Information Technology Advisory Board

Dr. Susan Wachter, professor of real estate and finance at the Wharton School, was sworn in December 2 as Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research at the Department of Housing and Urban Development. She had been approved by the Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee by a vote of 19 to 1 on November 19. Dr. Wachter, a national expert in housing analysis and the first woman to head the American Real Estate Urban Economics Association, was nominated by President Clinton this summer.

Dr. Wachter has taught at Wharton since 1972 and served as chair of its real estate department from 1997 to 1999. She also served the University as Ombudsman from 1987 to 1990. She has been a consultant to HUD’s Policy Development and Research office for much of the year and is currently on leave from Penn. Dr. Wachter pioneered work on home ownership affordability, including the first-time identification of the impact of borrowing constraints on home ownership. “I believe that expanding access and opportunity to home ownership are critical to the revitalization of our cities and the economic well-being of our nation,” said Dr. Wachter at the nomination hearings.

Provost Robert Barchi has announced the formation of an IT Advisory Board comprising senior faculty and administrators from across the University, as well as student representatives. The Board will meet on a regular basis to advise the Provost on strategic issues involving the use of information technology and their impact on the academic mission of the University.

“Shaping the University of the 21st Century,” Provost Barchi said, “requires us to take a broad view of the future centered on the academic mission of the institution. This Advisory Board draws on the time and talent of some distinguished Penn patriots and will support our work in important ways.”

The group was formed with consultation from the chairs of the Senate Executive Committee and will be chaired by James J. O’Donnell, Professor of Classical Studies and Vice Provost for Information Systems and Computing. The Advisory Board will include:

- Mary Alice Annecharico, Dir., Information Services, School of Medicine
- Robin Beck, Associate Vice President, ISC
- Peter Conn, Deputy Provost
- Margaret Cotroneo, Associate Professor, Nursing in Psychology
- Susan Davidson, Professor, CIS
- Laura Ducceschi, GAPSA
- Kathryn Engebretson, Vice President, Finance
- Alan Filreis, Professor, English
- Thomas Gerrity, Reliance Professor, Management and Private Enterprise
- Theo LeCompte, Co-Chair, Committee for Tangible Change
- Elizabeth Kelly, Professor, Law: Dir., Biddle Law Library
- Gerard McCartney, Executive Dir., Wharton Computing and IT
- Russell Neuman, Professor, Communication
- Michael Palladino, Executive Dir., ISC Networking
- Patricia Renfro, Associate Dir., Library Public Services
- Stanley Schwartz, Associate Professor, Medicine
- Dana Tomlin, Professor of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning
- Ira Winston, Executive Dir., SAS and SEAS Computing
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1. Chair’s Report. Faculty Senate Chair John Keene noted there was faculty concern regarding scheduling of the open forum on phasing out of the modem pool at the same time as the SEC meeting. He reminded SEC that there will be an open forum regarding the Campus Development Plan on December 6 and 13 (see ALMANAC November 23/30, 1999) on separate issues. He also said that the University is planning changes in the 403b retirement plan to insure compliance with the Internal Revenue Service requirements (see page 9).

2. Past Chair’s Report on Academic Planning and Budget Committee. There have been two meetings of the Academic Planning and Budget Committee since the last SEC meeting. One focused on the internal cost recovery system and the other on research administration and regulatory affairs.

3. Election of 1999-2000 Senate Nominating Committee Chair. Robert Hornik was elected as chair of the committee (see page 3).

4. Selection of 2000 Senate Committee on Committees. Nominations were made for the seven positions on the committee. SEC voted and the winners will be contacted.

5. Informal Discussion with the Provost. Provost Barchi addressed several topics requested by Senate Chair John Keene. The Provost stated that the University agreement with Singapore Institute of Management is to advise them on development of a return a Penn undergraduate business program leading to a bachelor’s degree in management for their new Singapore Management University (SMU). SMU will award graduate and undergraduate degrees. Professor Janice Bellace, former director of the Wharton-SMU Research Center, is taking a two-year leave of absence from the University to serve as SMU’s first president. SMU’s initial funding will be from the Singapore government. A SEC member asked whether SMU would operate under University of Pennsylvania guidelines covering conflict of interest and freedom of research and publication. Provost Barchi said he would review the agreement and report back to SEC.

6. Proposed Handbook Revision Concerning Clinical Faculty in the Associate Dean’s Office. Faculty Senate Chair Gerald Porter stated that when he worked on the Policy on Safeguarding Assets, privacy was the responsibility of the individual to the system. The Policy on Electronic Privacy is meant to extend the protection now afforded to materials in Penn offices to electronic materials in Penn virtual offices, our computers. He believes the policy would have gone through more quickly if it covered only faculty privacy, but the proposed University policy covers faculty, staff and students and is therefore more complicated. This draft policy is intended to make the guidelines aware of their responsibility to the individual. He advised SEC that e-mail should be treated as though it were a postcard. In the end, the caveat is that there is no guarantee of electronic privacy.

7. Draft Policy on Electronic Privacy. SEC member and chair of the University Council Committee on Communications Martin Pring provided background on the proposed revised policy and invited comment. He recalled that in 1995 a previous version of the policy was brought to SEC for faculty comment and was approved unanimously by University Council. Subsequently it disappeared. The drafting committee has been negotiating with the Office of the General Counsel to revive the proposal. The draft before SEC is a compromise on the original version. Professor Pring noted that case law clearly favors the rights of employers who supply equipment to gain access to their employees’ electronic communications. Under the law, employee e-mail is completely open to the employer, but in Professor Pring’s view the University will not go that far with faculty e-mail. Another member of the drafting committee and former Faculty Senate Chair Gerald Porter stated that when he worked on the Policy on Safeguarding Assets, privacy was the responsibility of the individual to the system. The Policy on Electronic Privacy is meant to extend the protection now afforded to materials in Penn offices to electronic materials in Penn virtual offices, our computers. He believes the policy would have gone through more quickly if it covered only faculty privacy, but the proposed University policy covers faculty, staff and students and is therefore more complicated. This draft policy is intended to make the guidelines aware of their responsibility to the individual. He advised SEC that e-mail should be treated as though it were a postcard. In the end, the caveat is that there is no guarantee of electronic privacy.

8. Motion of Thanks. Chair-elect Larry Gross noted that normally in the spring at the end of the term of the Faculty Senate Chair there is an expression of gratitude and SEC has already done that, but SEC needs to do that again. It was moved, seconded and adopted that the Senate Executive Committee expresses its gratitude to both outgoing Faculty Chair John Keene and outgoing Secretary Martin Pring for their above and beyond the call to duty for the Faculty Senate. The motion was adopted unanimously by applause.

9. Modem Pool Phase-out. Vice Provost for Information Systems and Computing James O’Donnell summarized the reasons for the proposed phase-out and the feedback received from faculty, staff and students. The cost of the modem pool is high, it is rising rapidly, and the technology will be out-of-date rather than a modem pool, arrangements will be made that allow access to the library, FinMIS, SPS, etc. He is hearing from many graduate students, who live on an $1100 stipend, and part-time faculty that they will be adversely affected by any increased cost. Vice Provost O’Donnell said the administration will recommend several remote access providers and will identify those who may make it difficult to use a Penn e-mail address. The policy may include making a smaller, slower modem pool available free, at least over the near term. He closed his remarks by inviting comment via e-mail.

Lindback Nominations

Letters of nomination for the Lindback and Provost’s Award for distinguished teaching are being accepted through December 13. Please send letters of nomination to Terry Conn 3611 Locust Walk/6222 or to conn@pobox.
Under the Faculty Senate Rules, formal notification to members may be accomplished by publication in Almanac. The following is published under that rule:

To: Members of the Standing Faculty
From: John C. Keene, Chair

Nominations for Offices Requested

In accordance with the Rules of the Faculty Senate you are invited to suggest candidates for the posts and terms stated below, with supporting letters if desired. Candidates’ names should be submitted promptly to Robert Hornik, Chair of the Senate Nominating Committee by telephone at (215) 898-7057 or by e-mail at rhornik@asc.upenn.edu.

The following posts are to be filled for 2000-2001:

Secretary-elect: (Incumbent: Vacant)

Four At-large Members of the Senate Executive Committee (3-yr term)
(Incumbents: Larry Gladney, Howard Lessnic, Ann O’Sullivan, Daniel Perlmutter)

One At-large Member of the Senate Executive Committee (1-year term)
(Incumbent: Holly Pittman)

One Assistant Professor Member of the Senate Executive Committee (2-yr term)
(Incumbent: Kathleen Hall)

Three Members of the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (3-yr term)
(Incumbents: Jere Behrman, Oscar Gandy, Ruth Muschel)

Three Members of the Senate Committee on Conduct (2-yr term)
(Incumbents: Jane Alavi, Lee Cassanelli, Vivian Gadsden)

Two Members of the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (3-yr term)
(Incumbents: Jane Barnsteiner, David Hackney)

* At its November 3, 1999 meeting, the Senate Executive Committee instructed the 1998-1999 Senate Nominating Committee to nominate a candidate for Chair-elect (see Almanac November 9, 1999).

Nominating Committee Elected

The Senate Executive Committee’s slate of nominees for the Senate Nominating Committee was circulated to the Senate Membership on November 9, 1999. No additional nominations by petition have been received within the prescribed time. Therefore, according to the Senate Rules, the Executive Committee’s slate is declared elected. Those elected are:

Dennis F. Culhane (assoc prof social work)
Julie Fairman (assst prof nursing)
Robert Hornik (prof communication), Chair
Madeleine M. Joullie (prof chemistry)
Kenneth Lande (prof physics)
David R. Manning (prof pharmacology/med)
Francis Mante (assoc prof restorative dentistry)
Gerald F. Porter (prof mathematics)
Phyllis Rackin (prof genl honors in English)

—Robert Barchi, Provost

Guidelines for Addressing Academic Issues of Students with Disabilities

Policy Statement

The University of Pennsylvania is committed to providing equal educational opportunities to all students, including students with disabilities. Penn does not discriminate against students with disabilities and provides reasonable accommodation to a student’s known disability in order to afford that student an equal opportunity to participate in University-sponsored programs.

Protection from Discrimination

The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 prohibit discrimination against people with disabilities in institutions like Penn that receive or benefit from Federal financial assistance. The ADA further protects from discrimination against persons who are associated with an individual disability.

Definitions

Disability—Under the law, a person with a disability is defined as an individual who (1) has a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities (2) has a history or record of such an impairment, or (3) is regarded as having such an impairment. Examples of recognized disabilities under the law include, but are not limited to, blindness, deafness, paralysis, cystic fibrosis, lupus, mental illness, HIV/AIDS and specific learning disabilities including Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD).

Reasonable Accommodation—a modification or adjustment to an academic program that enables an otherwise qualified individual with a disability...
ability full access to participation in University-sponsored programs. These modifications should not alter the fundamental purpose of the course.

Reasonable accommodation is determined on an individual basis and will reflect the functional impairment so that accommodation(s) may vary from class to class depending upon course content and format. Accommodations are intended to be effective and reasonable; they may not be exactly what the student wishes or requests.

**Appropriate Documentation** — a written evaluation or report provided by a clinician in a specific profession or area of expertise who is considered qualified to make the diagnosis. The documentation must be current, comprehensive and may include clinical and social histories from parents, counselors and specialists. A diagnosis must be included. Accommodations must relate to the student’s specific functional limitations within the academic setting. The documentation must conform to well-established practices in specific areas/fields.

### Responsible University Offices

Since August 1998, all students with Learning Disabilities and/or ADHD are served by the Office of the Learning Disabilities Specialist in Counseling and Psychological Services. All students with motor or sensory disabilities are served by the Program for People with Disabilities located in the Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity Programs.

Each responsible University office is available to assist faculty, academic support staff, and students in reaching a joint determination of academic accommodations, where needed.

- The Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunities, Program for People with Disabilities, Suite 228, Sansom Place East, 3600 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6106 or call (215) 898-6993 (Voice) or (215) 898-7803 (TDD).
- The Office of the Learning Disabilities Specialist, Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS), Suite 225, Sansom Place East, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6106 or call (215) 573-8459.

For additional information on the Memorandum, contact one of the above responsible University offices.

### Accommodation Procedure

**The Role of Students**

All students with disabilities who seek an accommodation at Penn have the responsibility to identify themselves to the responsible University office. Identification may take place at admissions or at any time during the student’s course of study.

All students with disabilities have the responsibility to provide documentation at their own expense in order to be considered for accommodations. Either disability office may request additional documentation from students if the determination of a disability is inconclusive, or if the documentation does not support the accommodations requested.

The request for accommodation and supporting documentation must be provided in a timely manner.

After documentation of disability has been approved and accommodations have been proposed, students must give permission for letters to be sent to all instructors in whose classes accommodations are being requested. Instructors should review the proposed accommodations (see below). After there is agreement on the appropriate accommodation, students are encouraged to introduce themselves to professors directly and to initiate a dialogue about their particular needs.

**Role of Faculty and Academic Support Staff**

Faculty members and academic support staff have a responsibility in ensuring equity in their programs and classrooms. However, the modifications offered should not fundamentally alter the academic requirements essential to a program of study or to licensing prerequisites.

Once faculty members have been notified officially, through presentation of a verification letter from the appropriate University office, that a student has a disability and that accommodations are being requested, instructors should review the proposed accommodations. If an accommodation is found to alter fundamentally the structure of a course the instructor should contact as quickly as possible the appropriate University office to request modification of the proposed accommodation, as the presence or absence of an accommodation may affect the students ability to take the course.

It is also important to recognize that students with disabilities must reach the same performance standards to fulfill degree requirements as their non-disabled peers. Accommodation provides the student with a disability with equity, not unfair advantage.

Faculty and academic support staff are required to consider accommoda-

---

**Guidelines for Addressing Academic Issues of Students with Disabilities**

(continued from page 3)
At Council on November 10, The President and Provost presented their annual State of the University reports. Below are the reports given by Provost Robert Barchi and Deputy Provost Peter Conn. President Rodin’s report was published in the November 23/30 issue. –Ed

The State of the University, 1999-2000 by Robert Barchi and Peter Conn

Report of the Provost

It really is a pleasure to have this opportunity to tell you a little bit about what’s happened with the academic programs of the institution during the past year. I want to diverge a little bit from tradition and not spend the whole time talking about what we’ve done, but rather also focus on where we’re going so you will know what’s happening during the coming year. I’ll take a few minutes to talk about the global indicators, what people are saying about how Penn’s doing in our core mission. Then I’ll address strategic planning, how we do it and how that lays out at various levels of the University, what we’ve accomplished and what we’re planning to do. I will conclude with some cross-cutting initiatives that we have to pay attention to during the year, where we are on those and where we’re going.

You’ve heard the President say that we both have children who are seniors in high school and we’re making the college circuit with our sons. It is interesting to hear what’s going on with other students who are making that circuit. The very unquantitative statement is that Penn’s hot. Other students who are making that circuit. The very unquantitative statement is that Penn’s hot. It is an indication of how Penn looks to the outside community.

Undergraduate Admissions

Let’s take a look at where we were last year and how that compares to prior years in terms of how students see us. Let’s look at two areas. One is our core undergraduate mission, which cuts across a large part of our academic enterprise, and the second is the production of new knowledge—our research enterprise.

I look for trends because trends tell me something year-to-year. (Figure 1) Here’s a trend that tells me something. This is the number of students that have applied to Penn, going from 13,700 to nearly 18,000 last year. Our target number of admissions is 2,500. In order to get that number we have been accepting about 4,800. With the rising interest in Penn, Lee Stetson ratcheted down the numbers last year and accepted a lower number of students—about 4,668. In the end, we actually wound up with more students accepting Penn than ever before. This has caused some unhappiness with parents of incoming freshman and a lot of e-mail from those freshman who found themselves living in the Sheraton rather than the Quad, but it is an indication of how Penn looks to the outside community.

The admission rate, which is basically our quality indicator—how selective can we be in looking at the incoming class—has been getting progressively better. Down is good. We’re dropping down this year, into the neighborhood of 26% and I would expect that the admission rate in the coming year will be well below that.

Now does that mean that we’re just taking anybody that walks in the door? The answer clearly is no. If you look at the quality indexes, in this case the predictive index, that rolls together things like SAT scores and class rank and AP placement and everything else, all of the predictive indices, be they for the total applicant pool, the total pool that we admitted or the total matriculation pool, is continuing the trend upward. Not only are we being more selective, and is the pool getting bigger, but the students who actually matriculate here are of increasingly high academic quality.

An early indicator of how we are doing this year is the early admit pool. As you know, students that we accept in early admit, accept us with a rate that’s in the high 90s. Our early admit pool as of today is up 15% from last year. We’ll know in a couple of weeks what the final numbers are. That’s a pretty good indication of where we are. Visits on campus, in spite of all the construction, are up considerably over last year. According to Lee, students who are accepted to Penn, who visit campus, accept us with about 70% plus probability. So overall the undergraduate mission looks very strong, we had a very good year last year, and I anticipate an even better year this year.

Research

The other metric that I look at for how we are meeting our core mission, is research activity. One of the surrogates for research activity certainly not the only one, are total awards received, and total grant dollars coming into the University from all sources.

That’s been trending upward progressively, especially in the latter part of this decade where Penn has enjoyed double digit growth at a time when many institutions have been flat. Much of...
that activity, not unexpectedly, has been in the School of Medicine. It’s been expanding its space, expanding its faculty and those faculty have been very successful in obtaining grants. But I should point out that the grant dollars in the rest of the University are also expanding. And if you look at the school that’s number one in terms of per capita grant dollars it’s not the School of Medicine, it’s the Graduate School of Education, one of our smallest schools. So this activity is spread all across the campus and is a strong indicator of the vitality of our research enterprise. We’re close to $1/2 billion a year in research awards, $467 million last year and this year looks like it may well be another double digit growth year.

Now let me raise several areas regarding research where we have to work hard this year. I’m going to start with the bottom of the slide. (figure 2) Research has increasingly become a regulated business. There is more and more compliance that we have to do. That means more and more of our time that we have to invest in things that you will hear with acronyms like IRBs and IA-CUCs. These committees monitor patient-related research and animal-related research. We have to do an even better job to ensure our compliance.

We have recruited two outstanding people to the staff, Andy Rudzynski and Joe Sherwin, to head up pieces of the infrastructure that support the research enterprise. But the investment in the infrastructure has been going up only 2%-3% per year at a time when the research volume has been growing 12-15% a year. We’ve been working with the deans to better link the financing of the research enterprise. But the investment in the infrastructure has been going up only 2%-3% per year at a time when the research volume has been growing 12-15% a year. We’ve been working with the deans to better link the financing of the infrastructure to the grant raise so that this infrastructure grows at a rate that’s compatible with our overall enterprise.

I’ll leave you with one note of caution here, and that is the cost of research. Every dollar that we bring into the University requires that we spend a certain amount of money for that research to be done, be it in light and heat, or safety and security, or a dozen other costs that go into the enterprise. That comes to the University in part through an indirect cost rate, money that’s given to the University as a percentage of the overhead, so the effective indirect cost recovery rate for the University is currently down around 38.5%. This is at a time when we are using bigger, better and more expensive research space.

We have a major challenge that we have to deal with here to make sure that we do our research in the most efficient way we can and that we look very carefully at the cost of doing research. We have several committees that focused directly on that issue this year.

**Strategic Planning**

Let me turn now to strategic planning for this academic enterprise. We’ve talked on a number of occasions about the University’s personality with its twelve schools and a small campus. I like to think of these as overlapping bubbles or a Venn diagram that may vary in terms of size by the number of students and the size of the research operation, but are clustered and overlapping because of the remarkable amount of interdisciplinary activity that takes place on the campus. Some of them are focused heavily on undergraduate enterprise, some of them are more at the professional level, some of them are combinations of both. How do you do planning for something as interrelated as this? (figure 3)

We use a multi-level approach here that looks at stratas of planning across the University. One strata looks at planning that deals with the University as a whole and all the schools’ programs. This is the President’s Agenda for Excellence. These are fundamental goals that are set for all of us in each school that we ask each school to articulate in their individual strategic plans. That Agenda for Excellence leads to academic priorities which might be between schools or within schools.

In addition, each school develops a strategic plan which interfaces with the Agenda for Excellence, and is done in conjunction with the other deans and the provost. That plan may have some components that are clearly part of the Agenda and other components that are school specific which may be within a school or ride between schools. Let’s look at several of those layers, I’m not going to be able to cover all of what’s been done or what we’re going to do. I just want to highlight a few areas.

**Academic Priorities**

First, I’ll highlight the Agenda for Excellence which is translated into each in the six academic priorities. Let me just choose three priorities and tell you about some of the exciting things that are happening.

**Life Sciences Technology and Policy**

I’ve spoken here before about the Center for Cognitive Neuroscience which we got off the ground in the spring of last year. That’s now up and running, and Martha Farah is the head of the center. It has a physical space, and we just learned a couple of days ago that we received a $2 million grant from the Howard Hughes Medical Institute to support program development and faculty recruitment in this area. The idea here is to make investments from the central administration in key interdisciplinary areas that can then be leveraged into additional funding outside. That’s exactly the way we want to see things done. Another big one that we’re going to look at this year is Genomics, an initiative, that again will cut across the campus, is an area that I think is critically important for our credibility in the life sciences.

**American and Comparative Democratic and Legal Institutions**

The Annenberg Public Policy Center opened on campus just a few weeks ago. It is a center that’s committed to the education of students in communication and the use of communications to better society and to attain the highest goals of citizenship. Many of you saw the impressive things that this center did during the past election campaign: really remarkable interactions between students and candidates. The candidates literally took the socks off the some of the candidates when they heard what these high school students were doing and the kinds of questions they were asking. A tremendous program was put together there.

We’ve been able to recruit four key faculty members in Political Science last year and I think again with a faculty like John DiLulio this program is off and running.

**The Urban Agenda**

I’ll mention just the urban education initiative that involves a number of our schools including the Graduate School of Fine Arts, the Graduate School of Education and the School of Social Work. We recently heard from the School Board that $20 million had been appropriated for the construction of the new pre-k through 8 school in West Philadelphia. This is a true community school, but will also represent a major initiative from our academic institution both in helping to plan it and also providing the very best in education for the children that will be there. So again, a leverage opportunity. The Center for Children’s Policy Practice and Research is bringing together medicine, law, social work, and Graduate School of Education, to focus on issues that have to do with improving the well-being of our children, the development of children, the opportunities to grow up safe and healthy in their homes and in their local environments.
With Larry Sherman, a revitalized Fels Center is being redirected and is back firmly in focus. I could go on with the other three Agenda topics in the same way. Lots of progress has been made during the past year and lots of new initiatives are being planned.

**School-Specific Programs**

Some things can be done through the Agenda for Excellence but others require school-specific programs. I want to focus just on two schools in my comments. The environment in which any one school operates reflects what’s happening for all the schools. We recognize that every school thrives only because of the success of all the schools. Having said that, there are some areas which we have to identify for special attention during the course of the year.

**School of Engineering and Applied Sciences**

Let me just mention two of them. One, SEAS, the President already focused on, and I’ll go over it very briefly. If I look at what we can do to improve the visibility and level of our undergraduate program, we can accomplish a tremendous amount. I would like SEAS to make that goal and making it excellent. Perhaps more than taking an excellent school and making it one step better. We really need to focus on schools that can benefit from the leverage. This is an area that is resurging in terms of its academic potential. It is an opportunity for niche marketing because of interactions with medicine, law, and with other schools in the University. It’s one where we focus on timing with leadership change, now having a new dean with Eduardo Glandt. We will be supporting the school as the President indicated in its three main areas, computer and information sciences, bioengineering and materials sciences with major new programs, major facility upgrades that will extend over a period of several years.

**School of Arts and Sciences**

The other area that is absolutely critical for the reputation of the University is the School of Arts and Sciences. It has the largest undergraduate student base. It provides a critical reputational area for Penn. We have strong new leadership in its dean, Sam Preston. It clearly has deferred investments in program and physical space, and fundraising potential which is still being developed. This is an area where we can focus our attention and leverage the effect. We concur with the areas that have been identified by the school in its strategic plan working in conjunction with the provost's office and the Agenda focusing on the humanities, English, history, the social sciences, political science and economics and in the natural sciences particularly on biology and psychology. You’ve heard me talk before about the critical need to upgrade facilities in some of these areas. One area that we’d like to focus our attention on is this area of the natural sciences.

Let me finish with a few more general initiatives that need attention during the coming year: again, cross–cutting programs that apply to each school, interdisciplinary programs that knit our schools together, the strategic plans of individual schools which can be improved so that the matrix in which the schools operate are improved. There are other aspects of the University that cut across all this. For example the entire complex of schools is embedded in a physical space and the President has already spent considerable time talking about the Campus Development Plan. That is something we are going to push very hard on this year, it is very important for the future of the core academic mission.

**Technology**

Another general consideration is technology. Everything we do, whether it’s the core academic mission, student life, or athletics, whatever goes on in the University takes place in the environment of our technological competence. If we are going to be a great University, we must be at the cutting–edge technologically too. I have asked faculty to come together with me during the course of the year to look at how we use technology, to recommend how we can be at the very cutting–edge of technology in our own classrooms, in the exchange of information on campus and in distance learning. That also triggers other considerations that cut across the entire faculty in all our schools, the biggest of which is the issue of copyright policy. We have a committee that is now being formed which will meet during the spring that will work with the provost’s office to create a Copyright Policy that can take us forward into these new areas of distance learning and software and web based information transfer.

In concluding, I want to tell you that the most positive thing that I’ve done in the past seven or eight months is to convince Peter Coughlin to be my deputy provost. I’ve introduced Peter to you before. You know his tremendous talents as a humanist, an author and a teacher. He’s been a Penn person for many, many years. He’s made a tremendous difference in life around the provost’s office. I’m going to ask Peter to take a few minutes to talk about graduate and undergraduate programs that specifically fall under his purview and then perhaps then we can take questions together.

**The Report of the Deputy Provost**

This is my first more or less formal appearance at Council in this new role, although many of you and I have crossed paths and even swords over many years. So I what I shall do is introduce myself and the elements of the assignment that the provost and I have talked about over the last couple of weeks and months, and then provide some particulars. The emphasis is actually going to be on undergraduate education rather than graduate education although, as Bob has mentioned, and as I will mention again, both are part of the package.

As you know, there has been a fairly significant redesign of the deputy provost position in this iteration. This was intended to underscore the centrality of educational purposes within the administrative activities of the University. A process of consultation has yielded a job description with three broad elements, which I will summarize in just a sentence or so apiece.

The first is to support the provost, who, if I may say so, is doing a terrific job, sometimes by taking responsibility for particular issues, and sometimes by serving as consultant or representative.

The second is to work with the schools, both undergraduate and graduate, usually by way of the graduate and undergraduate deans; both groups of deans are organized quite formally as committees and meet on a regular basis to advance their educational program.

The third is to work with several cultural resource centers, such wonderful places as the Annenberg Center, the Institute for Contemporary Art, the Arthur Ross Gallery, the University Museum, to assist them in addressing common goals, projects and problems. I want to return to that at one at the end of the century.

Let me begin with three governing assumptions, which I shared both with the committee I talked with last summer and again with Bob. In designing a deputy provostship which called some particular attention to the educational purposes of the University, we were at the same time insisting on the following key statement: that neither undergraduate nor graduate education at Penn is broken or in need of repair. Every measure available to us, from student evaluations of teaching, to admissions and matriculation data, to the research grants and the prizes won by the faculty and their academy memberships, indicates that our collective efforts are strong and indeed are surely stronger than they ever have been. By all the national rankings, people out there agree with that. The redesigned deputy provostship therefore represents an effort not to solve a problem but to capitalize on success at a major transition point in the University’s history. That was the first assumption and it continues to guide my own thinking.

Second, Penn is a federal institution, as our moderator and constitutional scholar Will Harris regularly reminds us. The principal responsibility for the conduct of our educational enterprise lies with the individual schools and with their faculties and deans and students and so we work under that governing assumption.

Third and finally, within that framework, the provost’s office does continue to play certain important roles. You’ve heard about some of them with respect to planning and there are many others. But from my point of view, the first of my own roles is to attempt to expedite, to articulate, to encourage, sometimes to discourage, and when appropriate to monitor— for instance, to measure existing progress and proposed initiatives against the University’s goals, specifically as laid out in the Agenda for Excellence. In other words, there does remain a long list of educational and academic issues, especially those that engage more than one school at a time, for which some oversight or involvement at the provost’s level seems appropriate. I’m going to give you a list of some of those in which I found myself involved. In a sense this will provide you with some of the details that underlie the general overview that the President and the Provost have already provided.

**College Houses**

You’ve heard a great deal about this, so I’m not going to tell you a lot about it again. I will only emphasize that this is a remarkably ambitious undertaking. The dollars that we hear associated with possible renovations and construction are quite extraordinary—indeed depending on my mood quite alarming. But the intellectual ambitions are even more important: in a relatively rapid period of time, to transform what had essentially been a set of dormitory spaces into educationally and culturally productive spaces,
and along with that to provide opportunities for students actually to take leadership roles. I will tell you quite candidly that I regard the College House System as very much a work-in-progress. I bring two perspectives, first as a member of the faculty, if that’s still a permissible self-reference, and as a master of one of these College Houses, which provides what I would never call a worm’s eye view but a hands-on experience. Clearly, heroic efforts have been undertaken and some tremendous accomplishments can be itemized. Nonetheless, it seems reasonably clear that the College Houses are not yet adequately imbedded in the culture of our campus. I don’t think that our faculty are sufficiently attentive to them. Frankly I’m not sure that all our students are sufficiently attentive to them, and here remains a lot of interesting and challenging work to be done. As you know, every new student now is automatically enrolled in a College House, and College Houses continue to involve many students after even their first year. In addition to undergraduate participation, the program involves a significant number of graduate students, since something like 25 graduate students are now living in those undergraduate residences as advisors and staff members.

Hubs

A related and emerging and quite exciting work-in-progress is what we sometimes call hubs. Writers House has been tremendously successful and has called remarkable attention to the opportunities that are offered by non-residential spaces where students are brought together by their shared interest in some subject or theme. I’ve had a close view of Civic House, the second of our hubs, because I’ve been rather actively involved in it. These first two so-called hubs provide both extraordinary opportunities for Penn, that simply weren’t here as recently as five years ago. Students themselves comment at great length on it, and also express interest in additional hubs. So again this is a work-in-progress, in the sense that what hubs could mean to our campus is an almost open-ended question. Indeed so successful have the first two been that every day by e-mail I hear from at least one group or individual nominating himself to be the hub and telling me exactly which very attractive central campus space they ought to occupy.

There are also a long list of what I will call thematic connections and across schools in which I’m either already deeply engaged or looking forward to addressing. I’ll give you just a couple of examples. Internationalism, by which I don’t mean exclusively the administrative work done so ably out of the Office of International Programs, but rather the theme of globalism and internationalism which is so central to the Agenda for Excellence. In fact we are a far more internationally university than we used to be by every measure, and technology and transportation are making universities of our sort more global in our populations and perspective every day. Where does Penn want to be in five years, for instance, with respect to programs of study abroad? What common standards should there be university-wide? Another topic of interest to the broad community is service learning courses. Penn offers more of these courses, which combine academic work with one kind of community service, than any other university in the United States. We are attempting in more or less sophisticated ways to give students the opportunity to enrich their educations both as young scholars and as citizens and servants of the community. Once again, what sorts or level of university-wide standards might be appropriate?

Technology

Another rapidly emerging issue which is transforming every aspect of our common experience is, of course, technology. My particular interest is in such questions as the uses of technology in distributed learning and advising. How can technology enrich our courses on campus? Research, which the provost illustrated on the macrolevel with respect to the astonishing numbers of research grants and contracts that our faculty generate, is of great importance as well to our educational program for both graduate and undergraduate students. I have been consulting with faculty and students on the design of a research hub or center; I hope fairly soon we’ll be able to offer a wheel out a draft and let people poke at and give us advice on. The purpose would be to enhance the opportunities for students to get high quality research work done. Sometimes it will mean providing some funds or facilities or some venues to make contacts they might otherwise not have been able to make, and to assist departments and schools and individual faculty in supporting their students. We will probably propose linking this—to a prediction not a promise—with some kind of an institutional central effort to coordinate the care and management for our students in their competition for fellowships and scholarships. I need to say that with great caution and civility and prudence, because there are a lot of people on this campus who work effectively and ably in assisting students right now compete for national fellowships and scholarships. We do very well. The question is, can we do somewhat better; can a central effort which brings a lot of these very able citizens together with some additional faculty and student resources perhaps enhance our efforts, and can we link that in turn with our emerging research effort? I think perhaps we can.

Advising

Although advising is a concern across all the schools, the College is right now embarked on an ambitious self study and renovation project. Here, frankly, my role is to assist Rick Beeman try to get to wherever it is the College ought to get to. But all the schools share a concerns across their boundaries. Undergraduates take courses in all the different schools and the College Houses, too, are a site of advising opportunities that are still not fully developed.

Penn InTouch and Penn InTouch 2000 are extraordinary new technological tools for advising. Most of you are familiar with the current Penn InTouch. Certainly the students in the room use it all the time. Not yet have Penn InTouch 2000. It’s going to knock your socks off when you do.

Academic Integrity

I’ve convened a task force on academic integrity which includes faculty and students from all four undergraduate schools. I want to emphasize that this task force had its origin in a student initiative. The students of the honor council argued persuasively that it would be productive for students and faculty and administration to sit together and design mechanisms and programs that would give educational value what we might call the culture of academic integrity at Penn. The recommendations that this task force will make sometime next semester will be intended to make the issues more visible, to have them taken more seriously, and to make them more part of the university’s daily conversation.

Urban Agenda

Penn’s identity as an urban university has been powerfully re-affirmed in recent years. Our faculty and students are increasingly and actively involved, as residents and partners in our community. We want as effectively as we can to enable and assist in the tremendous opportunities and help Penn students and faculty take every advantage of the local community and of the City generally than they already do, to make significant contributions to the community’s welfare, and to derive as much educational benefit as possible from their interactions. Putting all of these elements together, I believe that we have a chance to construct and nurture a more distinctive educational and cultural identity here: to make “Penn” at least as much and perhaps more than merely the sum of its extraordinary parts. I will describe by way of concluding one initiative which represents a microcosm of how this could happen. I mentioned that I work with the cultural resource centers such as Annenberg Center, Institute for Contemporary Arts, and so on. We’ve put together quite recently a new Council on Arts and Culture, about which I may come back and report on at greater length.

It’s quite exciting, because in bringing together those various Penn cultural centers, we aim to see if we can accomplish several things at once. We would like to make these centers more visible and more actively used, and to see what can be accomplished by linking them together collaboratively to address shared tasks and concerns. But in addition to that, we are committed to the proposition that we can take greater educational advantage both for our graduate and undergraduate students, and so on. We’ve put together quite recently a new Council on Arts and Culture, about which I may come back and report on at greater length.

(There were no questions for the Provost or Deputy Provost.)
To the University Community:

The recommendations for change in retirement benefits are published in Almanac so that all Penn faculty and staff will be aware of the proposed change and the rationale for the recommendations. It also provides an opportunity for the University community to give us feedback via e-mail at askhr@hr.upenn.edu or by campus mail respectively at 208 College Hall/6303 or 3401 Walnut Street, Suite 538A/6228. The comment period ends January 21, 2000. We anticipate the President, Provost and Executive Vice President will make a final decision after the comment period, with implementation effective July 1, 2000.

—Barbara J. Lowery, Associate Provost — John J. Heuer, Vice President for Human Resources

Proposed Retirement Plan Changes

Background

The University of Pennsylvania offers retirement benefits to help provide needed income to employees when they retire. The current retirement plans were designed over time to meet the personal and professional needs of our employees, and eligibility for the plans has been based on employment status. In general, eligible faculty and monthly-paid staff have participated in a “defined contribution,” tax-deferred annuity plan (TDA). Weekly-paid staff have been covered by a different, “defined benefit” retirement allowance plan (RAP). Both plans are described in more detail below.

Over the past several years many weekly-paid staff have asked to be included in the TDA because vesting in it is immediate and because its benefits are perceived to be greater than the RAP’s benefits. At the request of the Personnel Benefits Committee of University Council, the Division of Human Resources has reviewed this issue at length, and we are now very pleased to recommend to the President, the Provost and the Executive Vice President that this request be approved.

Specifically, we are recommending that all full-time, weekly-paid staff be given the option of joining the TDA. This option may significantly enhance the value of the benefits these staff receive for working at the University, and it will help us continue to provide Penn faculty and staff with a strong, competitive benefits package.

This change will also be consistent with current best practices in benefits design and IRS tax regulations.

Features of Current Retirement Plans

The University of Pennsylvania currently has three retirement plans:

- **Basic Tax-Deferred Annuity Plan (TDA)** — This is a defined contribution plan that covers full-time monthly paid staff and eligible faculty. In this plan, the University provides the employee with an annual retirement benefit equal to a percent of salary based on age, as long as the employee contributes a specified amount. University contributions are available after the employee completes 1 year of service. Participants choose their own investments, bear the investment risk, and receive the accumulated balance. Vesting is immediate.

- **Retirement Allowance Plan (RAP)** — This is a defined benefit plan that covers weekly-paid staff. At retirement, the employee receives a guaranteed percent of salary based on years of service. Participants do not contribute to this plan. The University bears the investment risk that sufficient funds will be available in the plan when required. Vesting occurs after the participant completes at least 1000 hours of service per year for 5 years.

- **Supplemental Tax-Deferred Annuity (TDA) Plan** — This is a defined contribution plan that covers part-time and full-time staff and faculty. This plan is funded solely by employee contributions that are not matched by the University. In this plan, participants choose their own investments, bear the investment risk, and receive the accumulated balance. Vesting is immediate.

## Issues

A number of employees in the RAP have contended that it does not provide as much of a benefit as that provided by the TDA. For example, the RAP does not provide immediate vesting, portability and the right for employees to make their own investment decisions.

However, other employees believe the RAP will provide them with a greater benefit than the TDA. The RAP does not require a contribution from employees, while the TDA requires direct financial contributions from participating employees. Some RAP participants, for this reason, may want to continue their participation in the RAP.

A third issue involves federal tax regulations governing retirement plans. Under IRS regulations, retirement plans may not discriminate in favor of highly compensated employees, defined as employees earning more than $85,000 as of the year 2000. The University’s retirement plans have passed relevant tests each of the past several years, but there is no assurance that the TDA and the RAP, as currently structured, will continue to pass in the future. Failure to pass the non-discrimination testing would seriously jeopardize the tax status of the TDA and could lead to the taxation of all prior pre-tax contributions into the Plan.

## Recommendations

The Office of the Provost and the Division of Human Resources make the following recommendations:

1. **Redesign the retirement benefits as follows:**
   - Create a comprehensive Tax-Deferred Retirement Plan available to all employees who meet the requirements for participation.
   - Provide employees with a basic age-based contribution from the University, which does not require a matching employee contribution. This contribution would begin after 1 year of service at the University.
   - In addition to the basic University contribution, provide a dollar-for-dollar University match for all employee contributions up to 5% of salary. Employees may begin to contribute immediately, and the matching contributions would begin after 1 year of service, as is currently provided in the TDA.
   - Continue to provide vesting for all contributions.

## Recommended Changes in TDA for All Full-Time Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Contribution</th>
<th>University Basic Contribution</th>
<th>University Matching Contribution</th>
<th>Total Potential University Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to Age 30</td>
<td>—4%</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 30-39</td>
<td>—5%</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 40 &amp; Over</td>
<td>—5%</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Changes**

- **A. No Contribution Required**
  - Up to Age 30: 1% on Employee, 4% on University, Dollar for Dollar Match
  - Ages 30-39: 3% on Employee, 6% on University, 8% Matching and Contributions
  - Ages 40 & Over: 4% on Employee, 9% University, 9% Total

**Supplemental Retirement Annuity to be retained as is.**

Vesting will continue to be immediate for all employees.

2. Give all current RAP participants a one-time irrevocable opportunity to move into the new Tax-Deferred Retirement Plan. No vested benefits will be lost to any individuals currently in the RAP. Current RAP participants who do not elect to join the new plan will continue to be covered by the RAP without any change in their benefits.

3. Discontinue the availability of the RAP to new employees effective July 1, 2000. All future employees meeting the participation requirements will be eligible for the new Tax-Deferred Retirement Plan.

(continued on next page)
Proposed Retirement Plan Changes
(continued from page 9)

Next Steps
- Following the comment period, the President, Provost, and Executive Vice President will decide whether or not to accept these recommendations.
- If the recommendations are accepted, the University will then institute an educational campaign designed to provide employees with in-depth retirement information (including group and individual counseling sessions).
- For employees currently in the RAP, the most advantageous retirement plan will depend on individual circumstances. A person’s age and salary must be factored into the decision along with his or her tolerance for risk and other financial circumstances. For some employees, the RAP may provide retirement coverage that is superior to what may be achieved in the Tax-Deferred Annuity Plan. For others, there will be advantages to changing plans.
- Those employees currently eligible for but not participating in the TDA will begin receiving basic University contributions under the new plan. They will need to make investment decisions for these contributions, and may want to take this opportunity to participate more fully in the plan. Individuals already in the TDA should find the changes relatively seamless.
- Individuals already in the TDA will be eligible to receive the same overall contribution level, but may see some administrative changes.

Summary
The recommended plan is superior to the current plans in several ways:
- It provides basic retirement benefits for all eligible employees regardless of whether or not they make financial contributions to it.
- It brings retirement benefits for weekly-paid staff into alignment with those of faculty and monthly-paid staff.
- Despite important basic changes, it maintains the same overall level of retirement benefits that currently exists in the TDA. Under the proposed new plan, the basic University contribution taken together with the full dollar-for-dollar match on up to 5% of salary offers the same level of benefits provided under the current TDA.
- It gives employees greater flexibility in choosing their contribution levels, since they no longer need to contribute a minimum amount in order to receive University matching contributions.
- We believe that these proposed changes, along with the other benefits provided by the University, will continue to provide Penn employees with a strong, competitive benefits package.

To Participants of Tax-Deferred Annuity Plans
- All employee and University contributions (if applicable) attributable to the month of December will be remitted to Vanguard and TIAA-CREF during the month of December. As a result, your fourth-quarter statement(s) for 1999 from Vanguard and/or TIAA-CREF will show one additional contribution, and your first-quarter statement(s) for 2000 will show one less contribution.
- Effective January 1, 2000, the maximum deferral limit as set by the Internal Revenue Service will be raised from $10,000 to $10,500. This limit refers to the maximum amount of pre-tax salary that you may legally defer in a given calendar year. Please note, depending on your situation, your contribution limit may actually be lower than $10,500. Or, you may be able to contribute more than this limit due to a special catch-up provision.

To Participants in the Keystone HMO and the UPHS Point of Service Plans
- Please note that effective December 1, 1999, if your dependent child becomes ineligible because of age or loss of student status, coverage will now end on the last day of the Plan Year (June 30) rather than the last day of the calendar year (December 31). If you have any questions, you may contact the Penn Benefits Center at 1-888-PENNBN (1-888-736-6236).

Financial Planning: December 7-9
American Express will conduct a seminar Planning to Retire? Financial Steps for Today. Learn what you can do today to plan for your retirement tomorrow. All seminars will be held in 105 Williams Hall as follows:
- Tuesday, December 7: noon to 1:30 p.m. and 3:30 to 5 p.m.
- Wednesday, December 8: 10:30 a.m. to noon and 2 to 3:30 p.m.
- Thursday, December 9: noon to 1:30 p.m. and 3:30 to 5 p.m.
To register, call 1-800-220-2190, Ext. 303 or e-mail william.b.carter@apex.com. (Walk-ins are also welcome.)

Of RECORD Rules Governing Final Examinations

1. No instructor may hold a final examination except during the period in which final examinations are scheduled; when necessary, exceptions to this policy may be granted for postponed examinations (see 3 and 4 below). No final examinations may be scheduled during the last week of classes or on reading days.
2. No student may be required to take more than two final examinations on any calendar day during the period in which final examinations are scheduled. If more than two are scheduled, the student may postpone the middle exam.
3. Examinations that are postponed because of conflicts with other examinations, or because more than two examinations are scheduled in the same day, may be taken at another time during the final examinations period if the faculty member and student can agree on that time. Otherwise, they must be taken during the official period for postponed examinations.
4. Examinations that are postponed because of illness, a death in the family, or some other unusual event, may be taken only during the official periods: the first week of the spring and fall semesters. Students must obtain permission from their dean’s office to take a postponed exam. Instructors in all courses must be willing to offer a make-up examination to all students who are excused from the final examination.
5. No instructor may change the time or date of a final exam without permission from the appropriate dean.
6. No instructor may increase the time allowed for a final exam beyond the scheduled two hours without permission from the appropriate dean.
7. No classes (excluding review sessions) may be held during the reading period.
8. All students must be allowed to see their final examination. Exams should be available as soon as possible after being graded with access ensured for a period of at least one regular semester after the exam has been given.

To Participants of the RAP
- Individuals already in the TDA will be eligible to receive the same overall contribution level, but may see some administrative changes.
- We believe that these proposed changes, along with the other benefits provided by the University, will continue to provide Penn employees with a strong, competitive benefits package.

To Participants of Tax-Deferred Annuity Plans
- All employee and University contributions (if applicable) attributable to the month of December will be remitted to Vanguard and TIAA-CREF during the month of December. As a result, your fourth-quarter statement(s) for 1999 from Vanguard and/or TIAA-CREF will show one additional contribution, and your first-quarter statement(s) for 2000 will show one less contribution.
- Effective January 1, 2000, the maximum deferral limit as set by the Internal Revenue Service will be raised from $10,000 to $10,500. This limit refers to the maximum amount of pre-tax salary that you may legally defer in a given calendar year. Please note, depending on your situation, your contribution limit may actually be lower than $10,500. Or, you may be able to contribute more than this limit due to a special catch-up provision.

If you currently participate in the Basic Tax-Deferred Annuity Plan, a personalized calculation for calendar year 2000 will be sent to your home in late January. Questions pertaining to your calculation (for both Vanguard and TIAA-CREF participants) may be directed to TIAA-CREF’s Tax-Deferred Annuity Calculation Unit at (800) 842-2733, extension 2929.
- Also effective January 1, 2000, the maximum compensation limit as set by the Internal Revenue Service will be raised from $160,000 to a new limit of $170,000. Federal law limits the amount of compensation that may be taken into account for purposes of calculating your contributions in any given calendar year.

To Participants in the Keystone HMO and the UPHS Point of Service Plans
- Please note that effective December 1, 1999, if your dependent child becomes ineligible because of age or loss of student status, coverage will now end on the last day of the Plan Year (June 30) rather than the last day of the calendar year (December 31). If you have any questions, you may contact the Penn Benefits Center at 1-888-PENNBN (1-888-736-6236).

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 or facilitator that their forms have been sent directly to Payroll. Selections will be made each Monday during the campaign on the lists provided by the coordinators and facilitators to the Penn’s Way Campaign by the close of business the preceeding Friday.

Congratulations go to 11/22/99 and 11/29/99 winners:
- Melissa Smith, School of Medicine—Doozie’s Goodies Candy Gift Basket
- John Washington, Development— Penn Relays Two Day Vouchers
- Ora Rosenthal, School of Medicine—4 Penn Relays Two Day Vouchers
- Mary Griffin, ISC—4 Penn Relays One Day Vouchers
- Julia Lotis, School of Medicine—4 Penn Ovals One Day Vouchers
- Peter Nichols, Development—Two tickets to Penn vs. Army Men’s Basketball Game
- Roxanne Gillis, Development—Two tickets to Penn vs. Penn State Men’s Basketball Game
- Carol Brandt, Acquisition Services—Two tickets to Penn vs. Drexel basketball game
- Alvin Alamo, Development—Quicken Software

Week 5 Raffle Prizes will be awarded 12/6/99 and include:
- Gift Basket from Parfumerie Douglas Cosmetics; Cordless Telephone; Two tickets to Penn vs. Lafayette Men’s Home basketball game (11/11/00); Two tickets to Penn vs. St. Joe’s Men’s Home basketball game (1/31/00); $25 Gift Certificate to Urban Outfitters.

We would like to give the following acknowledgements for their generous contributions to the Penn’s Way 2000 Week 5 raffle: Telecommunications Department, Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics, Parfumerie Douglas Cosmetics, and Urban Outfitters.

—Carol J. de Fries, Executive Director, Office of Government, Community and Public Affairs

ALMANAC December 7, 1999
 Correction: The exhibit *Treasures of the Chinese Scholar* was in the December AT PENN calendar in error, and is not currently at the University Museum. Also, the tour of that exhibit that is listed in the calendar for December 17 will not be held.

 Deadlines: The deadline for the weekly update is each Monday for the following week’s issue; for the February At Penn calendar it is January 17.

**UPDATE**

**DECEMBER AT PENN**

**SPECIAL EVENTS**

8 The University of Pennsylvania Press Holiday Open House; 3:30 to 5:30 p.m. at the Press offices, 4200 Pine Street.

10 End of the Year Celebration; 3-5 p.m.; Terrace Room, Logan Hall. All A-3’s welcome. Info: e-mail: smiley@pobox.upenn.edu. (A-3 Assembly).

**TALKS**

8 Conversation with Nuestra Comunidad: University Partnerships and the Latino Community: Toward a Strategy for Philadelphia; Ira Harkavy, Center for Community Partnerships; 7-9 p.m.; La Casa Latina (La Casa Latina; Center for Community Partnerships).

**18th District Report**

24 incidents and 3 arrests (including 17 robberies and 7 aggravated assaults) were reported between November 15 and November 28, 1999 by the 18th District covering the Schuylkill River to 49th Street and Market Street to Woodland Avenue.

### Date and Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/15/99</td>
<td>7:00 AM</td>
<td>4901 Spruce</td>
<td>Aggravated Assault/Arrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/99</td>
<td>10:00 PM</td>
<td>5036 Larchwood</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/99</td>
<td>11:43 PM</td>
<td>507 Malville</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/99</td>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td>4600 Market</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/99</td>
<td>5:09 PM</td>
<td>4307 Locust</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/99</td>
<td>7:30 PM</td>
<td>4821 Greenway</td>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/99</td>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td>5000 Market</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/99</td>
<td>12:01 PM</td>
<td>4700 Woodland</td>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/99</td>
<td>2:11 AM</td>
<td>4427 Sansom</td>
<td>Aggravated Assault/Arrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/99</td>
<td>1:00 AM</td>
<td>5100 Ludlow</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/21/99</td>
<td>2:22 AM</td>
<td>4800 Walston</td>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/21/99</td>
<td>1:20 PM</td>
<td>1400 Grays Ferry</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/21/99</td>
<td>10:45 PM</td>
<td>4000 Woodland</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/22/99</td>
<td>9:25 PM</td>
<td>4434 Ludlow</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/22/99</td>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td>4200 Walston</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/23/99</td>
<td>9:50 AM</td>
<td>4422 Sansom</td>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/23/99</td>
<td>11:56 PM</td>
<td>4602 Springfield</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/23/99</td>
<td>12:33 AM</td>
<td>4500 Spruce</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27/99</td>
<td>8:02 AM</td>
<td>4300 Spruce</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27/99</td>
<td>9:50 AM</td>
<td>4322 Market</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/99</td>
<td>12:30 AM</td>
<td>5001 Pine</td>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/99</td>
<td>11:59 AM</td>
<td>4958 Walston</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/99</td>
<td>11:27 AM</td>
<td>5100 Sansom</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/99</td>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>48th St.</td>
<td>Robbery/Arrest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VACATION**

Pinecone Chalet, 3 BDR/1BA, Near Jack Frost/BB. Firewood incl. $400/weekend, (610) 356-3488.

**HOME FOR SALE**

Washington Township, NJ, 30 minutes to Penn. Spacious 4 bedroom, 2 1/2 bath with basement. Many extras. Call 1-800-841-7870, Ext. 4020 for taped information 24/7, or call (215) 960-7038.

**RESEARCH STUDIES**

Overweight teenagers, ages 13-17, are wanted for a weight loss study. Call the Weight and Eating Disorders Program at the University of Pennsylvania: (215) 898-7314.

If your child is 7 to 17 years old and experiencing the signs of depression, consider enrolling your child in the Pediatric and Adolescent Antidepressant Research Study. Participation is available at no cost to those who qualify, but enrollment is limited. To find out if your child is eligible please call Glen Davis at (215) 590-7574.

**THERAPY**

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

**TO PLACE A CLASSIFIED AD**

To place a classified ad, call (215) 898-5274.

**OPPORTUNITIES**

All open positions at Penn are posted on the Human Resources web site at www.hr.upenn.edu. Todays Penn Job Application Center also provides services to Penn hiring officers for the hire of permanent and temporary office support staff. Todays is also managing the Penn Job Application Center. You may contact them at (215) 222-3400 for your employment needs. Penn’s Job Application Center at 3550 Market Street, Suite 110, is open 8 a.m.-6 p.m. weekdays when computer stations are available for you to browse the openings and/or apply on-line.
Founding Fathers

On December 17, 1750 the trustees of the original Pennsylvania Academy made the following appointment: "Mr. Theophilus Grew having offered himself as a Master in the Academy to teach Writing, Arithmetick, Accounts, Algebra, Astronomy, Navigation, and all other branches of Mathematics; it is ordered that he be received as such at the rate of one hundred and twenty five pounds a year, his service to commence on the seventh day of January next." Thus began mathematics education at the University of Pennsylvania.

Five years later on June 10, the trustees received a charter creating the College and Theophilus Grew was appointed the first Professor of Mathematics. From that time on, the highest ranking faculty position in the College was that of professor. Except for a few brief gaps early in the period, there was always one professor of mathematics at Penn in the century and a half following Grew’s appointment, but never more than one. Indeed, the total number of professors of mathematics from 1755 to 1899, a period of 144 years, was ten. In the 100 years since 1899, there have been sixty professors of mathematics at Penn.

In sharp contrast to the parochial state of mathematics in colonial America were the riches of the mathematics world of the 19th century Europe. With physics came the gradual understanding of electrical and magnetic phenomena, subjects impossible to understand without more advanced knowledge than simply calculus. Advanced training was available only in Europe, and all who taught in America had spent some time studying and obtaining advanced degrees there.

This situation in the U.S. began to change when, in 1876, Johns Hopkins University founded the first Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. At Penn in 1881, the trustees approved the formation of a Faculty of Philosophy for instruction leading to the Doctor of Philosophy.

The first meeting of the newly formed Faculty of Philosophy on December 8, 1882 is regarded as the beginning of the graduate school at Penn. The first mathematics Ph.D. was Edwin S. Crawley in 1892. In 1899 mathematics achieved final independence from other disciplines such as astronomy, physics, and moral philosophy with which it had been associated in earlier years. Thus this date is regarded as the beginning of the Department of Mathematics whose centenary is being celebrated in 1999.

20th Century Changes

On the world stage, mathematics continued at an accelerating pace. This was the time of Henri Poincaré, who founded the subject of topology and research of extreme proficiency in celestial mechanics. David Hilbert made so many different contributions to mathematics that one cannot escape his name even today. Added to this was the gradual mathematicalization of physics, of chemistry, and the crisis of abstract thought caused by special relativity. Mathematics assumed its current essential role in Western thought by the beginning years of the 20th century.