T&L Center in SAS: Dr. Robbins

Dr. Larry Robbins, a former assistant professor of English who has created communications training and teaching support programs in the Wharton School, has been named director of a newly-created Center for Teaching and Learning in the School of Arts & Sciences, the College’s Dean Richard Beeman has announced.

Dr. Robbins, who took his A.B. from Harvard and his Ph.D. from UC Berkeley, joined Penn’s English Department in 1967. In 1975 he became the first director of the Wharton Communication Program, later becoming also director of a Teacher Development Program and an Arts Management Program there.

In SAS, he will be responsible for creating programs to enhance teaching at all levels through the new Center (see description in Talk About Teaching, back page of this issue). Aside from activities in the Center and on its website, Dr. Robbins works with faculty individually and confidentially.

“With the creation of this new center, we want to send a very strong message that teaching matters,” said Dr. Beeman. “Larry Robbins and the Center will make a tremendous difference not only for faculty, but also for students who ultimately will reap the rewards of better teaching. He understands teaching in the Penn environment and brings to this new position outstanding credentials and wide experience across the University.”

He added that Dr. Robbins will continue to make his expertise available at Wharton and at SEAS.

Ira Abrams Award: Dr. Rescorla

Dr. Robert Rescorla, professor of psychology and former dean of the College, is this year’s recipient of SAS’s Ira Abrams Memorial Award for teaching. Now in its 13th year, the Abrams award calls for teaching that is “intellectually challenging and exceptionally coherent,” and is reserved to faculty who embody high standards of integrity and fairness, have a strong commitment to learning, and are open to new ideas.

Dean Samuel Preston, who announced the prize, described Dr. Rescorla as a magnificent teacher and a very distinguished scientist who has made attractive research experiences for undergraduates a priority.

In his scholarly work, where his honors include membership in the National Academy of Sciences, Dr. Rescorla focuses on elementary learning processes, particularly Pavlovian conditioning and instrumental learning.

During his three years as dean, 1994-97, he played a major role in the 21st Century Project to improve undergraduate education; expanded the College’s advising system; and established several interschool minors. He also helped create Almanac’s University-wide “Talk About Teaching” series in cooperation with the Lindback Society. (For his own contribution to the series, see “Undergraduate Research Experience,” Almanac December 6, 1994.)

Research Services: Dr. Rudczynski

Following a national search, Dr. Andrew B. Rudczynski joined the University April 1 as Associate Vice President for Finance and Executive Director, Research Services, Vice President for Finance Kathryn Engebretsen has announced. He will be responsible for managing the administrative support for a burgeoning sponsored research effort which last year exceeded $414 million.

Dr. Rudczynski came to Penn from Rutgers, where he was the associate vice president for research policy and administration. He was responsible for all aspects of research support at Rutgers, including grant and contract administration, institutional review board, technology transfer and animal care. Prior to his 15-year career at Rutgers, Dr. Rudczynski worked in research administration at the University of Maryland Eastern Shore, as a research scientist at the Michigan Cancer Foundation, and as a principal investigator at

In the Round: At Friday’s groundbreaking, the Wharton School unveiled the first three-dimensional model of Huntsman Hall; the view is from the southwest, with the 38th Street Bridge in the foreground.
Kahn Award: Classical Studies

At a reception for SAS faculty on April 28, in addition to presenting the Abrams Award to Dr. Robert Rescorla (page 1), Dean Samuel Preston will give the Kahn Award for Educational Excellence to the Department of Classical Studies and Ancient History, which he described as “a model in its use of the most modern educational tools—innovative pedagogy and the latest technology—to bring the classical world alive for its students.”

The department is chaired by Dr. Ralph Rosen, with Dr. Sheila Murnaghan as undergraduate chair and Dr. Joseph Farrell as graduate chair. The Kahn Award is in its second year as a $6000 prize for a department, undergraduate program, graduate group or center that demonstrates “extraordinary collective faculty commitment to teaching, curriculum innovation, and service to students.”

Research Services (from page 1)

the U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases. He holds a B.Sc. in biology and biochemistry from McGill; a Ph.D. in immunology from Syracuse; and an MBA from Southern Illinois University. He is on the board of the National Council of Illinois University. He is on the board of the National Council of Illinois University. He is on the board of the National Council of Illinois University. He is on the board of the National Council of Illinois University. He is on the board of the National Council of Illinois University.

Mr. Merritt, who has been serving as the Executive Director of Research Services, will remain at Penn as a Senior Advisor until his retirement on June 30, 2000. In this capacity, he will assist in Dr. Rudzynski’s transition and continue the work of Research Services.

Penn Relays: April 22-24

For three days starting Thursday, the campus will be host to some 18,000 athletes and as many as 90,000 spectators at the 105th running of the Penn Relay Carnival, the world’s oldest and largest. To fit in some 350 contests, the races are run steadily from 10 a.m. to 11 p.m. Thursday and Friday, and from 7 a.m. to 4 p.m. Saturday. For more on the Relays, see the live-coverage website that got over 400,000 hits last year: www.upenn.edu/relays.

Food Trucks During Relays

This is the first Penn Relays to be held since the relocation of food vendors under a new city ordinance that took effect last fall. Some 38 trucks and carts now lease space in off-street plazas built by the University—five of them just outside Franklin Field where their agreements with the University to reclaim the space on some occasions—including Penn Relays. “We have no quarrel with that,” said Former Vendor Association Vice President Oiy Glaewkettarn, who owns one of the trucks. “But we were told they were only going to move us across 33rd Street, from the Chemistry Building and up near Smith Walk.

“At the last minute we are told we have to go north of Walnut, in back of Hill House on 33rd,” he said. “This is a disaster. Our regulars come from the hospitals and Penn Tower area; they have very short lunch hours and we are being moved out of their range. For weeks we’ve been telling everyone where we will be and now we won’t be there.” He also cited costs of generators and supplies, and said if they had known the location would be so remote, some might have preferred to close for the Relays rather than incur these costs.

The trucks affected, in addition to Mr. Glaewkettarn’s Thai Foods, are Ralph’s Lunch, King’s Wok, Scott’s Vegetarian, and Sophie’s.

At presstime Almanac was advised by Jack Shannon of the Office of the EVP that after the original plan was communicated to owners, the Philadelphia Police rejected it for public safety reasons. “The Police Department is of the opinion that 33rd Street between Spruce and Walnut Streets must be kept clear of parked vehicles for both the traffic management of emergency vehicles and the rapid unloading of buses carrying student athletes participating in the Penn Relays,” the police said. “We have adopted the stance that no motor vehicles of any kind will be permitted to park along this stretch of 33rd Street for any length of time during the Relays.”

Petition in Fine Arts

We have been informed recently that Associate Professor and Undergraduate Chair Julie Saecker Schneider has been denied further consideration for a tenure track at the University of Pennsylvania. We are writing on behalf of all students enrolled in fine arts classes, to express our support for the continued presence of Professor Schneider as both teacher and administrator in the department of fine arts.

In the past four years, we have watched a virtually non-existent undergraduate curriculum flourish into the vital, rigorous and nationally ranked fine arts program that it is today. Professor Schneider’s leadership and foresight has been a driving force that continues to attract both prospective and current students to the department.

In the classroom, she has elevated basic studio curricula to an academically challenging and engaging level. Professor Schneider has brought a rigorous structure to the curriculum, informing formal concerns with historical context. Her classes are never an elective to be taken with ease. Her charismatic way, meticulous organization and demand for articulation has set a new standard for making art which was not expected of undergraduate students in the past.

Professor Schneider motivates us to question and investigate our processes and intentions as students of art, and as artists. This has set the tone for students and faculty alike.

In her capacity as the Undergraduate Chair, Julie’s attentiveness has won her the unanimous love and respect of the student body. When she is not teaching, you can always find Julie in her office, visited constantly by students and faculty seeking academic and personal advice. Whether for registration guidance or post-graduate and summer opportunities, Julie is the very first person we choose to consult for an honest and insightful critique.

Julie’s work and philosophy as an artist have inspired us to pursue our ideas to their end. Her process and aesthetic have been exemplary models of determination, refinement and follow-through. Her continued dedication to follow her unique vision, despite current formal or philosophical trends in the art world, brings diversity to the department and reminds us to strive for our individual visions.

We believe that Julie Schneider is who we need to ensure the future growth of the Fine Arts Department at the University of Pennsylvania. We are certain that there is nothing more essential to the department than Julie’s continued presence as an administrator, teacher and artist. Finally, attached please find signatures of students from various fine arts classes in support of this letter.

Speaking Out

The following letter, accompanied by a petition of 178 signatures, was sent to President Rodin and to Dean Gary Hack, and submitted to Almanac for publication. Dean Hack responds at far right.—Ed.

Petition in Fine Arts

We have been informed recently that Associate Professor and Undergraduate Chair Julie Saecker Schneider has been denied further consideration for a tenure track at the University of Pennsylvania. We are writing on behalf of all students enrolled in fine arts classes, to express our support for the continued presence of Professor Schneider as both teacher and administrator in the department of fine arts.

In the past four years, we have watched a virtually non-existent undergraduate curriculum flourish into the vital, rigorous and nationally ranked fine arts program that it is today. Professor Schneider’s leadership and foresight has been a driving force that continues to attract both prospective and current students to the department.

In the classroom, she has elevated basic studio curricula to an academically challenging and engaging level. Professor Schneider has brought a rigorous structure to the curriculum, informing formal concerns with historical context. Her classes are never an elective to be taken with ease. Her charismatic way, meticulous organization and demand for articulation has set a new standard for making art which was not expected of undergraduate students in the past. Professor Schneider motivates us to question and investigate our processes and intentions as students of art, and as artists. This has set the tone for students and faculty alike.

In her capacity as the Undergraduate Chair, Julie’s attentiveness has won her the unanimous love and respect of the student body. When she is not teaching, you can always find Julie in her office, visited constantly by students and faculty seeking academic and personal advice. Whether for registration guidance or post-graduate and summer opportunities, Julie is the very first person we choose to consult for an honest and insightful critique.

Julie’s work and philosophy as an artist have inspired us to pursue our ideas to their end. Her process and aesthetic have been exemplary models of determination, refinement and follow-through. Her continued dedication to follow her unique vision, despite current formal or philosophical trends in the art world, brings diversity to the department and reminds us to strive for our individual visions.

We believe that Julie Schneider is who we need to ensure the future growth of the Fine Arts Department at the University of Pennsylvania. We are certain that there is nothing more essential to the department than Julie’s continued presence as an administrator, teacher and artist. Finally, attached please find signatures of students from various fine arts classes in support of this letter.

The Dean’s Response

Dear Ms. Falchuk, Ms. Min, and other students,

I cannot agree more: Professor Julie Schneider has done a remarkable job of building the scope and quality of our undergraduate fine arts major. Being ranked in the top 10 nationally, for the first time, speaks to all she has accomplished. And she is a valued colleague and member of our faculty.

The tenure review committee found, however, that there was not sufficient agreement on the artistic merit and influence of her personal work to support a recommendation for permanent tenure. It is important that permanent faculty be seen as leaders in their field of work, as judged by their peers in the academic world and beyond.

Professor Schneider will be with us through next year, when we will dedicate new space for our undergraduate fine arts activities in Skinner Hall, a project which she has worked tirelessly to help us realize. We will be discussing over the next few months other ways that she might continue to provide leadership to our efforts beyond her current appointment.

— Gary Hack, Dean, Graduate School of Fine Arts

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.
Alcohol Policy: Spring Fling and Beyond

In two meetings last week the Working Group on Alcohol Abuse chaired by Provost Robert Barchi dealt with last-minute proposals on the eve of Spring Fling, but continued to work on other issues in prevention of alcohol abuse. From summaries issued by the his office:

April 13: Tuesday night in a two-hour meeting, the WGAA heard from three of its subcommittees Health and Safety; Responsibility/Accountability (of individuals and groups) and Alcohol Abuse (how to minimize risk and how to increase social options that do not involve alcohol) and discussed their preliminary recommendations.

April 14: The Working Group discussed the merits of modifying the temporary ban on alcohol at registered undergraduate events for Spring Fling, and of lifting the ban on a temporary basis for Fling events—but members concluded that “modifying the ban at this time would be irresponsible without the proper safeguards, education, and enforcement mechanisms in place.”

Some early recommendations to the President were approved, adding five new events to the Fling schedule. The Working Group also “expressed its concern that students be made aware of what level and types of enforcement they could expect this weekend,” the Provost’s Office report said. “They agreed that it was important to communicate to the student body what to expect.” The statement continued:

To that end, Provost Barchi assured the group that the University, and UPDD’s first priority this weekend, as always, will be the health and safety of Penn students. He did remind the group that University policy, local, state and federal laws would continue to be enforced and that students should remember that Fling is traditionally a weekend in which the LCE and Philadelphia police will also be monitoring campus and of campus.

He added that no student assisting another student in a medical emergency nor the student who is in danger will be penalized as a result of seeking medical treatment.

Further, Provost Barchi said that quiet parties and quiet activities in private residences should not be areas of concern. As they do earlier at Fling, the police will be present throughout the weekend and will enforce University, local, state and federal regulations, as appropriate.

The WGAA ended by saying it would refine its recommendations over the next several meetings, and expects to deliver a report to the President shortly.

Undergraduate Searches: A flurry of e-mail and phone calls rose in the College House system Friday night, some from students af-

fronted at having their bookbags searched as they came home to their dorms, and others reporting that guards were confiscating beverages from students over 21. Later it emerged that many staff as well as students in the House system were unaware of pre-Fling search cus-


toms—and that some guards were also unaware that moderate amounts of alcohol are allowed to those who are of legal age. Friday the VPUL issued the following letter, circulated widely via e-mail:

To Penn Undergraduate Students

With the approach of Spring Fling, the security guards who are regularly stationed at undergraduate residences have been inspecting packages carried by students as they enter the buildings. The purpose is to determine if the packages contain alcohol. Under the guidance of Penn’s Department of Public Safety, this same practice has been carried out in past years prior to and during Spring Fling.

If a student is found to be carrying alcohol, he or she will be asked for proof of age. If 21 or older, the student will be allowed to take a maximum of two six-packs of beer or one bottle of spirits into the residence.

If a student attempting to carry alcohol into an undergraduate residence is found to be underage, the security guard will hold the student’s PENNcard and call campus police. The police will come to the scene and issue a citation to the student.

Please have a healthy, safe, and fun Fling.

—Valarie Swain-Cade McCoullum, Vice Provost for University Life

Coda: Spring Fling...a Dorm Fire

An accidental fire in Hamilton House was the only major public safety incident of the Spring Fling weekend, which Public Safety’s Vice President Tom Seamon called the quietest Fling since he came here in 1995. Sixteen citations were issued to students at entry points to various dorms where guards checked for alcohol.

Philadelphia Fire Marshal investigators say the Saturday night blaze on the 11th Floor of the high-rise appears to have been caused by the explosion of a computer monitor, according to Harry Cusick, director of fire and occupational safety. The room was destroyed but no one was injured.

Salary Guidelines for 1999-2000

The principle guiding our salary planning for fiscal year 2000 is to pay faculty and staff competitively, in relationship to the markets for their positions and prevailing economic conditions. Salary increases should acknowledge the valuable contributions of faculty and staff to the University, and should help Penn remain a strong and financially viable institution. With this in mind, the following guidelines are recommended.

Faculty Increase Guidelines

Although individual faculty decisions are made at the school level, with Deans issuing to Department Chairs their own guide-

lines regarding available resources, certain standards have been established to which we ask all Deans to adhere:

• The minimum academic salary for new assistant professors will be $41,000.
• Salary increases to continuing faculty are to be based on general merit, including recognition of outstanding teaching, scholar-

ship, research, and service. As in previous years, there will be no minimum base increment for continuing faculty.
• The pool for merit increases for faculty shall not exceed 3.5 percent. In cases where schools wish to make faculty members’ salaries more competitive to meet market standards, Deans may supplement the pool, but this supplement must not exceed 0.5 percent without prior approval of the Provost. Salary increases for merit should range from 1.0 to 6.0 percent. Recommendations to provide an increase lower than 1.0 percent for non-meritorious performance or more than 6.0 percent for extraordinary performance should be made in consultation with the Provost. We also ask that Deans pay particular attention to any faculty who meet standards of merit but whose salaries for various reasons may have lagged over the years.
• The Provost will review the Deans’ faculty salary recommen-

dations prior to their release to insure that raises on average reflect market conditions in each discipline.

Staff Increase Guidelines

Penn’s salary structure and the information technology (IT) breadthband salary structure have been adjusted to reflect market competitiveness, effective April 1, 1999. The new salary scales are available on the web at www.hr.upenn.edu/compensation. All staff salaries must be at or above the minimum of their respective salary, effective April 1.

The following are guidelines for the July 1, 1999 merit salary increase program:

• Monthly, weekly, and hourly paid staff members (excluding bargaining units) are eligible for a merit increase if they are in a full-

time or part-time regular status, are not student workers, and were employed by the University on or before February 28, 1999. Due to budget constraints, Schools and Responsibility Centers may find it necessary to generate funds for staff salary increases through administrative restructuring, managing staff vacancies and other cost-saving initiatives. Success in these initiatives will enhance a School or Center’s flexibility in awarding competitive salary increases for high performance.

• Performance is the primary basis for all staff salary in-

creases. The performance appraisal process should substantiate the level of merit increase awarded. Salary increases for performance which meets expectations may vary but should generally range from 1.5 to 3.0 percent. Salary increases above 3.0 percent should only be given for performance which exceeds established goals and expectations; where performance consistently exceeds established goals and expectations, salary increases may be awarded up to 6.0 percent. If performance does not meet expectations, no increase will be awarded.

Salary decisions are among the most important that we make. We believe this year’s salary guidelines will reward staff for their contributions to the overall accomplishment of the University’s mission while helping it remain a strong and financially viable institution.
The following policy developed from recommendations made by the Ad Hoc Committee on Consultation, which was appointed and charged by the President in February 1998 and published its report in Almanac on April 14, 1998. At University Council on April 22, 1998, the recommendations were referred to the Senate Executive Committee for recasting in a form for inclusion in the Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators. SEC’s resulting Proposed Addendum was published December 8, 1998, and was approved as written by President Rodin in a letter on March 23 (opposite page, far right). It will be added to the electronic and print editions of the Handbook.—Ed.

Policy on Consultation Where the Administration Has Primary Decision-Making Responsibility

VI.H. Policy on Consultation where the Administration has Primary Decision-making Responsibility

This statement sets forth the policy of the University on consultation between officers of the University and their representatives (“the administration”) and persons or bodies who are members of constituent groups having an interest in the adoption, modification or implementation of various programs, actions and policies of the University in those areas of decision-making where the administration has final or primary responsibility and the faculty does not have a distinctive role.

This, thus, this policy on consultation—which includes the standing faculty as one among several relevant constituency groups—does not pertain to those areas of decision-making where the standing faculty holds primary responsibility or where responsibility is held jointly by the administration and the standing faculty, under the University’s system of coordinate powers and shared governance. Nor does it apply to those areas of primary administrative responsibility in which the standing faculty’s distinctive role in the University would justify differential access to consultation as compared with the other constituency groups referred to in this policy.

1. Norms governing consultation policy

This policy shall be interpreted and applied in light of certain underlying premises and norms:

a. The University is a non-profit organization committed to the structuring of its work and educational activities so as to provide opportunities for all who live, teach, carry on research, work, or study here to be participants in the campus community.

b. Except where strategic concerns actually and reasonably counsel little or no public knowledge or awareness of emergent policies or actions, it is the administration’s duty to allow for full and open discussion, that is consistent with the democratic aspirations of the University.

c. Faculty, students, and staff, both as individuals and as constituency groups, have a stake in the welfare of the community as a whole, typically make a major commitment of time and devotion to the common enterprise, and often possess skills, resources and perspectives critical to the making of decisions that improve the quality of life at the University and in the surrounding community.

d. As the largest private employer in Philadelphia, making its home in West Philadelphia community and the city as a whole, and has an important responsibility to take account of the effect of its decisions on those larger communities.

e. Consultation by the University administration should be understood as conferring on those who are consulted an invitation and a responsibility to respond, to respect confidentiality when it is promised, to report and represent accurately the views of constituents and superiors, and to report in a timely manner to their constituents.

f. In the decision-making areas to which this policy on consultation applies, ultimate decisional authority rests with the trustees and (pursuant to authority delegated by the trustees) the president, in order that they may fulfill their responsibility to ensure the institutional and financial health of the University, as distinguished from its academic and scholarly mission, where the faculty holds primary responsibility under the trustees or, in some cases, shares such responsibility with the administration. The consultative process itself may be considered separate from the outcomes of that process, and a democratic, substantive, interactive process of consultation is not a mechanism for ensuring specific outcomes or for suppressing disagreement on substantive issues.

2. Definition

Consultation includes, but goes beyond, the disclosure of information about emergent decisions and policies. It is a process that embodies the spirit of give-and-take, whereby information of all types—specific questions, concerns and methods, but also broader strategies, principles and frameworks—is exchanged and incorporated into the process throughout its duration.

3. The framework of consultation

a. Selection of consultation partners

It is for the most part in the administration’s discretion to determine the identity of those bodies or individuals with whom to consult on specific matters. (Consultative procedures for use in the appointment, reappointment, or removal of academic administrators are specified elsewhere in this Handbook, and are not addressed here.) The University Council and Faculty Senate, and their appropriate committees, as well as the independent committees provided for in the bylaws of the Council, are the means of carrying on the process. They are readily available.

b. Structures facilitating consultation

The long-standing practice of the president and provost to meet regularly with several groups provides a flexible established mechanism for raising matters on which consultation is appropriate, including the further specification of consultation partners. Specifically (but not exclusively), the chair, past chair, and chair-elect of the Faculty Senate (“the three chairs”) meet frequently, and the Senate Executive Committee meets periodically, with the president and the provost and, as needed with other senior administrators. Similar practices exist with respect to the chairs or other officers of the Undergraduate Assembly, the Graduate and Professional Students Assembly, the Penn Professional Staff Assembly, and the A-3 Assembly Executive Board.

c. Range and timing of consultation

(1) Range of decisions subject to consultation

The policies and decisions facing the University as an institution range along a continuum, from major developmental decisions, on one end, to narrower operational decisions, on the other. Broad consultation is needed most in the case of developmental decisions, and to a lesser extent with respect to operational decisions.

(2) Timing of consultation

A decision-making process contains a number of steps: (1) gathering of data; (2) formulation of goals; (3) development of major alternatives; (4) provisional evaluation of each alternative; (5) provisional selection of the most desirable alternative or set of alternatives; (6) implementation of the decision made; and (7) monitoring and adjustment of the action to be taken. The process is often sequential, but may be cyclical or overlapping rather than linear, with decision makers often revisiting some or all of the steps as they move toward a decision, refining and understanding it better with each cycle. The following norms shall guide the administration in applying the “steps” model to the question of the appropriate timing of consultation:

(a) Consultation is presumptively obligatory no later than the conclusion of Step 3, and should be considered earlier, and carried out, where the decision maker in fact believes it feasible or perceives its utility.

(b) Earlier consultation is presumptively obligatory in a particular case if, in the considered judgment of a reasonable person in the position of the decision maker, the momentum inherent in moving through steps 1-3 would be recognized as
4. Safeguards

a. When a constituency representative has been consulted in confidence about a matter thought by the administration not to be ripe for broader disclosure, the representative shall, at an appropriate later date, report the fact of confidential consultation to his or her constituency.

b. When those consulted by an administration representative believe that the issues involved are such that it is important that more senior administrators hear their views directly, it shall be their responsibility to bring that belief to the attention of the president or provost, utilizing the mechanisms described in section 3.b.

c. It shall be responsibility of the three chairs to advise the president or provost of any serious concerns that they have, or have come to their attention, regarding a matter that has not been disclosed to them by the administration, and to request the president to consider the timing and manner of consultation.

d. It shall be the responsibility of the leadership of student constituencies to take the necessary steps to orient the relevant student committees to the background and origin of a question, and to monitor the work of student committees to assure that their membership is active and increasingly informed and sophisticated about important matters.

e. It shall be the responsibility of a person, group of people, or committee or other body consulted by the administration on a matter, to consider whether that act suffices as consultation with the constituency itself, or whether it should share the information, propose that the administration itself share it, or (where the information has been given in confidence) seek administration approval to share it, with a broader range of membership within the relevant constituencies.

f. Where there is a need for consultation with a committee of Council or the Senate, or with officers of constituency bodies, the need is ordinarily not satisfied by consultation with an administrative committee that contains faculty, staff or student members among it.

President's Message on Consultation Policy

Dear Colleagues:

I am pleased to inform you of my acceptance of the Policy on Consultation as reviewed and approved by the Senate Executive Committee and University Council. It is a document that will help guide the consultative process at Penn in constructive and meaningful ways.

Importantly, the policy distinguishes operational from strategic, developmental decisions, and it distinguishes the different levels of consultation required for these different kinds of decisions. Just as importantly, the policy articulates the responsibilities of persons who are consulted to respond and accurately reflect the views of their constituents. It recognizes that “consultation” does not mean “agreement,” and that final decision-making authority in areas where the administration has ultimate or primary responsibility rests with the Trustees, the President, the Provost and the Executive Vice President. Further, the policy appropriately leaves to the administration the determination of which groups or individuals should be consulted in particular cases, while recognizing the weight of existing mechanisms for such consultation.

It would be difficult for any policy to enumerate all of the consultative bodies that exist at Penn, and I note that a number of important groups are not explicitly mentioned in the policy. These include the Academic Planning and Budget Committee, the President’s Advisory Group, the Council of Deans, the Graduate Council of the Faculties, and many other committees, working groups, and advisory groups such as the WXPN Policy Board and the Archives Advisory Committee. The Provost, Executive Vice President, and I will, of course, continue to seek the guidance of these and other existing consultative bodies when appropriate.

The policy thoughtfully articulates procedures for confidential consultation and recognizes the responsibilities of those so consulted. As you know, it will be necessary, on occasion, for administrative officials, as fiduciaries of the University, to conduct confidential discussions with internal and/or external parties in carrying out University business. As one obvious example, early negotiations on the University’s acquisition of strategic real estate would clearly require such confidentiality. If such negotiations were disclosed, the University’s negotiating position could be seriously undermined. In any future case of this sort, a decision by the administration to conduct University business on a confidential basis will be made only for compelling reasons, and, as stipulated in the policy, I will inform the Chairs of such a situation.

In closing, I will make sure that the senior officers of the University and their staffs are informed of this policy and its requirements. I look forward to working with you on the implementation of the Policy on Consultation.

— Judith Rodin, President

Spring 1999 Meetings

Following are some key dates as the University moves toward the end of the Spring Term:

**Faculty Club:** Annual Election, May 4, 4 p.m.

**Trustees:** Stated Meeting Executive Committee, May 13, 2:30-3:30 p.m. Henry A. Sweetbaum Room, Steinberg Conference Center. (Call 989-7005 for information).

**University Council:** Meeting, April 28, 4-6 p.m., McClelland Hall, Quad.

**PPSA:** Executive Board Meeting, May 10, noon-1:30 p.m., room 532, Levy Building, Dental School. Must e-mail ppsa@pobox.upenn to attend.

**Annual Elections:** May 20, noon-1:30 p.m., Logan Hall, room 17.

**A-3 Assembly:** Executive Board Meetings: Every other Thursday (April 22, May 6, May 20, June 10) from noon-1 p.m., suite 70 McNeil Building; location subject to change; e-mail dartur@oyez.law.upenn.edu.

**A-3 Career Conference Week,** June 7-11 (information to be published in future Almanac).
The Leonard Berwick Memorial Teaching Award, established in 1980-81 by the Berwick family and the Department of Pathology, recognizes a member of the medical faculty who in his or her teaching most effectively fuses basic science and clinical medicine. It goes to two distinguished faculty members this year, the second of them honored posthumously:

Leslie A. Litzky, M.D., is an assistant professor of pathology and laboratory medicine who served as director for the former Pathology 200 course from 1994-1998 while simultaneously acting as the pathology coordinator during the development of Curriculum 2000. Her lectures and laboratory sessions cover a wide range of topics within pulmonary pathology. She has considerable expertise regarding the surgical and medical management of lung disease and her lectures are informed by an awareness of the clinical issues and implications surrounding pathologic diagnoses. Her sessions not only cover basic pathologic concepts, but are also clinically pathologic diagnoses. Her sessions not only cover basic pathologic concepts, but are also clinically pathologic diagnoses.

Kevin E. Salhany, M.D., (9/30/57-10/15/98) was a 1978 graduate of Tennessee’s Southern Missionary College who received his M.D. at Loma Linda University in California. After residencies and fellowships at Vanderbilt University, he joined Penn Med in 1991 as an assistant professor. As a member of the surgical pathology and hematopathology services of and the Penn Cancer Center, he published widely and served as a consultant to regional pathologists, hematologists and oncologists outside Penn. Within the University he worked with the hematology-oncology group and also with individuals in surgery, thoracic surgery and thoracic laryngology in the evaluation of lymphoid proliferations in various organ systems. His personal research interests included studies of cutaneous and other lymphomas, focusing on T-cell proliferations. “In his strong Tennessee accent,” a close friend and colleague recalls, “he would methodically assess a case and walk his students and residents through its complexities to an understanding of the diagnosis. He was always available for a consult with a colleague and he was dedicated to the service of his patients. He had a gentlemanly sense of fairness and honesty that made him very special. Kevin took his role as teacher to heart, and is remembered by the medical students for his excellent teaching along with his responsiveness to their needs, particularly during the recent integration of pathology with the Curriculum 2000 initiative. His students, residents and fellows, and colleagues remember and honor him as a remarkable physician, teacher, mentor, and friend. We will never forget him.”

1999 Blockley-Osler Award: Created in 1987 by the Blockley Section of the Philadelphia College of Physicians, it is presented annually to a member of the faculty at an affiliated hospital for excellence in teaching modern clinical medicine in the bedside tradition of William Osler. This year it is given to Louis M. Bell, M.D., associate professor of pediatrics in infectious diseases and emergency medicine at CHOP. An attending physician at CHOP since completing a fellowship in pediatric infectious diseases there in 1986, Dr. Bell considers medical education to be one of the most important missions of academic medicine.

The Robert Dunning Dripps Memorial Award, established in 1983 by the Department of Anesthesia, recognizes a faculty member who exemplifies excellence in the education of residents and fellows in the areas of clinical care, research, teaching and/or administration. This year it is presented to Alan J. Wein, M.D., professor and chair of urology at HUP. Dr. Wein holds a Princeton A.B., cum laude, in biology. He took his M.D. from Penn, and completed his surgery, basic science research and urology training there before serving as a major in the U.S. Army in 1972-74. He returned to Penn as an assistant professor and moved through the ranks to full professor, chair of urology and chief of urology at HUP. His clinical expertise is primarily in urologic cancer, and he has long been recognized as one whose “extraordinary genius, vision, tenacity, compassion and entrepreneurial spirit restore[s] hope and normalcy to children and adults with urologic abnormalities and dysfunction,” as one of his many awards put it.

His basic science contributions have been primarily in the physiology and pharmacology of the lower urinary tract, in which field his laboratory has been responsible for many important contributions, including much of the original work on the autonomic receptor content of the lower urinary tract and the implications of this for drug therapy of voiding dysfunction. He is responsible for one of the most widely used classification systems for voiding dysfunction. He was one of the two original urologists elected to serve on the NIH-appointed national Kidney and Urologic Diseases Advisory Board and was

The School of Medicine’s 1998-99 Teaching Awards

Full-time faculty members in the tenure and clinician-educator tracks are eligible for these awards. Nominations are solicited from the faculty, housestaff and students. Dossiers are reviewed by the Faculty Teaching Awards Committee which determines the recipients.

The Dean’s Award for Excellence in Graduate Student Training, established in 1992-93, goes this year to Patrick J. Loll, Ph.D., assistant professor in the department of pharmacology. Dr. Loll received an undergraduate degree in chemical engineering from the Catholic University of America, and holds a Ph.D. in biophysics from the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine. He performed post-doctoral research with Michael Garavito at the University of Chicago, and joined the Penn faculty in 1995. Awards Dr. Loll has received include a Damon Runyon-Walter Winchell Cancer Research Fund Post-doctoral Fellowship, the Bayer Young Researchers’ International Aspirin Award, and the Michael S. Brown Junior Research Award.

The Dean’s Award for Excellence in Clinical Teaching at an Affiliated Hospital was established in 1987 to honor commitment to medical education and excellence in clinical teaching by recognizing outstanding faculty members from affiliated hospitals. Two distinguished faculty members were chosen this year: Laura F. McNicholas, M.D., Ph.D., is assistant professor of psychology and associate director of the fellowship program in the Penn/VA Center on Studies of Addiction. She joined the faculty in 1992 after completing her psychiatry residency at Penn, as well as a fellowship in clinical research in substance abuse. She became director of education for the Penn/VA Center on Studies of Addiction and became co- Director of Psychiatry 105, now the Substance Abuse section of Brain and Behavior in Module 2. She is also active in teaching in other aspects of Brain and Behavior, as well as Psychiatry 200 and the Psychiatry Residency Program. As associate director of the Fellowship Program in the
The Vice Dean for Education, in consultation with the Teaching Awards Selection Committee, identifies faculty members who have made unique contributions to medical education at Penn during the previous year. Two distinguished faculty members are being honored this year: Stephen Ludwig, M.D., is professor and associate chair for medical education in the Department of Pediatrics. He came to Penn in 1974 and has worked in pediatric emergency medicine, general pediatrics and child abuse, and throughout his career has been a strong advocate and teacher of students and housestaff. In 1998 he was elected to the Institute of Medicine for his efforts in developing the specialty of Pediatric Emergency Medicine. Dr. Ludwig has been the course director for three medical school courses and has served on the Curriculum Committee, Admissions Committee, Dean’s Letter Committee, and the education subcommittee of the Committee on Appointments and Promotions. He is currently the Co-Chair of the Student Standard Committee. Dr. Ludwig has been recognized by the CHOP housestaff with their Faculty Teacher of the Year Award. He has also won the Christian R. & Mary E. Lindback Award (1998) and the R. Dunning Dripps Award. In 1998 the Board of Trustees of CHOP awarded him the John H. and Hortense Casseli Jensen Chair in Pediatric Development and Teaching. Dr. Ludwig describes his most important professional accomplishments as having taught others about the honor and joy that comes from caring for children and having guided many young physicians in their careers.

Emma Meagher, M.D., is director of the Patient Oriented Research Training Program and the associate director of both the Center for the Treatment of Complex Hypertension and the Cardiovascular Risk Intervention Program. She graduated cum laude from the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland, and in 1994, after completing her residency and fellowship training, she moved to the U.S. to take up a faculty position as an assistant professor, clinician-educator, in the Department of Medicine at Penn. Dr. Meagher initiated the development of PennMed’s Patient Oriented Research Training Program, launched in the fall of 1997. The objective of this program is to introduce clinical fellows to the basic principles that underlie clinical research including biostatistical, ethical and translational aspects of this endeavor. Dr. Meagher has harnessed the collaboration of leading physician-scientists in the institution together with the directors of the programs in clinical epidemiology and biostatistics and bioethics. Additionally, she is the academic coordinator on a recent submission for a NIH K30 grant to support the development and implementation of a new Masters Degree Course in Clinical Investigation. Her clinical practice is in the area of cardiovascular risk intervention and the management of hypertension. Her research interests include mechanisms of vascular dysfunction in cardiovascular disease; alcohol induced liver and cardiovascular disease, and the role of antioxidant vitamin therapy in health maintenance and disease prevention. Dr. Meagher is also integrally involved in undergraduate and postgraduate medical education of pharmacology and therapeutics.

Medical Student Government Awards. The graduating class selects annual recipients of two awards.

Clinical Medicine Teaching Award
Robert Gaiser, M.D., who is also a 1999 Lindback Award winner, is an assistant professor of anesthesia, who came to the department of anesthesia in 1992 as a fellow in obstetrical anesthesia, and joined the faculty in 1993. He has a B.S.E. from SEAS and an M.D. from Columbia University. He was named Teacher of the Year in Anesthesia twice and also received the Penn Pearls Teaching Award and in 1997 he received the Robert Dripps Memorial Teaching Award of PennMed. He has developed two significant resident teaching programs during his tenure, and has made a significant impact on his trainees.

Basic Science Teaching Award
Alan C. Rosenquist, Ph.D., took his doctorate from Princeton in 1968, and joined the Penn faculty after a two-year postdoctoral fellowship at the Institute of Neurological Sciences here. He is now professor of neuroscience and associate dean for basic science education in the Medical School. He served as Chairman of the Curriculum and Academic Review Committees of the Neuroscience Graduate Group and remains active in graduate student education. The recipient of a number of teaching awards and honors, and a seasoned member of NSF review panels and NIH study sections, he is currently involved in developing and implementing the Medical School’s new four-year Curriculum 2000. Meanwhile, he is course director for the Brain and Behavior Organ System Block. His research focuses on the neural mechanisms underlying recovery of function after brain injury, and he is as associate editor for the journal Cerebral Cortex. He is interested particularly in the interface between the basic and clinical neurosciences, teaching a Neuroscience Review Course for the housestaff in Neurology. He also serves as an officer of the Council on Accreditation of the Association for the Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care, which reviews and accredits institutions worldwide.
COUNCIL A Year-End Report on the April 28 Agenda


The Safety and Security Committee (SSC) met six times during the 1998-99 year and has one scheduled meeting remaining. Topics addressed during the year included the following:

After much work both within the Committee and in conjunction with the Committee on Open Expression, SSC completed the formulation of a University video monitoring policy, which was subsequently presented to, and approved by Council.

SSC re-education subcommittee with development of a safety curriculum appropriate to undergraduates over their four-year university experience. The subcommittee worked with the Student Affairs Committee. Final recommendations are still being formulated, including forming a student/peer advisory group in charge of ongoing education. The extent of interest among students is not clear.

A subcommittee was formed to review the situation of graduate student safety and security. They sent questionnaires to 3000 graduate and professional students asking their perceptions of campus safety. 425 students responded.

97.4% felt somewhat to very safe in residences
94.8% felt somewhat to very safe walking on campus
95.3% felt somewhat to very safe in campus facilities

The survey also elicited over 250 detailed, free-text, wide-ranging comments addressing various issues including transportation, parking, and bicycles.

This subcommittee will continue to address student safety issues as they arise.

There were several discussions of the Wharton incident (November 8, 1998) and related matters. The incident resulted in several women’s groups presenting to Council a number of demands and concerns. One of these was specifically referred to the SSC. The SSC supported the idea of including issues of interpersonal violence and violence prevention into the safety orientation program. However, the concept of “mandatory” orientation was felt to be a difficult concept to enforce. SSC also supported facilitating access to information for victims, including web page links and a reassessment of current resource materials.

Members of the women’s groups who petitioned Council were invited to attend SSC meetings and contributed to discussions of these issues, as well as the issues referred to other committees. These issues included installation of panic alarms in bathrooms, improved awareness of and access to support services, and modifications of crime reporting. These demands and concerns were thoroughly discussed. In some cases they were ultimately referred to other units. For example, the ex-officio members from Public Safety arranged for testing of current alarms and surveying of bathrooms to determine feasibility of installing panic alarms. Committee members from VPUL integrated the issues into the work of the sexual and relationship violence task force.

The committee continued to evaluate the progress of the bicycle safety subcommittee’s work. The committee concluded that the current policy of “no bikes on Locust Walk” should continue as is and the University should urge the city to install bicycle lanes on Walnut and Spruce Streets as previously planned. Once there is a safe alternative for cyclists, the University and the SSC should reevaluate the bicycle policies and their level of enforcement.

Other action items, agenda topics, and areas of recommendations to ex-officio members of the committee included: Alcohol education honors course, University City circulator (bus service), Hamilton House portal (access) system, mandatory wearing of Penncards at various hours in various buildings, reduction of number of transit system stops, and certain incidents reported to public safety.

— Sean Kennedy, Chair

Membership of the 1998-1999 Safety and Security Committee
Chair: Sean Kennedy; Faculty: Sean Kennedy, anesthesia/med; John Lepore, civil systems; Ponzy Lu, chemistry; Jerry Prince, Romance languages; Margaret D. Sovie, nursing; Margaret Spencer, education; William Tyson, legal studies; Karen Winiey, materials sci; Students: Jennifer Bible, Angelos Keromytis, Garrett Gleim, Jay Krishnan, Brett Weinheimer, PPSA: Valerie Pena, Health Science Library; David Valentine, Treasurer’s Office; Ex officio: Jeanne Arnold, director, African American resource center; Doug Berger, director, residential living; Omar Blaik, vice president, facilities ser-vices; Harry Cusick, director, fire & occupational safety; Elena DiLapi, director, Penn women’s center; Robert Furniss, director, transportation & parking; Scott Reikofski, director, fraternity/sorority affairs; Maureen Rush, director, police operations; Thomas Seamon, vice president, public safety; Valarie Swain-Cade McCoulum, vice provost, University life.

In conjunction with the Committee on Communications proposal for a Disconnect Policy for computers (opposite page, past insert), Penn’s Information Security Officer recommends steps to prevent such disconnects.

Risky Business by David R. Millar

Imagine sharing your home with total strangers. The front door is always ajar and you always leave a light on. Nothing valuable has been stolen yet and the damage has been minimal, but you have begun to wonder what happens when you are away. Your neighbors have stopped talking to you.

Purchasing and installing a powerful computing workstation or server with no regard for security is not too much different. If intruders discover your system, then sensitive data are at risk of disclosure, alteration or destruction.

Seventy computer break-ins were reported at Penn in 1998. Our systems are scanned almost continuously with automated scripts probing for weaknesses. Once, a system was hacked the day after going on the network. When someone breaks into your computer they frequently use it to try to attack other systems, often those of your peers right here at Penn. They might attempt more break-ins or they might simply try to crash other computers and networks. Sometimes they use your disk space to store illegal pirated software.

The recovery effort can take several days, costing thousands of dollars of staff time, and possibly leaving you without e-mail or access to critical data. Under the proposed Disconnect Policy, your computer could be disconnected from Penn’s network if it has been compromised and poses a significant threat.

Many break-ins could have been prevented if someone were managing the system. Vendors often ship new computers with weak security, and nearly every month new weaknesses are discovered in the most popular operating systems like UNIX and Windows NT. Part of the system administrator’s job is to first secure the system before putting it on the network, and to apply the necessary security fixes. The trouble is that if the system has been carelessly managed, or worse, not managed at all, then it gets hacked.

Recommendations
— Contact your local support provider or ISC for advice on selecting and configuring a secure system.
— Make arrangements through your local support provider for a qualified system administrator to manage security.
— Apply the latest security patches.
— Contact ISC for free UNIX and NT security training beginning Summer, 1999.
— Request that ISC scan your system for vulnerabilities.
— Subscribe to one of ISC’s security e-mail lists to monitor computer security incidents on campus. ISC moderates lists for Unix security (UUGP) and NT Security (NTSP).

Send security requests and questions to security@isc.upenn.edu.

Good systems administration will not stop all computer break-ins. When simple passwords are used for authentication without being encrypted, they are vulnerable to snooping. Stronger authentication methods, firewalls and intrusion detection can reduce risks. But establishing formal system administration is an important first step to reducing risk.
Proposed Policy on Computer Disconnection from PennNet

Background: A well functioning network is critical to the research, academic and service missions of the University. Information Security has documented an increasing frequency of computer intrusions which threaten the integrity of PennNet. The capacity of entire departments to teach and conduct research has been limited as a result, and sensitive data have been at risk of unauthorized disclosure. At times, rapid response is required to protect the integrity of systems, data and those that rely on them. Inefficiency sometimes results because the owners of the penetrated machines can not be located. Disagreements arise over the magnitude and immediacy of the problems without a formal mechanism for resolving conflicts.

Certain types of misconfiguration of Penn systems, intentional or otherwise, can have serious and detrimental consequences. Examples include using another host’s Internet Protocol address (“IP Spoofing”) or misconfigured networking protocols. Normal operation of Penn computers, and even computers elsewhere on the worldwide Internet, can be compromised. Networks can become so congested that network traffic can not get through.

Purpose: The goal of this policy is to protect the academic missions served by Penn’s computers and networks from disruption.

Policy: Information Systems and Computing (ISC) will disconnect from PennNet any computers that have actually damaged or pose an imminent threat of harming the integrity of PennNet.

Scope: This policy only applies to computers and devices attached directly or indirectly to PennNet, including improper or defective “daisy-chain” connections and private Local Area Networks with active networking components connected to PennNet wallplates and hosts.

This policy does not address removing computers from PennNet for reasons related solely to their content.

Implementation: Systems administrators must report serious computer security incidents to the University Information Security Officer. Serious computer security incidents will be defined as those that jeopardize the integrity, privacy and/or availability of other computers and networks. Examples of serious computer security incidents include break-ins where privileged accounts (e.g. UNIX “root” account, or NT “Administrator” account) are used without authorization, incidents where network traffic is monitored without authorization, and incidents where Penn computers or networks are either the source or the target of “denial of service” attacks. The Information Security Officer will coordinate the response to computer security incidents, including notifying campus systems administrators, law enforcement officers, external sites, incident response teams and University offices as appropriate.

Authorized actions: If, in the judgement of the Vice Provost for ISC (VPISC) or his/her designate, criteria are met which suggest that a system poses a significant and immediate threat either to:

- The security of other Penn computers and networks, or
- The continued operation of Penn networks and computers, and the problem cannot be resolved expeditiously through collaboration between the computer owners and ISC, then ISC will notify senior management of the department or unit and will require the owners to remove the computer from the network until the problem is solved.

Absent/Unidentified Owners: If ISC is unable, using the Assignments database, to identify a system owner or Local Support Provider (LSP), ISC will move unilaterally to protect the network by disconnecting the threatening system.

Disputes: In cases where there is persistent disagreement between ISC and the owner of the perceived threat, ISC must notify the owner and the LSP of the following information in writing:

- The reason for the disconnection
- What steps must be taken for the network connection to be restored

- How to arrange for the system to be reconnected
- The process of appealing a decision to disconnect
- When the owner of the system has taken the steps necessary to correct the problem, ISC will restore the PennNet connection as soon as possible.

Appealing a Decision to Disconnect: The Council Committee on Communications shall appoint a subcommittee to review appeals of decisions to disconnect computers. The subcommittee will consist of:

- At least four members of the faculty appointed by the Committee on Communications, one of whom to serve as chair
- VPISC or her/his designate
- University Information Security Officer or her/his designate

The Committee on Communications may designate alternates to serve on the hearings of an appeal when its appointees are unavailable.

The owner of a disconnected system who believes that the threat that the system posed is outweighed by the impact of its disconnection on their academic mission may appeal the decision by documenting this belief in writing to the chair of the subcommittee. The chair or her/his designate may resolve the dispute amicably; failing this it will be heard formally by the subcommittee. The subcommittee will resolve conflicts as rapidly as possible within the constraints of fairness. It will establish and follow its own operating procedures.

If the subcommittee does not begin the proceedings within 5 working days in cases where the issue is a threat and not actual harm, or 30 working days in cases where ISC can document actual harm, the subject system must be reconnected. Once the subcommittee has begun the process, time limits will not be imposed.

In considering appeals, the subcommittee will balance the value of leaving machines connected against the associated risks. Its decision will be final. The only recourse for faculty whose appeals are denied will be to the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility. ISC may not appeal. However, it may re-disconnect the computer and restart the entire process whenever another trigger event is detected.

System owners who believe that their freedom of expression has been unduly infringed may, under the Guidelines for Open Expression, request that the Committee on Open Expression determine if the Guidelines were properly interpreted and applied to the disconnection of their system.

Interpreting this policy: As technology evolves, questions may arise about how to interpret this policy. The VPISC may as needed, after consultation with the Council Committee on Communications, publish specific rules interpreting this policy.

Advice: To minimize the likelihood of a serious computer security compromise, campus systems administrators are encouraged to configure their systems in accordance with the following standards:

www.upenn.edu/computing/security-privacy/standards/

Glossary

Assignments Database: A computer database provided by ISC Networking where Local Support Providers maintain information about PennNet connected computers, including the network address, operating system, and contact information. For more information about how to maintain records in the Assignments Database, contact: security@isc.upenn.edu

Denial of Service Attack: An attack where someone takes up so much of a shared resource that insufficient is left for others. Denial of service attacks threaten the availability of resources, including computer processes, disk space, or network capacity among other things. The result is a degradation or loss of service.

Local Support Provider: Departments/Units at Penn appoint Local Support Providers to provide information technology support locally.

— Martin Pring, Chair, Council Committee on Communications
The University Council Committee on International Programs met seven times during the 1998-1999 academic year and addressed the following charges to the Committee:

— Review revised INS regulations and how they will affect registered students
— Continue to monitor the orientation of international students—what programs exist and what forms of outreach are in place to encourage students and postdoctoral fellows to use them
— Continue discussion of study-abroad programs, including information on health insurance for those studying abroad
— Examine the issue of tuition charges for students in study-abroad programs
— Examine the issue of housing for short-term international guests

The Committee met with invited guests Ann Kuhlman, Associate Director of the OIP; Dr. Richard Beeman, Dean of the College; Dr. Geoffrey Gee, Associate Director of the OIP; Larry Moneta, Associate Vice President for Campus Services; and Dr. Robert Barchi, Provost.

The Committee has specifically directed me to comment on the University response to a number of specific recommendations of this Committee in previous years. In 1996-97, the Committee recommended the establishment of an International Students’ Day as a major priority and this was endorsed again by the Committee in 1997-98. The 1997-98 Committee recommended that provisions similar to those that have already been implemented for postdoctoral students in the School of Medicine also be made available to other postdoctoral students in the University. The Committee also recommended that low-cost housing options be expanded for short-term visiting students and scholars. These recommendations were in addition to suggestions to further study issues such as the establishment of an International Center and improvement of integration of international students and scholars into the University community. The Committee notes that there has been little University response to its specific recommendations in the prior two years.

It was evident to the Committee that the Office of International Programs is doing an outstanding job. This Office, the center for promotion and coordination of international activities throughout the University, gives a very high level of service even though hampered by inadequate facilities.

In the course of our discussions, a number of issues were raised in addition to those specifically outlined in the charges to the Committee. For clarity of organization in this report, these issues and committee charges are grouped under the following topics: International Students and Scholars on the Penn Campus, Study-Abroad Programs, Housing for Short-Term International Guests, and Development of a Penn International Center on campus.

### A. International Students and Scholars on the Penn Campus

The committee learned from Ann Kuhlman that a number of changes have been recently made in the INS regulations which impact on visiting scholars. The most significant change is that individuals admitted under B visas can now accept honoraria and associated incidental expenses from a higher education institution. We were also informed that the annual cap for H-1B visas has been increased from 65,000 to 115,000 for FY 1999.

The Committee also discussed problems of taxation for international visitors. Unfortunately, it is poorly appreciated on campus that a whole year of exemption from FICA and Medicare withholding, and in some cases a year of tax treaty exemption from Federal income tax, is used up if a scholar arrives in the U.S. for just one day of the calendar year (i.e., arrival on Dec. 31). Therefore, it would be useful for Departments and Centers to advise scholars who plan to arrive on campus for a multi-year stay not to arrive in the last months of the calendar year. Another issue related to taxation is that as a part of the initial process of setting up payroll accounts, visiting scholars must visit Penn’s Tax Office, often on their first day or two on campus. The reception in this office has not always been cordial and friendly.

The OIP has an extremely effective orientation program for newly arrived students and scholars. Unfortunately, it is poorly appreciated on campus that a whole year of exemption from FICA and Medicare withholding, and in some cases a year of tax treaty exemption from Federal income tax, is used up if a scholar arrives in the U.S. for just one day of the calendar year (i.e., arrival on Dec. 31). Therefore, it would be useful for Departments and Centers to advise scholars who plan to arrive on campus for a multi-year stay not to arrive in the last months of the calendar year. Another issue related to taxation is that as a part of the initial process of setting up payroll accounts, visiting scholars must visit Penn’s Tax Office, often on their first day or two on campus. The reception in this office has not always been cordial and friendly.

The Committee devoted two full meetings to discussion of study-abroad programs. We reviewed the current policy, which permits attendance in programs approved by Penn or, in special cases, by petition. Among research Universities, Penn ranked #1 in 1996-97 in the total number undergraduate and graduate/professional students studying abroad for credit. The Committee is of the opinion that these programs are an extremely valuable option for Penn students. The current policy provides for the monitoring of approved undergraduate programs to determine if they are at the standard expected for credit at Penn. Flexibility is maintained by allowing students with special study abroad needs to petition for attendance at other sites. The Committee thinks these policies are reasonable and that our study-abroad programs are well administered. However, there are particular problems that need to be addressed.

A.5. The facilities of the OIP need to be greatly expanded so it may serve as a true center of international activities on campus.

### B. Study-Abroad Programs

The Committee devoted two full meetings to discussion of study-abroad programs. We reviewed the current policy, which permits attendance in programs approved by Penn or, in special cases, by petition. Among research Universities, Penn ranked #1 in 1996-97 in the total number undergraduate and graduate/professional students studying abroad for credit. The Committee is of the opinion that these programs are an extremely valuable option for Penn students. The current policy provides for the monitoring of approved undergraduate programs to determine if they are at the standard expected for credit at Penn. Flexibility is maintained by allowing students with special study abroad needs to petition for attendance at other sites. The Committee thinks these policies are reasonable and that our study-abroad programs are well administered. However, there are particular problems that need to be addressed.

A.1. Improvements in communication with Departments and business offices on campus on matters of changes in tax, employment, and visa policies should be implemented. In addition to increasing coverage of these issues in the newsletter sent to international scholars, the OIP should communicate with departmental and center business offices by e-mail on these administrative matters.

A.2. The quality of reception for international visitors during their first days on campus could be improved to some extent. Specifically, a warmer atmosphere needs to be created at the University’s Tax Office and at the ID center.

A.3. All international scholars and students should be required to visit the OIP as soon as they arrive on campus. The Committee has unanimously passed a resolution which strongly advises the administration to implement a mechanism to ensure that visiting scholars cannot start their programs, receive ID’s, appear on the payroll, or obtain any other Penn privileges, without first registering with the OIP. The Committee also unanimously advises the administration to require that host departments notify the OIP if there is any change in an international scholar’s status.

A.4. Increased resources need to be provided to create a more welcoming atmosphere for international visitors on campus. Mechanisms need to be put in place to get additional faculty and domestic students involved in hosting and attending activities for international students and scholars.

A.5. The facilities of the OIP need to be greatly expanded so it may serve as a true center of international activities on campus.
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A.5. The facilities of the OIP need to be greatly expanded so it may serve as a true center of international activities on campus.

### Committee Recommendations
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### B. Study-Abroad Programs

The Committee devoted two full meetings to discussion of study-abroad programs. We reviewed the current policy, which permits attendance in programs approved by Penn or, in special cases, by petition. Among research Universities, Penn ranked #1 in 1996-97 in the total number undergraduate and graduate/professional students studying abroad for credit. The Committee is of the opinion that these programs are an extremely valuable option for Penn students. The current policy provides for the monitoring of approved undergraduate programs to determine if they are at the standard expected for credit at Penn. Flexibility is maintained by allowing students with special study abroad needs to petition for attendance at other sites. The Committee thinks these policies are reasonable and that our study-abroad programs are well administered. However, there are particular problems that need to be addressed.

A.1. Improvements in communication with Departments and business offices on campus on matters of changes in tax, employment, and visa policies should be implemented. In addition to increasing coverage of these issues in the newsletter sent to international scholars, the OIP should communicate with departmental and center business offices by e-mail on these administrative matters.

A.2. The quality of reception for international visitors during their first days on campus could be improved to some extent. Specifically, a warmer atmosphere needs to be created at the University’s Tax Office and at the ID center.

A.3. All international scholars and students should be required to visit the OIP as soon as they arrive on campus. The Committee has unanimously passed a resolution which strongly advises the administration to implement a mechanism to ensure that visiting scholars cannot start their programs, receive ID’s, appear on the payroll, or obtain any other Penn privileges, without first registering with the OIP. The Committee also unanimously advises the administration to require that host departments notify the OIP if there is any change in an international scholar’s status.
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of appropriate sites for students majoring in that department (see recommendation B.2).

Some programs with a limited number of slots are very much in demand. Occasionally, applicants do not meet the 3.00 GPA requirement. Since this standard may not be generally appreciated, the Committee considered it appropriate to more widely publicize this standard. Particularly important would be to advise the Admissions Office to refer to Study-Abroad as a valuable privilege earned by academic performance. The Committee learned that in some instances, slots in particular programs were being filled by students who have not met the GPA requirement. The Committee advises that the standard should be applied to all students.

The Committee also reviewed the policy of charging full tuition to all students in Penn study-abroad programs. Although this policy may appear at first sight to be unjust to students participating in programs with lower costs to non-Penn students, the Committee agreed that the current Penn policy was appropriate. Tuition funds not only are used to pay the actual costs of the students’ program but are also used for undergraduate financial aid, administrative overhead costs, and to maintain the individual schools, and for School-based advising and administration. With the caveat that the Committee thinks that insufficient funds are provided to the Schools and OIP for the review process (see B.1), the policy seems to be fair. For example, study-abroad students are eligible for financial aid and it would be financially disruptive for some study-abroad students not to pay a share of these costs to the University.

The Committee discussed the health insurance coverage of undergraduate study abroad students. The University required that study abroad students maintain coverage that is valid in the U.S. and meets standards of the Student Health Office. The OIP makes students aware of the health insurance requirement but has no way of determining what policies students actually have. A variety of supplemental plans that offer medical expense insurance valid abroad are brought to the attention of students by the OIP. One problem may be that the Penn Student Insurance plan is one of the options for health coverage for study abroad students, but may not cover non-emergency or even emergency medical situations. The Committee recommends that the University ensure that the current Penn Student insurance plan will cover student health needs abroad, or if not, develop a group plan that will provide such coverage.

Committee Recommendations

B.1. Increased funds (supplied from the tuition collected from study-abroad students) need to be provided to OIP and to the individual schools to allow increased monitoring of study-abroad programs. A much more active review process with on-site evaluations by faculty and OIP staff should be instituted.

B.2. Each department or undergraduate major needs to be more involved in providing advice on which study-abroad programs are suitable for their majors. Particular study-abroad sites should be recommended to majors and the faculty of relevant departments should be brought into the site evaluation process to a much greater extent than is current practice. Deans of the relevant schools should implement changes vigorously.

B.3. GPA requirements for study-abroad programs should be made clear in University publications, including material supplied by the Admissions Office. The OIP should uniformly apply this standard.

B.4. The University should ensure that a degree of coverage for study abroad students be provided either by the current Student Health Plan or by a new group plan. Students who choose health coverage solely relying on the Student Health Plan should not be left without health insurance protection.

C. Housing for Short-Term International Guests

The Committee has been concerned about the lack of adequate housing for short-term international guests. Visitors to the campus who stay for a few days can find adequate hotel accommodations and long-term visitors can rent furnished or unfurnished apartments. However, visitors to Penn who need to stay near the campus for a period of one week to several months find very little suitable housing. As a major research university, Penn should have facilities to encourage visits of research collaborators who need to be housed near campus. Laboratory research particularly requires proximity to campus since experimental work often requires late-night and weekend activity in University laboratory buildings. Unfortunately, Penn short-term housing is mostly limited to guest suites in Grad Towers at $1100 to $1200 per month or rooms in Grad Towers with shared bath at $115 per week. The Committee considers the former to be too expensive and the latter to be too uninviting for international postdoctoral and junior research level. Moreover, rooms in these categories are often booked long in advance and, except for the guest suites, are made available only if they are not occupied by graduate students with long-term leases. The one other source of short-term housing near campus is the Divine Tracy Hotel, which although inexpensive, has dress codes which discriminate against women and a particular religious orientation, a situation not appropriate for many of our international visitors.

The Committee has reviewed a number of housing options over the past two years and is concerned that the University not only has no plans to fill the need for moderately priced short-term housing but is actually considering decreasing the number of high-end and low-end units now available. The Committee understands that the University cannot put its resources into developing such housing unless there is a demonstrated need. We propose that surveys be carried out within departments with significant research personnel to determine the current need for moderate cost short-term housing. However, it also should be realized that the availability of such housing may itself lead to increased visits from international collaborators, thus generating additional demand. The Committee recommends that the University develop a plan to provide modest but inviting units at the price range of $600-$800 per month, the number of which would be determined by appropriate surveys and market research.

In part A of this report, the Committee notes that the atmosphere on campus for international visitors needs significant improvement. We recommended an expansion of facilities so that the OIP can serve as an effective center for international activities on campus. We propose that such a center have a number of guest suites and moderately priced single rooms for short-term international guests on campus for teaching and/or research. An International Center could serve as a focal point for housing, lectures and seminars, OIP administration, and study-abroad.

Committee Recommendation

C.1. The University needs to develop a plan to provide moderately priced short-term housing for international visitors. Current short-term housing should be maintained and additional housing at a cost affordable to postdoctoral and junior research level visitors needs to be created. The number of units to be developed should be determined by appropriate surveys and market research. An appropriate site for such housing would be a new International Center which could be developed on campus.

D. Development of an International Center on Campus

The development of an International Center, a topic considered in past years by the Committee, should be given a high priority by the University. The relative lack of integration of our international scholars and visitors into the University community is in part due to a lack of an adequate center for activities with an international focus. The OIP is housed in inadequate facilities that provide little opportunity for development of meetings, seminars, and reading areas. Part of a Penn International Center could provide the space necessary for a more effective OIP. New interdisciplinary academic programs with strong international components also could be housed in such a center, as might meeting centers for internationally oriented student organizations. The problem of inadequate housing for international scholars would be alleviated if a housing component were included in a new International Center. The Committee strongly suggests that the development of such a Center would greatly improve the ambiance of Penn international scholars and students and offer a central focus for the integration of international visitors into campus life.

Committee Recommendation

D.1. The University should place a high priority on developing a new International Center on campus to house an expanded OIP, provide meeting areas for international scholars and students, house new interdisciplinary academic programs with an international focus, serve as a center for internationally oriented student organizations, and provide short-term housing for international scholars on campus.

We wish to thank Ann Kuhlman, Richard Beeman, Geoffrey Gee, Larry Moneta and Robert Barchi for taking the time to meet with the Committee and provide valuable insights. Though the OIP manages to appreciate the valuable input from Joyce Randolph. Elva Power has served as a most effective and helpful secretary and we thank her for enabling the committee to function smoothly and for documenting our discussions so well.

—Eric S. Weinberg, Chair

Membership of the 1998-1999 Committee on International Programs

Chair: Eric S. Weinberg; Faculty: Roger Allen, Asian and Middle Eastern studies; N. Bulenik Galikein, finance; Roberto Mariano, economics; Irving Nachmanick, pathology and laboratory medicine; Gregory L. Posehl, anthropology; Sohrab Rabii, electrical engineering; Harold F. Schiffman, South Asia regional studies. Eric S. Weinberg, biology; Administration: Mary Ann Kilian; Undergraduate Students: Thomas Kisling (Wh'02/Nursing '01); Katie O'Connor (CAS '90); Jeremy Thompson (CAS '99), Graduate/Professional Students: Hugh Bozorgzadeh (Dental); Aveek Das (SEAS); Heidi Wushinsky (GSE). Ex officio: Joyce Randolph, Director, OIP.
The charges for the committee this year were to review the multi-phase renovation of Van Pelt-Dietrich Library’s physical facilities and to discuss and evaluate the issues of how the College House System will potentially increase access to the library and impact the use of the library’s resources. The committee was asked to look into issues such as expanded hours, impact of staffing, and other ongoing needs.

The committee met 6 times this year and in an effort to expand the committee’s working knowledge of the library system, each meeting was held in a different library and, for members unfamiliar with a particular library, tours were offered by many of the library directors. From the very first committee meeting and discussion, it was clear that the expansion and renovation within the Van Pelt Library was continuing on schedule. An update of this project with specific points concerning the Undergraduate Library [Rosengarten] was given by Karin L. McGowan at the March meeting of University Council.

Because the last undergraduate and graduate surveys that were formulated by the library were done so in 1996, a goal of the committee was to sponsor an event that would question students about their use and satisfaction of the library’s services. Input from student committee members helped shape this idea and at their suggestion, 2 separate open forums were held. Student members felt that graduate and undergraduate students use the library system differently that it would make for a confusing meeting if everyone attended at the same time. On Feb. 25th, a 2 hour session was held in the Van Pelt Library for graduate students and on March 18th, a similar session was held for undergraduate students. Both meetings were extremely informative, for library staff as well as the committee and a summary of the issues raised at each of the sessions is included at the end of this report. One point was very clear at the end of the sessions, and that was that a lot of information about the library is not reaching the student body. Part of the problem is that there is no good way or combination of ways to reach the majority of undergraduate and graduate students on this campus. Unlike other universities, there is no “required” library orientation by any department or school on campus and many students are on this campus for years before a specific course assignment drives them into the library or to use a library service they had not used before. The library hands out immense amounts of printed information about library services to students from the moment they arrive. When asked, most students admitted they never read it. The library’s web page has been redesigned and is very user friendly, on-line suggestion boxes answer student questions and complaints on an almost daily basis. As a result of the open forum questions that were held, the library has established connections with the GSAC and UA and hopes to solicit feedback on ways to reach more students on campus.

Discussions concerning the 21st Century Wheel Project consumed much of the committee’s time. Because of the committee’s charge this year, Ms. Debra Bucher, the library coordinator of in-residence programs was asked to be a guest member of the committee. Debra came to all of the years’ committee meetings and was tremendously useful in helping us understand the issues and scope of the project. The Library pilot project started in Van Pelt College House in 1996-97, expanded to support 11 First Year Houses in 1997-98, and scaled up to the entire campus, including the three new College Houses in the High Rises, in 1998-99.

Library advising is one of four support portions to the 21st Century Wheel Project, Information Technology, Math, and Writing being the other three, and this is the third year of the project. There is presently a student library advisor (LA) in every dorm to provide a “first level” of assistance to students. LA’s work under Debra Bucher’s direction, helping other students use library databases, connect to the Digital Library, and understand library services and policies. These in residence LA’s have undergone a training in the library and are paid for their work. In addition, LA’s spend approximately 5 hours per week working at the new Information Desk at Van Pelt. This gives them an opportunity to develop their library knowledge and then students coming to the library see a familiar face when they first walk into the building. In general, students have responded well to being helped by a peer serving as an LA.

In addition, LA’s use the “electronic library” which is an actual link to the various librarians. When a question is raised that a LA cannot answer, the electronic link is used to contact the appropriate librarian. That librarian will then get back in touch with the students within 12 hours. Because the project is still in its pilot stage, financially at this time, there can only be one student advisor per house. In some houses, that gives a ratio of 1 LA: 200 students; in the high rises, the ratio is 1 LA: 800 students.

Many activities are held to get freshman interested in the libraries such as a scavenger hunt held during College House Night but some have been minimally attended. It would be helpful if resident advisors (RAs) were required to attend such events since it would help recruit more freshmen.

The third level of activity in the library project involves reference consultations. These are coordinated by the LAs. This is where Ms. Bucher goes into a dorm [usually in the evening hours] and the students have a chance to meet a reference librarian and discuss their specific research and information needs. As you might imagine, these have been extremely popular, but to expand this activity, more librarians will have to be assigned to the project. It has been very clear that this project is still experimenting with different options. Dr. Paul Mosher, the head of libraries, sees this as just the “beginning” of the project. Once specific aspects of the project prove to be successful, then the library can decide whether or not to commit further resources to them.

Committee Recommendations

- At least every 2 years, open forum sessions sponsored by the Council Committee on Libraries and the Library should be held for undergraduate and graduate students on campus. While the Library conducts its own student surveys approximately every 5-6 years, it’s important that a group separate from the Library routinely poll students on their use of the system to find out if student needs are being met. Both the Committee and Library staff learned a tremendous amount of information from this year’s sessions with the students.

- Students are most appreciative of the Librarians and library staff. They commented frequently that the staff are great, helpful, resourceful, and knowledgeable.

- Students are quite vocal that they want the libraries open more often. They asked in particular that the library lengthen evening and weekend hours in Fine Arts and Special Collections and lengthen weekend access to the Museum Library. For graduate students, the need is primarily for access to collections—many graduate students work to support themselves and have difficulty accessing what they need under the existing time schedules.

- The 4 support segments of the College House System need to be coordinated to work together. At present they appear to work as 4 separate systems rather than complementing each other and sponsoring events together. One of our student committee members is also a writing advisor—she made numerous terrific suggestions this year to Debra Bucher and the committee, all of which are presently being used by the Writing Project. There must be a more efficient way of sharing such information. In addition, faculty who teach courses to freshmen need to be tied into the House Project as well. For example, assignments could be designed that require greater library and computer use, necessitating student’s use of information technology and library services.

- There need to be more student library advisors per house, particularly for the high rises that house as many as 800 students. This may require additional financial support. Everyone knows many students procrastinate as much as possible, particularly first year students. When large assignments are due, it’s unlikely that one LA can meet the needs of 800 students in a high rise—the end result is that students just won’t use the service at times they need it the most.

- Finally, there needs to be an evaluation process — it’s hard to judge the success of a project and also what areas to expand or eliminate when there is no ongoing evaluation of the system. While still in the “pilot project” stage, evaluation criteria need to be established for all portions of the College House System.

— Karin L. McGowan, Chair

(For committee membership and report appendices, see next page.)
Issues Raised in the Graduate/Professional Student Forum on the Library, February 25, 1999

Collections/Stacks

Improve conditions in third floor stacks at Van Pelt; shelves are overcrowded and generally in disarray. Consult with students and other stakeholders before transferring materials from crowded places to storage.

Consider merging the Lippincott and Van Pelt stacks; division is confusing and redundant.

Remedy the chronic vandalism of journals; seminal articles in the literature are often razored out of Library volumes.

Systemize, as much as possible, the acquisition of slides; close gaps in the collection.

Keep acquiring electronic journals—they're great.

Improve the rebinding of old volumes: the present process trims away stitched binding ends, rebinds signatures with glue; these often then fall out, thus shortening the life of the books.

Study Conditions/Facilities

Demand for Moser carrels exceeds supply; continue upgrading carrels in Van Pelt-Dietrich Library (VPDL). Wired carrels are very desirable.

Graduate students want more dedicated study space. Examples included:

— group study facilities
— seminars with core collections, reference materials
— quiet areas sequestered from noise, socializers, food debris.

Have security patrols deal more proactively with noise makers, food problems; install signs that designate quiet areas.

Too many computer stations are occupied for e-mailing. Find some way to inhibit e-mail use at the Look Up Center, wherever else computers have primarily research application. Create a designated e-mail center.

Allow students to reserve stations in VPDL’s 5th floor lab.

Carpet the carrel area in Fine Arts or place felt on the chair legs to reduce irritating noise.

Deploy color copiers in Fine Arts and VPDL.

Place a dictionary and atlas in Current Periodicals, VPDL; install a clock within view of the periodicals reading area. Improve the sloppy newspaper storage system.

Circulation

Provide circulation status in Franklin for items charged to carrels. If the system cannot identify specific carrels, then configure Franklin to provide a general indication that an item is charged to a carrel.

Provide e-mail, rather than snail-mail, overdue notices.

Consider standardizing graduate student loan periods and fine rates for all Libraries. Alternate: provide a standard carrel charge period.

Allow items to circulate to carrels regardless of item or carrel location.

Hours/Staffing

Lengthen evening and weekend hours in Fine Arts; lengthen weekend access to Museum Library; need is primarily for access to collections. Consider opening VPDL 24 hours for research. Lengthen weekend/evening hours in Special Collections — many graduate students work and have difficulty accessing during existing hours.

Increase staffing in the Museum and Slide Libraries commensurate with collection growth and, particularly in slides, processing needs.

The staff are great, helpful, resourceful, knowledgeable: circulation, stacks, ILL, reference, special collections, bibliographers, staff throughout the libraries.

Communication

Raise general user awareness of library policies, service improvements, new resources, etc. Ideas offered include:

Create a “tip of the day” feature on the library web
Create an issues and answers forum on the Web to keep users apprised of library efforts to respond to their needs
Publish a series of informative bookmarks
Collaborate with GSAC in expanding communication with students.

Appendix II

Issues Raised in the Undergraduate Student Forum on the Library, March 18, 1999

(Incorporates e-mail contributions of students unable to attend)

Facilities/Computing

The removal of e-mail access from computer stations in the Class of 1964 Lookup Center (1st Floor, Van Pelt Dietrich Library [VPDL]) has heightened the need to provide more e-mail access points on campus, including the Library spaces. Students pressed for the Library to add more computers and printers, and to increase the range of software on Library computers to include FTP and teaching applications such as Maple.

Study Space

Students were most vocal about the need for well designed, highly accessible study space. In study spaces, students want comfortable seating, lighting appropriate to tasks, the ability to study in groups and individually (more carrel areas like those on the upper floors of VPDL). The expression of need seemed heightened by student’s general dissatisfaction with study environments in the High Rises. Those present and most persons commenting by e-mail indicated that the renovation of Rosengarten is critical. They endorsed the plan to create a mix of quiet study and social areas in Rosengarten; several e-mails were emphatic about the need for quiet study. There was also a general interest in having an additional Library on campus available for late-night study. The Dental Library was raised as one possibility (because of its convenient location near the high rises); others suggested lengthening evening and weekend hours in Fine Arts. Undergraduates want food service in VPDL. If plans for the Library Cafe are realized in the short term, they asked the Library to consider erecting a vending zone in Rosengarten as an interim step.

Outside the Library, food service has become particularly skimpy since the closing of Houston Hall for renovation. Could the Library provide an interim vending service at least until Houston Hall reopens? The restrooms in VPDL are a source of universal dissatisfaction. The VPDL should increase the number of campus phones.

Security Issues

Students variously complained about overzealous and lax security. Sentiment was very strong for overhauling the security system at the VPDL exit. Staff don’t check parcels consistently or thoroughly, arousing student cynicism and irritation with the process. The requirement that students sign in to use computer labs in VPDL was cited as another security frustration, since students aren’t asked to present ID in computer areas in Lippincott or Van Pelt Reference. Other students, commenting through e-mail, complained of risks to personal property in VPDL and urged higher security, especially more stack patrols.

Collections

Steps should be taken to improve the availability of materials that are reported on the shelf; too often items are not findable despite a “not charged” status in Franklin. Franklin should also represent more clearly the status of materials held in Current Periodicals. The Library should step up conservation efforts to reduce the problem of mutilated books and journals. With regard to serials, the students said they use and strongly endorse the continued acquisition of e-journals. From e-mail, the library heard about the poor access to film and video collections on campus and the inadequacy of viewing facilities. To address these problems, they were asked to create a viewing space in the Library and catalog the MMETS collection in Franklin.

Instructional Outreach

Each student had had, and found very useful, an in-class presentation from a librarian on how to research a topic using library resources. They encouraged the Library to do more course-related instruction in the classroom. To orient undergraduates, the library was advised to first to orient T.A.’s., their main teaching cohort. An e-mail correspondent encouraged the continuation of the Wheel project and urged the library to publicize the program more vigorously.

Communication

As in other user forums, we found that students are not getting the message about Library resources and services. We sought their advice on how to better inform students—where, for example, do they go for information about campus resources. Undergraduates read the DP to stay informed; so they encouraged the library to advertise there. They liked the idea of the Library publishing a tabloid style information bulletin (perhaps distributed with the DP) at least once a term, with information about databases, policies and help topics. And they recommended that the bulletin be realized in the short term; they gratefully acknowledge that there are available. Further advice: package the information for lazy readers with short attention spans. Opinion was divided about the efficacy of using the Web to survey undergraduates for feedback, although they did support the general idea of using surveys to measure undergraduate opinion.
OF RECORD Summary Annual Reports

This is a summary of the annual reports for the University of Pennsylvania Plans named above for the plan year ending June 30, 1998. These Plans are sponsored by the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania, whose Federal employer identification number is 23-352685. The annual reports have been filed with the Internal Revenue Service as required under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA).

It is also required under the terms of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 that these Summary Annual Reports be furnished to Plan participants. To facilitate publication, the reports for the Plan year ended June 30, 1998 have been combined. Consequently, portions of this summary may refer to Plans in which you are not currently participating.

Life Insurance Program of the University of Pennsylvania

The Plan has a contract with Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association/College Retirement Equities Fund (TIAA-CREF) to pay all life insurance claims incurred under the terms of the Plan. The total premiums paid for the Plan year ended June 30, 1998 were $3,051,249.

Plan costs are affected by, among other things, the number and size of claims. Of the total insurance premiums paid for the Plan year ending June 30, 1998, the premiums paid under the experience rated contract during the Plan year was $3,051,249, and the total of all benefit claims charged under the experience rated contract during the Plan year was $3,778,690.

Dental Plan of the University of Pennsylvania—Prudential

The Plan is a prepaid Plan providing dental benefits. Since there is no insurance involved, no insurance premiums were paid during the Plan year ending June 30, 1998.

Dental Plan of the University of Pennsylvania—Penn Faculty Practice Plan

The Plan is a prepaid Plan providing dental benefits. Since there is no insurance involved, no insurance premiums were paid during the Plan year ending June 30, 1998.

Retirement Allowance Plan of the University of Pennsylvania:

Basic Financial Statement

Benefits under this Plan are provided through a trust with Bankers Trust Company. Plan expenses were $4,539,144. These expenses include $329,754 in administrative expenses and PBGC premiums and $4,209,385 in benefits paid to Plan participants and beneficiaries. A total of 6,091 individuals were participants or beneficiaries at the end of the Plan year, although not all of these persons had yet earned the right to receive benefits.

The value of Plan assets, after subtracting liabilities of the Plan, was $136,687,238 as of June 30, 1998, compared to $124,125,153 as of June 30, 1997. During the Plan year, the Plan experienced an increase in its net assets of $12,562,085. This increase includes unrealized appreciation or depreciation in the value of plan assets; that is, the difference between the value of the Plan’s assets at the end of the year and the value of the assets at the beginning of the year or the cost of assets acquired during the year.

Minimum Funding Standards

An actuary’s statement shows that the Plan was funded in accordance with the minimum funding standards of ERISA.

Additional Information

As described below, you have the right to receive a copy of the full annual report of the Retirement Allowance Plan, or any part thereof, on request.

The items listed below are included in that report:

1. An accountant’s report
2. Assets held for investment
3. Insurance information (including sales commissions paid by insurance carriers), and
4. Actuarial information regarding the funding of the plan

You also have the right to receive from the plan administrator, on request and at no charge, a statement of the assets and liabilities of the Plan and accompanying notes, or a statement of income and expenses of the Plan and accompanying notes, or both. If you request a copy of the full annual report from the plan administrator, these two statements and accompanying notes will be included as part of that report. The charge to cover copying costs does not include a charge for the copying of these portions of the report because these portions are furnished without charge.

Your Rights to Additional Information About These Plans

You have the right to receive a copy of the full annual report of any of these Plans, or any part thereof, on request. To obtain a copy of the full annual report(s), or any part thereof, write or call the office of the Vice President of Human Resources who is the Plan Administrator, Room 538A, 3401 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 898-6884. The charge for the full annual report of the Retirement Allowance Plan is $5.00. The charge for each other full annual report is $2.50, and the charge for any single page is 25 cents.

In addition, you have the legally protected right to examine the annual reports at the University of Pennsylvania, Benefits Office, Room 527A, 3401 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104. You also have the right to examine the annual reports at the U.S. Department of Labor in Washington, D.C., or obtain a copy from the U.S. Department of Labor upon payment of copying costs. Requests to the Department of Labor should be addressed to Public Disclosure Room, N4677, Pension and Welfare Benefit Programs, Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20216.

Play and Discussion: ‘Oscar Wilde’

Penn’s Association of Alumniae is sponsoring a theater event on Sunday, May 2, at Plays and Players Theater, 1714 Delancey Street in Philadelphia. At 2-15 p.m., Dr. Wendy Steiner, professor of English and chair of Penn’s department of English, will give background and comment on the play, Gross Indecency: The Three Trials of Oscar Wilde.

A question and answer session will follow the performance. The program will begin with a reception at 1:15 p.m. The show begins at 3 p.m. For more information, call co-chairs Marion Taxin (610-565-0289) or Mindy Cohen (610-520-9350). Tickets: $45.

Computer Connection Hours

The Computer Connection’s next inventory will be the first weekend in May. Due to our quarterly inventory procedures, the Computer Connection will have the following hours:

Tuesday, April 26 to Friday, April 30
8:30 a.m.-9 p.m.

Saturday, May 1 & Sunday, May 2—closed

Monday, May 3—resume normal hours,
8:30 a.m.-9 p.m.

You may visit our website at www.upenn.edu/ccx for product information.

Jeff Rusling, Associate Manager
Penn Computer Connection

OCCUPATIONS

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.
The Pennsylvania University Police Department Community Crime Report

About the Crime Report: Below are all Crimes Against Persons and Crimes Against Society from the campus report for April 5, 1999 through April 11, 1999. Also reported were Crimes Against Property: 19 total thefts & attempts (including 3 thefts of bicycles & parts, 1 theft of autos & parts, & 16 incidents of criminal mischief & vandalism). Full reports on the Web (www.upenn.edu/alm/1999/crimes.html).—Ed.

This summary is prepared by the Division of Public Safety and includes all criminal incidents reported and made known to the University Police Department between the dates of April 5, 1999 and April 11, 1999. The University Police actively 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 896-4482.

**Crimes Against Persons**

### 34th to 38th/Market to Civic Center: Threats & Harassment–3
- 04/06/99 1:30 PM Hospital Unchanged calls received
- 04/09/99 11:45 AM Hospital Unchanged calls received
- 04/11/99 1:51 AM Sansom West Unwanted call received

### 38th to 41st/Market to Baltimore: Robberies (Attempts)–4; Aggravated Assaults–1; Simple Assaults–2
- 04/05/99 5:23 PM 3800 Blk Locust Complainant assaulted
- 04/08/99 11:00 PM Harrison House Harassing e-mails sent to computer
- 03/27/99 7:30 AM 3901 Chestnut St. Complainant robbed/attempt
- 04/09/99 10:12 PM 3901 Chestnut St. Complainant robbed/attempt
- 04/10/99 5:43 AM 3923 Walnut St. Unknown suspect attempted to rob complainant
- 04/10/99 10:53 PM Chestnut Hall Unwanted calls received
- 04/10/99 11:22 PM 4000 Blk Chestnut Complainant robbed by unknown suspect
- 04/11/99 11:22 PM 4026 Market Complainant punched and stabbed/attempt

### Crimes Against Society

### 34th to 38th/Market to Civic Center: Alcohol & Drug Offenses–2
- 04/06/99 6:58 PM 3420 Marivan St Underdrinker
- 04/08/99 9:20 PM 38th & Spruce Male cited for liquor violation and disorderly conduct

### 38th to 41st/Market to Baltimore: Disorderly Conduct–2; Alcohol & Drug Offenses–5
- 04/05/99 8:24 PM 40th & Spruce Male cited for disorderly conduct
- 04/09/99 4:44 PM 40th & Chestnut Male causing disturbance/cited for disorderly conduct
- 04/10/99 2:52 PM 3900 Blk Spruce Male cited for liquor violation and disorderly conduct

### 18th District Crimes Against Persons

9 incidents and 2 arrests (2 aggravated assaults and 7 robberies) were reported between April 5, 1999 to April 11, 1999 by the 18th District covering the Schuylkill River to 49th Street and Market St. to Woodland Avenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Incident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/05/99</td>
<td>9:58 PM 5100 Walnut Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/05/99</td>
<td>11:30 PM 3925 Walnut Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/06/99</td>
<td>12:05 PM 127 50th St. Agg Assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/06/99</td>
<td>5:05 PM 4325 Chestnut Robbery/attempt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/08/99</td>
<td>12:01 AM 4600 Chester Agg Assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/08/99</td>
<td>10:25 AM 3400 Spruce St. Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/09/99</td>
<td>10:12 PM 3900 Chestnut Robbery/attempt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/99</td>
<td>5:42 AM 3923 Walnut Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/11/99</td>
<td>2:05 AM 200 blk 40th Robbery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University of Pennsylvania values diversity and seeks talented students, faculty and staff from diverse backgrounds. The University of Pennsylvania does not discriminate on the basis of race, sex, sexual orientation, religion, color, national or ethnic origin, age, disability, or status as a Vietnam Era Veteran or disabled veteran in the administration of educational policies, programs or activities; admissions policies; scholarship and loan programs; athletic and other University programs and services; student conduct policies; in the education program or activity; or in any other University program or activity. Questions or complaints regarding this policy should be directed to Valerie Hayes, Executive Director, Office of Affirmative Action, 3600 Chestnut Street, 2nd floor, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6106 or (215) 898-6993 (Voice) or (215) 898-7863 (TDD).
When a teacher asks a rhetorical question, students often whisper the answer. Is that an opportunity lost or a way to save time in class? Too often we do not think about the process of teaching, thus losing an opportunity to improve learning.

In an effort to help teachers explore the process of education, the School of Arts and Sciences will open a Center for Teaching and Learning on July 1, 1999. Located in Logan Hall, the new center will assist individual faculty members and departments and will provide printed and electronic resources dedicated to teaching.

The goals of the center will be to sustain and improve effective teaching and learning. It will do this by encouraging faculty, doctoral candidates, undergraduate students and administration to create a supportive atmosphere for enhancing the educational process.

One of the center’s first projects will be to develop a useful website that will provide current information on teaching. This website will expand on the already existing Teachnet provided by the Office of the Vice Provost for Graduate Education. The current site demonstrates that many institutions already have teaching centers eager to share their experience with colleagues. Some, such as Physics, also publish information related specifically to teaching, information that has general and specific applications. All of this information will be available on the site, along with news, timely suggestions and links to other sites.

The center will serve as a clearinghouse for the excellent resources already available at Penn. For example, the combined office of SAS and SEAS Computing provides assistance on using technology in the classroom, as does SAS Multi-Media and Educational Technical Services and Wharton Computing and Instructional Technology. Faculty should contact these offices directly for immediate assistance, but as the center develops, opportunities for coordination will be ample.

The desire to enhance teaching and learning is not new at Penn. Of course, the Graduate School of Education has always engaged in research on pedagogy. Wharton has had a Teacher Development Program since 1984, and various departments within SAS (English, Mathematics, Music and Physics to name a few) have had longstanding programs to train doctoral students. SAS sponsors an orientation program for new faculty and a training program for teaching assistants, and some departments have begun mentoring programs for faculty. The Lindback Society has sponsored several initiatives (including Almanac’s Talk About Teaching column) for collegial discussions about teaching and sponsors lectures on timely topics. Recognizing the importance of learning in the educational process, the Learning Resources and Academic Support Program works closely with students as well as teachers to improve all aspects of education.

The Center for Teaching and Learning will complement existing programs in several ways. First, and most important, the center will provide individual assistance to faculty. Normally, this assistance will include observation and videotaping of a class. The consultation, which is voluntary and completely confidential, works as follows: the faculty member and consultant will have an initial conversation about individual goals and, in some cases, problems. This initial discussion might include a review of a syllabus or course outline, discussion of ways to motivate students, presentation techniques, and many other issues.

...instructors need to know how to observe themselves efficiently.

The next step is videotaping the class. The consultant, accompanied by a camera operator, will sit in on a full class, taking notes on the dynamics of the session. After the class, the videotape immediately becomes the property of the instructor, who will review the tape and make notes on all aspects of the class: organization, presentation, interaction, etc. The instructor will then bring the tape to the consultant, and the two of them will compare notes and review relevant portions of the tape. This process can be repeated within a semester or during succeeding semesters.

In addition to individual consultations, the center will participate in new faculty orientation, sponsor lectures and discussions on teaching issues and work with individual departments to enhance teaching within specific disciplines. One type of departmental program will involve mentoring. Since one of the objectives of the center is to help faculty help each other, senior faculty can learn to advise junior faculty on teaching issues just as they do on research. Mentoring can also be peer-to-peer, especially in team-taught courses or in courses with multiple sections. If done well, faculty mentoring will take advantage of the rich resources for teaching already available within departments. The center will help departments develop faculty mentoring programs that will be specific to the needs of a particular academic discipline.

As the center develops, plans call for an advisory committee, consisting of faculty, graduate and undergraduate students and administrators. The committee will monitor the activities of the center, providing advice and preventing overlap with other programs. The committee will monitor the activities of the center, helping it to meet the needs of individual instructors and academic departments. Individuals who interact with the center will be able to evaluate the process by both formal and informal feedback.

To help departments evaluate and improve their teaching, the center can help develop effective methods of internal observation. Although many departments already have curriculum committees, it might be appropriate to add a teaching committee to help coordinate teaching and learning. Students can participate in the process by forming “quality circles” or engaging in other types of discussions to supplement the end-of-semester evaluations. The center can help coordinate these activities.

Since the primary goal of the new center will be to enhance teaching, instructors need to know how to observe themselves efficiently. The center can help teachers anticipate and solve problems. It can suggest new ways of teaching that will motivate students to learn and help instructors maintain the excitement that attracts them to the profession.

Although the Center for Teaching and Learning represents a new venture, the desire to improve teaching is not new at Penn. Among the goals of the center, therefore, will be to support existing programs, to develop new resources for teaching and to create a collegial and collaborative environment for enhancing the ability to communicate knowledge.

When asked to describe the best attributes of their best teachers, students will often respond: “That’s easy. Enthusiasm and organization.” One student, however, recently gave a different answer: “My best teachers know when I don’t understand what’s being taught.” Developing the ability to know what is being taught and what is being learned is a goal Penn can achieve.

---

This essay concludes the fifth year of the Talk About Teaching series, conducted jointly by the Lindback Society for Distinguished Teaching and the College of Arts and Sciences. Dr. Robbins is currently the director of the Wharton Communication Program and the Wharton Teacher Development Program.

*On July 1, 1999, he will become the director of the School of Arts and Sciences’ new Center for Teaching and Learning.*