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At Council Wednesday, President Judith Rodin announced the formation of a new University working group (right) to look into issues of bicycle and pedestrian safety on campus and issue a report by the end of the spring term.  

[The working group is charged to expedite improvements in safety, Co-chair Carol Scheman notes in a “Speaking Out” response on page 2 of this issue. Ms. Scheman also reports on steps agreed upon at the the group’s first meeting, held last Friday.]  

Other Council coverage, including the State of the University reports of the President and Provost, is in preparation for a future issue. —Ed.

Computing: A Planned Power Outage over Thanksgiving

A 24-hour power outage in the ISC computer room at 3401 Walnut over the Thanksgiving holiday will interrupt service on some key Penn computing systems. Major administrative systems/services that will NOT be available include PennNet through the modem pool will be severely limited. In addition, some important network services will not be operating and University voicemail will be inoperative.

The outage will last from 8 a.m. Friday, November 26, to 8 a.m. Saturday, November 27.

The outage is required so that obsolete technology that provides electrical power service to the computer room, including backup power for emergencies, can be entirely replaced. Power to stores and offices at 3401 Walnut will not be interrupted.

Network traffic to and from the Internet and around PennNet (other than that involving the 3401 Walnut computer room) will NOT be affected. ISC regrets the necessity of the outage but hopes that the timing will minimize the impact.

Some notes on services and systems affected:

Administrative systems: Administrative systems/services that will NOT be available include FinMIS, the Data Warehouse, and all systems housed on IVY.UUMIS (e.g., Student Financial Systems (SFS), Student Records (SRS), Payroll, and Gifts).

Other widely used systems: Penn InTouch, the On-line Directory, the On-line Calendar, Netnews, and the graduate and undergraduate online applications will NOT be available.

Modern/Office/ResNet connections: The main PPP modem pool (215) 573-4778 will NOT be operating. The express pool and the slower CLI pool will be available. Network access from ISP accounts (DCA.Net, AOL, etc.), ResNet rooms, and on-campus offices will also be available.

E-mail: Pobox, dolphin, and mail.sas.e-mail will NOT be available. Messages arriving for accounts on those systems will be delayed but delivered as soon as the systems are up again.

VoiceMail: VoiceMail will NOT be available, so it will not be possible to leave or retrieve messages.

Web: Penn’s home page, Oncolink, University Archives, and the many office and service web sites on the central Web server, www.upenn.edu, will NOT be available. Some School web sites and web applications (Dental, GSE, GSFA, SAS, Blackboard, IRQDB) will NOT be available. Web sites on pobox and dolphin will NOT be available. Web applications that require users to enter a PennNet ID and password to authenticate themselves will NOT be available. The Library Web and web servers in other Schools and offices will be available.

If you have concerns regarding how the outage will affect your work, please call (215) 898-1099 (for administrative systems only) or contact your local service provider (LSP).

—James J. O’Donnell, Vice Provost, Information Systems and Computing

Remembering Ormandy: November 18

Friends of the Library will celebrate the 100th birthday of the late Maestro with a 3-5 p.m. panel discussion Thursday in Dietrich Hall Lounge in Van Pelt-Dietrich Library, along with the continuing exhibition Eugene Ormandy: A Centennial Celebration, from which this photo is taken.

For Wharton and SEAS:

A $2 Million Gift from Ford

Ford Motor Company has donated $2 million to support “a wide range of student and faculty programs” at both the Wharton School and the School of Engineering and Applied Science. President Judith Rodin said $1.5 million of the total will be given over five years to Wharton—representing one of the largest single grants to the school from a publicly-traded company—and that Wharton will use it toward variety of projects including minority programs and fellowships, the LEAP Program for high school students from under-represented minority groups, the Forum on Electronic Commerce, the Global Consulting Practicum and the Environmental Management Program.

The contribution, made possible through Ford Motor Company Fund, continues a relationship between the Ford Motor Company and the University of Pennsylvania that has existed for more than 40 years. Dr. Rodin said, “We are very pleased that Ford Motor Company has chosen to continue what has been a long-standing and productive relationship with Wharton as well as initiate a new relationship with the School of Engineering and Applied Science.”

Dr. Rodin said, “The programs and activities made possible through this generosity are not only important to these schools but represent support for programs and activities that are essential components of the University’s vision for the future.”

Added Jacques A. Nasser, Ford’s president and CEO: “Ford Motor Company’s relationship with the University of Pennsylvania is a partnership in the truest sense, and Ford is committed to keeping it strong.... These initiatives at the University illustrate our continuing corporate commitment to higher education and our belief that academia and business should work more closely together to ensure that future generations of students are prepared to meet the challenges and opportunities of an increasingly competitive business environment.”
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“What I Wouldn’t Do...” (Simon Richter)
A Senseless Tragedy

The tragic bicycle-related death of Dr. Benjamin Tencer, a 70-year old retired engineer attending Penn as a Senior Associate was reported by both the Daily Pennsylvania and Almanac. My deepest sympathies go out to Dr. Tencer’s family at this time.

His tragic death reopened several discussions of issues surrounding bicycle safety that have periodically been reviewed at the University Council including (according to Almanac October 19), proposals for bicycle lanes that would require action by the City.

While the discussions of bicycle lanes can only be viewed as a positive step toward injury prevention, an important point has been completely overlooked: Bicycle helmets. And why no one on our campus wears them. Over the years we’ve seen many Penn students, staff, and faculty members of Philadelphia enter the doors of our Head Injury Center because they did not think to protect their heads in the event of a fall while riding a bicycle or rollerblading.

The use of a helmet has been convincingly shown to reduce head injuries for cyclists of all ages involved in all types of crashes including those with motor vehicles. According to the latest statistics from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, wearing a helmet can reduce the risk of head injury by 85%. An informal survey I have taken over the past two weeks across our campus indicates that fewer than 5% of all cyclists were wearing helmets.

Shouldn’t Dr. Tencer’s untimely death make us realize that these almost daily tragedies are largely preventable? Shouldn’t everyone in the Penn community, young and old, recognize the value of protecting our most precious commodity?

——Tracy K. McIntosh, Professor of Neurosurgery, Director Head Injury Center

A Pedestrian’s Perspective

I am deeply concerned about what isn’t being done to protect students and staff at hazardous intersections throughout the campus. It’s about time someone spoke up about the traffic problems that have been plaguing the campus for years. I applaud Mr. Wolpe for taking the first step (see Almanac November 2). However, it is the University that should have taken that “first step” years ago. Unfortunately this comes too late, especially after the recent deaths of two University members and the serious injury of another. It is situations like these that bring attention to an issue that has been a major problem at Penn for several years.

In addition to the locations Mr. Wolpe spoke of, another that needs to be immediately addressed is the 40th and Locust St. intersection at the Dental School. I focus on this location because one too many times I have witnessed unfortunate mishaps there. I have seen Penn Police on foot and in patrol vehicles at this intersection take no action when vehicles go through posted stop signs. While there are two stop signs on each side of 40th St. as you approach Locust, many times trucks have parked directly in front of them blocking the sign’s view to traffic. Police on duty do not ticket these vehicles as they should; don’t warn the driver as to the hazard posed; and least of all, they don’t tell them to move. If one went to that intersection right now, chances are they would see a truck parked there.

I recently had a bad experience at this intersection due to this type of negligence. After having just dropped someone off for work, I was at the stop sign on Locust approaching 40th Street. As usual I waited until I was sure that the car coming down 40th was completely stopped before I proceeded. Fortunately for the many pedestrians about to cross the street and for myself, we did not take for granted that any car would stop as they should. A car barreled through the intersection. I can only assume that they did not see the stop sign because there was a huge truck parked right in front of it. A Penn Police car parked next to me did nothing to stop the vehicle or make an effort to go after the driver.

Now, more than ever, something must be done about this dangerous situation, especially since it is now a construction site not only for the new Dental School building, but also for the Sundance Cinema. A site of one of the University’s Dental Careoffices, frequented by University staff, students and city residents.

There must be something the University can do in conjunction with the city to prevent another horrible accident. If the University cares so much about its staff and its students as they constantly say they do, then when will they fix this problem? When will we become their priority? According to the report from the Facilities Committee (Almanac October 5, 1999) discussed at Council on September 22, “Several very important areas of transportation are neglected because they ‘fall between’ several departments and get no adequate attention. Good examples of this problem are the neglect of pedestrian traffic and safety, and lack of treatment of bicycle traffic as a system.” I have been impressed with the strides the University has made for creating safer streets for students and city residents—for example, adding brighter lights to walkways. Now how about focusing on some of the busiest intersections throughout campus? Does the University want to wait until another person is seriously injured?

As Vice President John Fry once stated, the Hamilton Village area is “where our campus meets our community” (see Pennsylvania Current October 15, 1998). This is where the University and the City begin; it is a key area that joins the University and the City together. From other articles I have read in Almanac, the University has defined Hamilton Village as a functional and attractive part of Penn’s physical environment.” What about making it a safer part of Penn’s physical environment? With all the proposed construction for the Hamilton Village area, that location in particular will become much more congested than it is now. Please add one more item to the agenda for the Village and to the Agenda for Excellence. Please consider better ways to control the traffic in and around Penn’s campus and secure the safety of all individuals whether a student, staff member, or city resident. I challenge Penn to take the initiative in promoting a dialogue with the City. Mr. Wolpe’s letter is just one of several excellent examples on where to begin. I challenge the University to make this a priority now.

—Cynthia Pretko, Radiation Oncology

Response on Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety

Over the past several years there have been a series of discussions between the University and the City’s Street Department regarding safety improvements to the streets in and around campus. While these discussions have led to the City and State’s Spring 2000 implementation plan to accommodate bicycles along Walnut, Chestnut, Spruce, 33rd and 34th Streets, we have an opportunity to develop a more comprehensive plan by combining the efforts, resources and expertise of members of the Penn community.

President Rodin has asked Thomas Seamon, Vice President of the Division of Public Safety, and me to chair an internal working group to address immediate and long-term concerns about safety of bicyclists and pedestrians on and around campus, many of which have been raised in “Speaking Out” letters in Almanac and other communication outlets. (See page 1 for names to date; a representative from the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly is to be named.)

Dr. Rodin has charged this group with expediting implementation of improved safety conditions for bicyclists on campus and the surrounding major corridors and developing a more comprehensive plan of action than the current City plan. This work will encompass enhanced safety measures and improvements to vehicular traffic as well. The working group met on Friday, November 12.

Based on this meeting, the group agreed to the following phased approach:

1. Specific recommendations for immediate and aggressive action between Penn and the City in regards to: installation of pedestrian crossing signals at street intersections between the Schuylkill River and 40th Streets between Spruce and Walnut Streets (and includes the Smith Walk pedestrian crossings located on 33rd and 34th streets); better control of vehicles (including bicycles) on campus walkways; improvements to pedestrian crossings surrounding various construction sites on campus; development of a bicycle safety education program for members of the Penn community with assistance from the Bicycle Coalition, a city-wide advocacy group.

2. Because the City’s current plan for pedestrian bicycle lanes on Walnut, Chestnut, Spruce, 33rd and 34th Streets by the Spring semester lacks specificity and appears not to address many of our concerns, we believe it could benefit from University input. The group’s traffic and transportation experts will develop recommendations by December to submit to the City and State for their review and implementation. The group will also develop a timeline for further improvements.

The University recognizes that the safety of its students and employees is a priority and intends to ensure that the recommendations of this working group are implemented in a timely manner.

—Carol R. Scheman, Vice President for Government, Community and Public Affairs
CCTV for Public Spaces

In accordance with the University’s Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) Monitoring Policy, the Division of Public Safety is providing Phase Two locations of exterior cameras. The CCTV Monitoring Committee has approved the following locations.

Steve Murray’s Way & Chestnut Street
Steve Murray’s Way & Sansom Street
100 block S. 37th Street—Sansom Common Loading Dock
37th & Walnut Streets
37th Street & Woodland Walk
36th & Spruce Streets
34th & Walnut Streets
33rd Street & Smith Walk
SEAS Courtyard

As additional phases of the project are scheduled, new locations will be published in Almanac.

These cameras will be used by DPS to monitor public areas for public safety purposes. The field of view of the cameras is approximately one (1) city block in all directions. There are specific guidelines for the use of the cameras. The operators of the cameras are located in Public Safety Headquarters, 4040 Chestnut Street and are under the direction of the Penn Police Department. These personnel are specially trained and closely supervised.

It is important to know that, while there will be a number of cameras placed at strategic locations around campus, all cameras will not be monitored at all times. However, all cameras will be recorded 24 hours per day. In addition to observations for safety and security purposes, the cameras will be utilized for alarm verification and in conjunction with other security devices, including the blue light emergency telephone system.

As provided in the Policy, the Committee and the Vice President for Public Safety must approve the release of any information not related to a criminal investigation. Videotapes and/or digital information not retained under specific provisions of the CCTV Monitoring Policy will be regularly purged and destroyed after 30 days. Storage and access to all information is closely secured with access strictly limited and controlled. The committee is authorized to review CCTV procedures and inspect the CCTV operation at any time.

Questions in reference to the CCTV system or policy may be addressed to Thomas Seamon, Vice President for Public Safety or Stratis Skoufalos, Director of Security Services.

The full CCTV Monitoring Policy can be found in Almanac April 13, 1999 or on the web at www.upenn.edu/almanac/v45/n28/cctv.html.

Black United Fund is IN

We are pleased to announce that the Black United Fund (BUF) has recently received state certification to solicit as a charity in Pennsylvania. Therefore, interested employees will be able to choose BUF when contributing to Penn’s Way 2000. This news was received after the other Penn’s Way materials had gone to print. Campaign materials for BUF are now being printed and will be forwarded to the coordinators in each school and center for distribution to interested parties, as soon as the University receives them.

In the interim, for those employees who want to contribute to the umbrella organization of BUF, write CO200 on your pledge card. For those desiring to contribute to a member organization of BUF before the materials are distributed on campus, you may contact Nan Steketee at the Center for Responsible Funding at (215) 925-6140 for individual agency numbers.

Larry Gross and Carol R. Scheman
Penn’s Way Co-Chairs

Raffles: Latest Winners

To qualify for raffles, Penn employees must turn in their completed confidential Penn’s Way envelope to their school/center’s coordinator or facilitator. Employees who mail in their envelopes directly to the Payroll Department can also qualify if they inform their coordinator/facilitator that their forms have been sent directly to Payroll. Selections will be made each Monday during the campaign based on the lists provided by the coordinators and facilitators to the Penn’s Way Campaign by the close of business the preceding Friday.

Congratulations go to the 11/8/99 winners:

- Christina Belden, EHRS—Parking prize
- Jack Lewis, OAA—One night at University City Sheraton
- Vincent DiFelice—Morris Arboretum Class
- Marie Witt, Business Services—La Terrasse Lunch
- Jen Baldino, Office of the President—Penn Book Center certificate

Raffle Prizes Available for Week 3:

- Quicken Software Package; Voucher for 4 two day passes to the Penn Relays (4/27 and 4/28); Voucher for 4 one day passes to the Penn Relays (4/27); Two tickets to UPenn vs. Army Men’s Basketball Game (12/3 at 7 p.m.); and Dinner for two at the Ivy Grill.

Two Deadline Extensions

Models of Excellence

To give more time for nominations for the Models of Excellence program, the deadline has been extended to December 7. We look forward to hearing about the great achievements of our Penn colleagues. Nominations may be submitted for consideration by the Selection Committee via intramural mail to: Models—Human Resources, 527A, 3401 Walnut/6228.

—Division of Human Resources

Trustees’ Council Grants

The Trustees’ Council of Penn Women has extended its proposal deadline to November 30. For applications, call Angela Scott at 898-7811 or stop at Sweeten Alumni House, 3533 Locust Walk. Guidelines are in Almanac October 5 (www.upenn.edu/almanac).
Like many in the room today, I have spent my entire adult life at universities, as a student, as a faculty member, as an administrator, as a president. That may not qualify me for a number of things I would like to do—piloting the space shuttle, for example—but it has given me a number of thoughts and a broad perspective on these institutions we love so well and on their roles and responsibilities in society.

I’d like to share some of those thoughts with you today.

A couple of weeks ago The Philadelphia Inquirer published an editorial addressing the controversy over Australian ethicist Peter Singer, newly appointed to the Princeton faculty. The first line of the editorial was the question: “What’s the point of a university?” Supporting Singer’s appointment, the editorial proceeded to ask, rhetorically, “Is it only to cram a society’s settled opinions into the minds of young adults, to prepare them to ease smoothly into the workplace once they’ve snagged a diploma?”

“Or is it also to spur those minds to become more agile and powerful, capable of challenging and improving upon the received wisdom, able to stretch the boundaries of theory and research?”

We would all agree, I am sure, that the latter goal is paramount. “Spurting minds to become more agile and powerful” sounds like the business we want to be in. And, judging by contemporary results, we’re doing it well in many ways.

At places like Yale and Penn, undergraduate applications continue to skyrocket, research advances garner headlines and greater funding, our graduates have multiple career opportunities, endowments grow to levels we never dreamt of, and other markings of success proliferate. But have those academic programs found synergy in the combination of scholarship and service? Is our knowledge, or our students, inside carefully constructed and vigorously defended disciplinary walls? Our problems are too complex and there are too many other things—about the world and about ourselves—that our students need to learn—and that we need to learn from them.

It is not enough for us to produce brilliant, imaginative doctors, lawyers, scholars and scientists who will press the envelopes of their disciplines or professions if we do not also engage them in the larger issues of our day, in the ferment of our times and our society.

These days there is much talk that cynicism is sweeping over the American spirit, that people are losing faith in institutions, that they are coming to believe that action and involvement are futile. Just look at politics. Why would anyone want to enter that mean-spirited and dispirited arena? Look at the media. Why would anyone want to join a profession that seems to wish to hasten our destruction just so it can report on it?

I have heard the cynics. And I have heard the deafening silence of the indifferent. But that is not all I have heard across the nation’s campuses. I have heard students speak with compassion about the plight of kids in urban ghettos, as well as Bosnia and Somalia. I have watched them do something in response. I have heard faculty explain their research with passion and their constant search for new ways to make teaching a more magical experience. I have heard the loyal dedication of staff members to both the ideals of education and the care of “their” students and faculty. I have heard and been moved by neighbors reaching out for partnerships in our communities.

Building on these impulses, we can be the exemplars of a new kind of civic engagement. The kind of civic engagement I have in mind is neither easy nor accidental. It is strategic, comprehensive, intense, and purposeful. At its best, it weaves itself in and through every aspect of campus life, from medical research and particle physics to classical studies, student volunteerism, and economic development.

It must become not a second thought, not an afterthought, but a matter of forethought and persistent commitment. Though the culture of higher education is notoriously resistant to change, this kind of civic engagement can—and must—become part of the ethos of higher education in the 21st century. Active citizenship is an old idea but today it must contend with new challenges.

Here are some examples of what I have in mind for a university’s role. The first involves the continuing development of academic “service-learning” courses that find synergy in the combination of scholarship and service. Such courses feature a direct and conscious link between the application and social value of knowledge and the academic core of the University. These are not second-rate, watered-down, “applied” field sessions. They are not academic credit for what should properly be volunteer activities. When well-conceived and implemented, they are high-order creations of intellectual sophistication and a precious public spirit.

At Penn we have developed “service learning” courses that go well beyond the alleviation of individual misery—beyond feeding the hungry, sheltering the homeless, or tutoring the “slow learner”—to bring about structural, enduring community improvements such as effective public schools, neighborhood economic development, and vital community organizations.

These academic programs find synergy in the combination of scholarship and service, in their application of theories in practice. The interaction of theory and practice is a part of Penn’s “genetic material” from our founder, the great statesman and scientist, Benjamin Franklin. In a typical Penn program, a student performs service as part of an internship that is coordinated with scholarly research—to the mutual benefit of research and service.

This point is well-illustrated by the work of Robert Giegengack, a geologist, chair of our department of Earth and Environmental Science, and a past director of Penn’s Institute for Environmental Studies. His class in Environmental Studies covers basic research in environmental toxins. Then members of the class help public school students and their
families, most living below the poverty line, to identify sources of lead in and around their homes.

The undergraduates work with students from a nearby middle school to test soil samples from their yards, and dust and paint samples from their homes, and assist in mapping the risk of lead exposure in the neighborhood. In addition, the middle school students work with the undergraduates to design materials that are disseminated to parents and neighbors warning them of the dangers of lead exposure and how to decrease the chances of lead ingestion by the group most at risk of its ill effects, pre-school toddlers.

As a short-term program of outreach and information dissemination, the program has been a dramatic success. School children are now far more knowledgeable about the problem of lead exposure in their homes and neighborhoods, and middle schools now have a unit of study installed in their curriculum that focuses on the lead problem.

And the educational benefits to our undergraduates are enormous. Moreover, the findings of the program are enabling us to better understand the epidemiology of lead exposure in Philadelphia and other cities and may well help other schools in Philadelphia and elsewhere to adopt the program with similar success.

There are many other examples. What is important is that all these courses connect the campus and the world outside in transformative ways.

A second critical form of civic engagement is the commitment that universities, as citizens themselves, make to the quality of life in their neighboring communities. Universities shoulder extensive civic duties, and the manner in which they do so, once again, is an example to their students, to students' communities, to the institutions, neighborhoods, and institutions and their neighbors in the conversations of democracy—which are rarely smooth and rarely easy—is the only way to gain the long-term benefits of mutual trust and mutual understanding.

At Yale, at Penn and at universities across the country—particularly urban universities—progress has been made in this arena. But we must understand that this progress requires regular nourishment. Real progress takes a different mindset, asking not what we do to the community, or even for the community, but rather what we do with the community. The conversations must never stop. I am convinced that sustained community partnerships will help define successful universities in the 21st century, and such partnerships will fail in the absence of a continuous civic dialogue.

In West Philadelphia today, Penn, the public school district, and the teachers' union have formed a unique partnership to build a new university-assisted preK-8 neighborhood school. It will feature small classes and learning communities, active professional development for teachers, a cutting-edge curriculum and other important innovations. It is not a Penn lab school. It is not a charter school. It is a neighborhood public high school near the Penn campus.

In a different type of intervention, we are requiring that all our University construction projects create substantial access for women and minorities and we are investing in small businesses that create opportunity for women to work together with other members of our local community. Indeed, our Wharton entrepreneurship program is helping to develop their business plans. We are working to build community capacity and infrastructure, and we have become a forceful catalyst for change.

Derek Bok recently spoke of the opportunity—and the need—for another community-building role for universities, that is to act as credible information clearinghouses in this age of information overload. He believes—and there is an important role for universities to play in helping to sort out what we know and what we don't know so that people can make sense of all the data. By helping to provide clear information, in certain cases, we may help to explode negative popular myths that breed unfounded cynicism, and we help to provide good data to inform public policy debates.

For example, in its well-known national survey in 1996, The Washington Post found that millions of Americans believe the country's environmental problems have worsened in recent decades, although in fact air and water quality actually have improved. The same survey polled residents of Levittown, Pennsylvania and revealed that their leading source of anxiety was fear of violent crime, fueled by a perception that such crime had significantly increased. The truth, on the other hand, is that violent crime in Levittown has actually decreased by 20 percent over the past generation.

People who believe things are worse than they are make bad decisions. University students who believe most of their peers binge drink—even though the truth is most do not—are much more likely to behave self-destructively themselves.

So, I think Derek Bok is right. Universities could do more to interpret and publicize the fruits of their research to the general public—to clarify what is true and what is false—and greatly benefit public policy and the common good.

But in the end, the most important form of civic engagement on the part of universities may be their own evolution as strong and lively “discourse communities,” forged from the crucible of intense engagement by their members over issues of personal and public moment.

As I see things, we can only create real, solid community by debating—even arguing—with each other over important matters, not by ignoring or suppressing them, especially when we disagree.

Led by this conviction three years ago, I convened the Penn National Commission on Society, Culture, and Community—a group of 46 scholars, political leaders, and shapers of public opinion, including your own David Bromwich—to consider ways to foster a more robust and reasoned public discourse.

The Commission has thought a lot about the fragmentation of communities over issues of race, class, ideology, ethnicity, and special interests, and a current culture of intolerance that too often dominates our public discourse.

As we discussed the problems of incivility, intolerance, and community fragmentation, we quickly came to a consensus that the surface manifestations of incivility are not a new phenomenon in American history, though they are certainly amplified by the advent of mass market entertainment, with its sanitized nationalized global communications.

They are, in fact, probably less worrisome than the absence of a richer, more engaged, more honest, public dialogue. In the past, such an energetic discussion surrounded and contextualized the same kinds of incivility and intolerance that now seem so dramatic and overwhelming.

So, in contrast to some of the other national groups concerned with civility and civic renewal, we have articulated our broadest objective as one of creating “a robust and diverse public culture in which reasoned and reasonable discourse can flourish”—not condemning incivility or moralizing about it.

In fact, we believe that frank, robust—at times, even, uncivil—conversations about issues that really matter to people, are an essential step in the formation of the kinds of inclusive communities that we all desire. For example, think about the often uncivil and certainly robustly engaged conversations the Founders had over independence, slavery, federalism, taxes, and other issues, through which they brought thirteen colonies together to form a single nation.

As part of its work, the Commission has examined a range of communities that create dialogue, engagement, and a sense of shared consequence. As part of this work, we focused on the Penn West Community.

Importantly, such communities seem to emerge less often from a controlled, “civil” conversation and more often from the raw, ragged interactions required when people are thrown together with unavoidable common tasks, “with work to do together,” to use historian Tom Bender’s phrase.

Compare the trite dialogue of President Clinton’s national conversation on race—where participants worked toward no outcome—with the extraordinary manner of discourse in South Africa’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission—where all shared in a common, crucial task.

Such conversations can be—must be—precursors for inclusive, sustainable communities. Such formative conversations are often difficult. They require more than just “rational argument” or “reasonable behavior,” and too much “civility” and “politeness” can be positively destructive.

Rather, good communal conversation involves integrating personal narratives, life experiences, strong emotions, and empathetic listening, with the more traditional norms of rational argument, reasoned debate, and rules of evidence. It is only by risking both our minds—and our hearts—that we can break down the barriers that divide us and form the kinds of communities we so desperately need.

What are the civic tasks in which university communities must engage if they are to be real communities? We must form communities of serious conversation around the most compelling issues of the day—issues like affirmative action, immigration, and health care. Where is the discussion of hot-button, compelling social issues more likely to bear fruit than on our campuses? In doing so, we will offer our students valid experiences of active, engaged public discourse and civic involvement that may serve as life-long prototypes.

When discussions grow hot and ill-tempered, we will show that heat...
and anger can be handled. We may also show we cannot legislate away bad behavior and incivility with codes, policies, and regulations. I would like to spend another moment on this.

Campus speech codes and similar regulations were not able to reduce the level of intolerance or incivility, as we found so painfully at Penn, and they certainly will not moderate the ideological polarizations of our politics. I abolished the speech code at Penn because I believe that such measures fundamentally send the wrong message, a message that reinforces the sense of powerless individuals and of monolithic institutions, of cultural orthodoxy and paternalistic authority, and of ideological conformity and political correctness.

We must learn to use the freedom of ideas and expression to educate rather than to wound. The University administration’s job, in my opinion, is to support such dialogue and debate, not to cut it off; to create an environment in which we can educate each other, not one in which doctrine or orthodoxy are legislated from on high.

Must I provide “moral leadership” to the Penn community? Absolutely. But moral leadership requires susaion not censorship, conscience not coercion. Most of all, it requires insisting that we—all of us—talk about what troubles us. Words are the life-blood of a university. For all their limitations, even if they sometimes drive us apart, words are what bind us together in the academy.

Martin Luther King, Jr., understood the power of words. He believed that we must use them to talk about the difficult and painful issues that divide us, about race and about religion, about politics and about power, about gender and about identity.

Free and robust inquiry or debate is essential to an academic community. Tempting as the mantle of moral leadership may be, it is too often a comfortable excuse for imposing quietude and conformity, where raucous debate and energetic engagement should flourish. And I think we academic leaders—and many of our constituencies—too often feel this temptation and fall prey to it. But we must not. And the students cannot retreat to their computers, their courses, their careers. We all have to engage.

If we can learn this lesson and put it into practice, then we can create together a model community at our universities in which individual and group differences form a mosaic that shows the beauty of our differences, not a melting pot that tries to mask them in a homogenous mix. We are a community of different identities, and we must create a context in which a true diversity of views and opinions, persons and groups, politics and perspectives, is nurtured, valued, and shared. We must openly celebrate our differentness as well as our similarities, and engage one another across all the boundaries of race, ethnicity, nationality, age, religion, gender and sexual orientation, politics and expression.

But we must raise the level of the discourse and each take more responsibility for all the members of our community.

Basic academic values that we already hold, values like respecting complexity, posing substantive rather than rhetorical questions when framing a discussion, welcoming real input and participation, holding open the possibility that we may be in error, and, of course, refraining from ad hominem arguments—these are not only guidelines for good public discourse, but they create in modern universities a readily accessible model for workable communities. By modeling this kind of public discourse and behavior in our universities, I think we will have taken an important step toward fulfilling our leadership responsibilities.

College should be a transformative experience. And it should come as no surprise that, in transforming our students, universities transform the faculty as well, and in transforming our students and ourselves, we surely have the opportunity to experiment with alternative approaches, to test and to tinker, to model transformative experiences for the larger democratic society.

We have the capacity to change people’s expectations of others and of themselves, and I believe fervently that by changing expectations we can set in motion a dynamic that has the potential to begin to influence our society.

If Mandela and his fellow prisoners in their university of the mind can conceive of new forms of democracy while breaking rocks, imagine what we—in our real universities—have the potential to create.

---

**Final Report of the Consultative Committee on the Selection of a Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science**

The School of Engineering and Applied Science Dean Search Committee was convened by President Judith Rodin and Interim Provost Michael Wachter on October 30, 1998. Members of the committee were: Alyssa Abo (Undergraduate student, Biomedical Science, SEAS); Portonovo Ayyagari (Aya Whitney Professor of Dynamical Engineering, SEAS); Morris Cohen (Matsushita Professor of Manufacturing and Logistics, The Wharton School) chair; Peter F. Davies (Director, Institute for Medicine and Engineering, SEAS); Peter K. Davies (Professor, Department of Materials Science and Engineering, SEAS); David Ege (Graduate student, Chemical Engineering, SEAS); Louis A. Girifalco (University Professor Materials Science and Engineering, SEAS); Vijay Kumar (Professor of Mechanical Engineering and Applied Science, SEAS); Kathleen Hall Jamieson (Professor of Communication and Walter H. Annenberg Dean, Annenberg School for Communication); Mitchell Marcus (Chair, Computer and Information Science, SEAS); Solomon R. Pollack (Professor Bioengineering, SEAS); Mitchell I. Quain (School of Engineering and Applied Science Alumnus and Chair of the SEAS Board of Overseers); and Constance C. Goodman (Office of the Secretary) served as secretary to the committee.

In order to understand the issues and challenges facing the School of Engineering and Applied Science, the committee consulted widely with students, faculty, alumni and members of the administration. The goal of the committee was to find a dean who could provide the intellectual vision and leadership necessary to lead the School into the next century in a manner that will maintain and strengthen its academic excellence in education and research. The committee sought candidates with impeccable scholarly and administrative credentials, keen intellect, integrity and the broad knowledge necessary to lead the School as it enters this time of significant change in the field. The search focused on identifying a chief academic officer of the School who could be responsible for all educational programs, research activities, planning, budgeting, development and faculty appointments. The committee was especially interested in engaging candidates who could support the innovative interdisciplinary programs currently underway within the School and across Schools in the University.

The committee solicited nominations from SEAS faculty, students, and alumni as well as from peer institutions across the country. Advertisements were placed in The Chronicle of Higher Education, Black Issues in Higher Education, Hispanic Outlook, The Wall Street Journal (Eastern and Western), Science, Chemical & Engineering News, IEE Spectrum, IIE Solutions, MRS Bulletin, Mechanical Engineering Magazine, and OR/MS Today. In addition, the search firm of A.T. Kearney was engaged to assist the committee in identifying candidates.

In all, the committee met 28 times and reviewed the credentials of 211 candidates, 19 of whom were women, 30 were identified as minorities, and nine were faculty members of the School.

A total of eight individuals were interviewed. At the completion of this process, and after careful deliberation, the committee submitted a set of recommendations to the President and Provost, who subsequently announced the appointment of Eduardo D. Glandt. An accomplished scholar, Dr. Glandt has been both the Carl V. S. Patterson Professor and the Russell P. and Elizabeth C. Heuer Professor of Chemical Engineering. He is also an outstanding teacher and in 1980 received the Lindback Award for Distinguished Teaching. A graduate of the University of Buenos Aires, he received both his M.S. and Ph.D. from Penn. Dr. Glandt has served as Interim Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science since August 1998. The appointment will be submitted to the Trustees of the University for final approval on February 18, 2000.

— Morris Cohen, Chair
The University of Pennsylvania Police Department
Community Crime Report

About the Crime Report: Below are all Crimes Against Persons and Crimes Against Society from the campus report for November 1, 1999 through November 7, 1999. Also reported were Crimes Against Property; 32 total thefts, 1 burglary and 3 criminal mischief. Full reports on the web (www.upenn.edu/almanac/v46/112/). Prior weeks' reports are also online. —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 November 1, 1999 and November 7, 1999. The University Police actively patrol from Market Street to Baltimore Avenue and from the Schuylkill River to 43rd Street in conjunction with the Philadelphia Police. In this effort to provide you with a thorough and accurate report on public safety concerns, we hope that your increased awareness will lessen the opportunity for crime. For any concerns or suggestions regarding this report, please call the Division of Public Safety at (215) 898-4482.

Crimes Against Persons and Society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Offense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/2/99</td>
<td>3:12 AM</td>
<td>200 S 37 St</td>
<td>Defiant trespass; Unauthorized male in building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2/99</td>
<td>2:54 PM</td>
<td>3901 Spruce St</td>
<td>Harassment; Unauthorized calls received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/4/99</td>
<td>2:10 AM</td>
<td>3650 Chestnut St</td>
<td>Harassment; Unauthorized calls received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/4/99</td>
<td>2:45 AM</td>
<td>3900 Walnut St</td>
<td>Disorderly conduct; Unruly male arrested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/4/99</td>
<td>3:56 PM</td>
<td>3700 Walnut St</td>
<td>Harassment; Unauthorized calls received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/5/99</td>
<td>8:28 AM</td>
<td>3901 Market St</td>
<td>Threats; Supervisor threatened by terminated employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/5/99</td>
<td>2:15 PM</td>
<td>36th &amp; Hamilton Wk</td>
<td>Threats; Complainant threatened by ex-boyfriend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/6/99</td>
<td>12:24 AM</td>
<td>4200 blk Walnut</td>
<td>Robbery; Complainant robbed by 2 unknown suspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/6/99</td>
<td>3:35 AM</td>
<td>3744 Spruce St</td>
<td>Assault; Complainant struck by unknown man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/6/99</td>
<td>9:10 AM</td>
<td>3700 Spruce St</td>
<td>Threats; Threatening calls received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/7/99</td>
<td>3:15 AM</td>
<td>4000 blk Walnut</td>
<td>Simple assault; Complainant assaulted by 2 unknown males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/7/99</td>
<td>3:04 PM</td>
<td>3601 Walnut St</td>
<td>Harassment; Unauthorized calls received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/7/99</td>
<td>9:32 PM</td>
<td>3650 Chestnut St</td>
<td>Harassment; Unauthorized calls received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/7/99</td>
<td>11:16 PM</td>
<td>3650 Chestnut St</td>
<td>Harassment; Unauthorized calls received</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18th District Report

10 incidents and 2 arrests (6 robberies, 2 aggravated assaults, and 2 rapes) were reported between November 1 and November 7, 1999 by the 18th District covering the Schuylkill River to 43rd Street and Market Street to Woodland Avenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Offense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/1/99</td>
<td>1:30 AM</td>
<td>700 blk 42nd St</td>
<td>Rape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/1/99</td>
<td>7:00 PM</td>
<td>4800 Chester</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2/99</td>
<td>11:50 PM</td>
<td>5000 blk Spruce</td>
<td>Rape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2/99</td>
<td>3:40 AM</td>
<td>409 46th St.</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/4/99</td>
<td>10:50 PM</td>
<td>4940 Hazel</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/5/99</td>
<td>11:27 AM</td>
<td>4625 Hazel</td>
<td>Robbery/Arrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/99</td>
<td>12:01 AM</td>
<td>4739 Upland</td>
<td>Agg Assault/Arrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/9/99</td>
<td>4:49 AM</td>
<td>3800 Spruce</td>
<td>Agg Assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/9/99</td>
<td>4:00 AM</td>
<td>4600 Chestnut</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/9/99</td>
<td>12:15 AM</td>
<td>4200 Walnut</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What I Wouldn’t Do For Enrollment

by Simon Richter

I like the ambiguity of this title because it captures both the plight and the fervent wish of many a small-department chair. It signals my openness to unconventional possibilities for winning the interest of undergraduate students for courses they might not otherwise consider. In that sense, the statement is incomplete. It should read: What I wouldn’t do for enrollment in rigorous courses that involve significant literary, philosophical and cultural works, or demanding training in advanced language skills and cultural fluency. At the same time, it indicates that I do draw the line somewhere: there are some things I won’t do for enrollment.

One place I do not draw the line is in the matter of giving courses appealing titles. A course that for many years was called “The Faust Legend in Literature” had exhausted its cachet. Renamed “The Devil’s Pact in Literature, Film, and Music,” it promptly struck a chord and enrollment jumped 500%. As a consequence, many more students had an opportunity to read key works of literature (parts of the Bible, Marlowe’s and Goethe’s versions of Faust, and Bulgakov’s Master and Margarita, to name a few) while concurrently learning to recognize the same aesthetic and moral issues in an episode from the Simpsons, the blues of Robert Johnson, and Hollywood films such as The Devil’s Advocate and Angel Heart. We sometimes forget that today’s television and movie writers are frequently graduates of Penn or similar schools and that great works of literature often have their beginnings in popular culture—Faust, after all, started out as a puppet play.

I’ve learned not to underestimate the intellectual curiosity of students. The real challenge it seems to me is to construct a context that allows their urgent intellectual, ethical, and existential issues to intersect with those of the greatest works and ideas of our disciplines. An appeal to students’ vanity, self-interest and ambition is not out of place here. Penn’s undergrads expect the best and that applies to the literature we select as much as to anything else. Student vanity can also be put to work by giving students themselves opportunities to shine. I’m teaching a course on the German mass media, taught in German, and each student was responsible for a detailed “professional” oral presentation on a significant newspaper or magazine. To a person, each prepared a stunning PowerPoint presentation, replete with graphs and pie charts, facts and figures, scanned-in visual material, internet links, and critical analysis. We’ve come a long way from index cards. The extensive preparation itself involved students in more foreign language material than any other assignment I could imagine. Students drew confidence from the flashy PowerPoint display of their own material, and aspired to strike an equivalent tone in their oral presentation.

Another way to arouse student interest and to illustrate the connections between academe and the world at large is to bring local talent to the classroom, or alternatively to take the class out into the world. A freshmen seminar I’m currently teaching called “Food for Thought” is a pretext for introducing students to some Hegel, Freud, and Levi-Strauss, in addition to reading selected classics of literature and film. As we were discussing Knut Hamsun’s Hunger, the original starving artist novel, students also worked in a local soup kitchen—the combined experience was transforming in ways that revealed to them the power of literature. In the same vein, I arranged a visit with the chef of the White Dog Cafe who not only spoke to the class about his relationship to food and cooking, but also generously served each member a three-course meal. These are intellectual experiences students will never forget. Inscribed in each experience is the intellectual principle or concept it was designed to teach. The other day, we were analyzing Babette’s Feast. Our discussion focused on laying out the structural dynamics of the film; as one student listened to the increasingly productive conversation, he suddenly remarked, “Wow, that’s like totally dialectical.” Hegel hit home.

What won’t I do for enrollment? Where do I draw the line? I guess the best way to put it is that I won’t sacrifice my standards or my commitment to the great works and the great ideas in my discipline. Instead, I’ll search for every means, however dialectical, to forge a connection between the lives of students and the world of the liberal arts and sciences.

Dr. Richter is Associate Professor of Germanic Languages and Literatures and chair of the department. Further information about the courses he describes may be found on his home page at http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/german/people/simon.html.

His essay continues the Talk About Teaching Series into its sixth year as the joint creation of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Lindback Society for Distinguished Teaching.