some flowers while catching up with old friends and helping some new ones. No skills or previous experience necessary.

Volunteers are needed to help on any of the following days in 1999: April 9, 10, 16, 17. If you are interested in helping with a house, send an e-mail to ciap@wharton.upenn.edu with the date(s) you would like to work and the number of people in your group. For more information, visit our web site at http://dolphin.upenn.edu/~xmas.

— Steve Schrodell, Wharton Grad ’99

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 March 22, 1999 through March 28, 1999. Also reported were Crimes Against Property: 29 total thefts & attempts (including 1 burglary & attempt), 6 thefts of bicycles & parts, 10 thefts from autos) and 2 incidents of criminal mischief & vandalism.

Full reports on the Web (www.upenn.edu/almacan/v45n27crimes.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 March 22, 1999 and March 28, 1999. 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 988-4482.

Crimes Against Persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/22/99</td>
<td>6:09 AM</td>
<td>Sansom West</td>
<td>Compliant assaulted/strafing order/arrest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/26/99</td>
<td>11:09 AM</td>
<td>Rittenhouse</td>
<td>Unauthorized wanted letters received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/25/99</td>
<td>6:31 PM</td>
<td>3900 Blk Walnut</td>
<td>Bike taken by unknown suspects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/26/99</td>
<td>12:52 AM</td>
<td>Harrison House</td>
<td>Resident advisor slapped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/26/99</td>
<td>7:13 AM</td>
<td>305 S 40th St</td>
<td>Inwanted calls received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Crimes Against Society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/26/99</td>
<td>6:01 AM</td>
<td>Phi Gamma Sigma</td>
<td>Beer delivered in violation of policy/situation adjusted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/28/99</td>
<td>4:10 PM</td>
<td>3604 Chestnut St</td>
<td>Disorderly made on location/arrest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/28/99</td>
<td>4:51 PM</td>
<td>Prephosphorized</td>
<td>Alcohol &amp; Drug Offenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/27/99</td>
<td>1:06 AM</td>
<td>200 Blk 40th</td>
<td>Underaged drinking/citation issued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/28/99</td>
<td>3:19 AM</td>
<td>Zeta Beta Tau</td>
<td>Underaged drinking/citations issued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18th District Crimes Against Persons

University of Pennsylvania Police Department did not receive the 18th District Crime Report for March 22, 1999 to March 28, 1999 in time for publication in this issue.

The report will be published when it becomes available.

The University of Pennsylvania Police Department did not receive the 18th District Crime Report for March 22, 1999 to March 28, 1999 in time for publication in this issue.

The report will be published when it becomes available.
Dr. Isabella Lugoski Karle  
Head of the X-ray Diffraction Section,  
Laboratory for the Structure of Matter  
U.S. Naval Research Laboratory

Dr. Karle is the scientist whose experimental procedures are used worldwide for molecular structure analysis using electron and X-ray diffraction techniques. Among other things, Dr. Ralph Hirschmann of Penn Chemistry notes, her work has formed the basis for all the current computer programs that are used in a "black box" fashion for the more than 10,000 new crystal structure analyses per year that are published or recorded in the Cambridge Crystallographic Data Base.

Dr. Karle earned her Ph.D. from the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, in 1944, when she was 22 years old. She and her husband, Jerome Karle, began working at the Naval Research Lab in 1946. Her husband, now chief scientist at NRL’s Laboratory for the Structure of Matter, began working on so-called direct methods for analyzing crystal structures. In 1954, Dr. Karle sought practical applications for her husband’s mathematical theories. She taught herself X-ray crystallography from textbooks and in 1963, she introduced the “Symbolic Addition Procedure,” which revolutionized the types and complexity of problems that can be solved by analyzing crystal structures.

She has used her method to perform structural studies of complex proteins, leading to a better understanding of their functions (her analysis of the structure of Leu-zeraminic, an antibiotic, shows that conformational changes in the antibiotic create a “molecular gate” through which ions may be transported across cell membranes; and she was the first to obtain the formulas and the first structures of the polycyclic products resulting from photoarrangements of amino acid derivatives and nucleic acid bases by exposure to UV radiation. Another major portion of her research activities has been directed toward the structures of peptides and her seminal contributions there are of particular importance to medicinal chemists interested in drug design.

A recipient of the National Medal of Science and the first woman to receive the Bower Award, Dr. Karle is a member of the National Academy of Sciences, the American Philosophical Society and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. In 1995 she was awarded the National Academy of Sciences Award in Chemical Sciences for her key role in developing multi-disciplinary applications for determining crystalline and molecular structures using X-ray and electron diffraction.

Billie Jean King  
Director, Co-Founder and CEO,  
WORLD TEAM TENNIS

For more than 20 years, until she retired from active playing in 1984, Billie Jean King dominated the world of tennis, winning 20 Wimbledon titles, 13 U.S. Open titles, the French Open, the Australian Open and the Virginia Slims singles titles. She was ranked the number one player seven times between 1966 and 1974.

Ms. King’s drive turned women’s tennis into a major professional sport and spearheaded the drive for equal prize money and equal treatment of women. Breaking down barriers and changing the American perception of women in sports, she helped establish the Virginia Slims professional tour in 1970, and founded the Women’s Tennis Association and the Women’s Sports Foundation.

Ms. King was 18 when she upset Margaret Court-Smith, the world’s leading women’s tennis player, at Wimbledon in 1962. In 1967 she became the first woman since 1939 to win the triple crown of singles, doubles and mixed doubles in both the British and American championships. She was the first woman to be named Sports Illustrated’s “Sportsperson of the Year”; and the first woman to coach a co-ed professional sports team (the Philadelphia Freedoms, 1974). In 1976, she was named World Tennis Woman of the Year by Tennis magazine and Sports Illustrated.

In 1981, Ms. King founded the WTT, and has served as its commissioner since 1984. WTT, America’s only professional co-ed team sport, also sponsors recreational leagues and championships and, in the fall of each year, helps host Smash Hits, a celebrity event which benefits the Elton John AIDS Foundation.

Billie Jean King has ranked No. 5 on the Sports Illustrated top 40 Athletes list and was the highest ranked of the four women on the list appearing in the magazine’s 40th anniversary issue. She was named one of Life magazine’s 100 Most Important Americans of the 20th Century. In April 1994, she was awarded the March of Dimes Lifetime Achievement Award.

Dr. Gerda Lerner  
Robinson-Edwards Professor of History Emerita, University of Wisconsin

Dr. Lerner is a pioneer in women’s history who, in building at Wisconsin the premier Ph.D. program in African-American Women’s History, created and nurtured an entirely new discipline of academic study.

Born to a Jewish family in Vienna in 1920, Gerda Lerner was imprisoned when the Nazis came to power. In 1938, she fled Austria for the United States, where she initially worked in a series of menial jobs, married and had two children, and participated in civic affairs. At the age of 38, she began taking history courses to research a fictionalized biography of two 19th century feminists, but abandoned the project in favor of training as a historian. After earning her B.A. from the New School of Social Research in 1962 she went to Columbia, earning M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in history within three years.

Since then she has gone on to teach what is believed to be the first postwar college course on women’s history, and to establishing at Sarah Lawrence College the country’s first graduate program in Women’s History.

Among her ten books, Black Women in White America (1972) was for a decade the only general book on the subject available for teaching. In 1997, she published Why History Matters, calling upon all to reconsider not just the purposes of scholarship, but its place in the larger world.

In The Creation of Feminist Consciousness, Dr. Lerner found great women writers and thinkers all others that enzymes in animals are regulated by the chemical groups called adenylates. This discovery has led to recent investigations in the basic biology of aging, including studies of the role of oxygen radicals and the mechanisms of repair in damaged cells. Along with his notable achievements as a scientist, Dr. Stadtman is recognized for his leadership in teaching and in the role as a mentor to his students. His work has been recognized with the National Medal of Science and the Robert A. Welch Award in Chemistry. Dr. Stadtman is also a member of the National Academy of Sciences and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.