

# Almanac

Tuesday, October 1, 1985

Published by the University of Pennsylvania

Volume 32, Number 6

Dianne Feltoon



## Athletic Director: Paul Rubincam

Wharton's director of alumni affairs, Paul Rubincam, (left) has been named director of the Division of Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics. Mr. Rubincam takes office immediately, succeeding Charles Harris, who left Penn in June to become director of Arizona State.

Mr. Rubincam, 52, joined Penn in 1953 as a freshman; but military service interrupted his education and he took his degree in economics (then at Wharton) in 1960. As an undergraduate he was elected to Sphinx; lettered in baseball and basketball; and was elected basketball captain his senior year but could not serve because his eligibility had been affected by military service. He coached that season instead, and two years after graduation he returned as assistant basketball coach. While coaching he also worked with the admissions office, where he later

served as assistant dean until 1970. From 1970-74 he was director of conferences (a post created to develop use of the then-new residences by off-campus groups during downtime), and he took his present post at Wharton in 1974. At Wharton, Mr. Rubincam has had oversight of annual giving, alumni relations and the build-up of the world-wide Wharton alumni network, and the School's alumni magazine. "He has served the University well and in a number of capacities directly related to his new position," said President Sheldon Hackney. Added Dr. Paul Zingg, who chaired the search committee: "A concern before the committee was to identify a candidate with a thorough knowledge of the University and its athletic program. Among [Mr. Rubincam's] many strengths is his ability to understand the role of the Division and to interpret them effectively for the University as a whole."

## Fall Break II: Coming October 21-22

On Monday and Tuesday, October 21-22, Penn will have a fall break for the second year in a row—the repeat of an experiment in reducing student stress, with evaluation again to be conducted by the University Council's Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Fall Break.

Last year's committee, headed by Dr. Herbert S. Levine of Economics, distributed a questionnaire to faculty, students and administrative units, and reported largely positive reactions (*Almanac* May 14, 1985). The questionnaire had a low, but mostly favorable, response from students; and Student Health and University Counseling reported reductions in stress-related visits. Recording a significant response from faculty, the committee found that "In general, the faculty reacted favorably. . . . While some were highly enthusiastic and some strongly negative, a large proportion of the faculty stated that they thought the fall break was on the whole useful and caused little damage to academic schedules, continuity and attendance." However, the committee said Physics reported problems with laboratory schedules and Social Work reported difficulty keeping its library open without work-study aides while demand for services remained normal.

According to Dr. Joan Gotwals, deputy director of libraries, the Social Work experience was not unique. "This year we are going to have to make a superhuman effort even to keep Van Pelt and Lippincott operating at normal hours, and we cannot be certain of the School and departmental libraries' schedules," she said last week.

"The problem is partly that we don't know what to expect during fall break: Will people leave campus, or will they see this as an opportunity to put in more time at the library? And,

there seems to be a very great difference between the needs of undergraduates, whose classes uniformly are canceled, and graduate students whose work may go on as usual."

## Upcoming Awareness Weeks

Before the October 21-22 break, three campus-wide "awareness weeks" are crowded into two calendar weeks:

**Apartheid:** Leading up to a national day (October 11), the Penn Anti-Apartheid Coalition will set up information tables on Locust Walk starting Monday, October 7. At 9 a.m. Wednesday, October 9, the Coalition begins a round-the-clock vigil at the Benjamin Franklin statue. The vigil culminates in a rally Friday, October 11, at 12:30 p.m. Speakers—and possibly some petitions—will deal jointly with South African and U.S. racial issues. Meanwhile, Council has on its October 9 agenda a discussion of procedural options for conveying campus views on investment policy to the Trustees; see the joint message from the Provost and the Senate Chair, page 2.

**Asian Awareness:** A seven-day week is devoted to Asian-American life and culture, starting with an all-day conference Saturday, October 5 in Steinberg Hall-Dietrich Hall.

Weeknight speakers during Asian Awareness Week (October 7 through 11, all at 100 Law School and all at 8 p.m. except the Tuesday program, 7 p.m.) are: Monday, Computer Associates CEO *Charles B. Wang*; Tuesday, California Congressman *Norman Mineta* and Delaware Lt. Gov. *S.B. Woo*; Wednesday, World Trade Center Architect *Minoru Yamasaki* and the award-winning painter *Nhevar P. Bhavsar* (with slides of their respective work);

## A Special Thanks

Everyone who came to work last Friday deserves a special note of thanks. Because of their efforts the University remained on an even keel, despite the winds and wishes of Hurricane Gloria.

Laboratory and office staff and faculty fielded issues and phone calls in the offices down the hall as well as their own. Maintenance and public safety personnel responded to situations before they became emergencies.

The camaraderie that we experienced in the face of anxiety and adversity was terrific. Thank you.

Sincerely,

—Helen O'Bannon

Thursday, Yale Sociology Professor *Hesung Koh* (on Asian-American women); and Friday, the 1948 and 1952 Olympic gold medal diving champion *Dr. Sammy Lee* (on rights and privileges of Asian-Americans).

The week ends with an Asian-American Culturefest Saturday, October 12, 4 to 8 p.m. in Houston Hall. Performances by campus groups combine with foods of Asian cultures; there is no admission charge for performances.

**Alcohol Awareness:** October 14 starts Alcohol Awareness Week at Penn. The week is a national one, elsewhere starting October 21 but moved up at Penn because of the fall break.

**University Citifest:** Not a full week, but an awareness program just the same; see page 8.

## INSIDE

- Conveying Views (Ehrlich, Tomazinis) p. 2
- On Dependent Care (O'Bannon), p. 2
- Senate: Committee on Administration: On Revision of Rules, pp. 3-4
- Computing: Grant Deadlines, p. 5
- Speaking Out: Extent of Harassment, p. 6
- Admin. Assembly: Child Care (Hill), p. 6
- OF RECORD: Open Expression, p. 7

## Conveying Views on South Africa

At a meeting on October 9, the University Council will consider ways to bring to the attention of University Trustees the views of faculty, students, and staff on issues relating to South Africa. Among the many procedural options that might be considered are: (1) An ad hoc group of Trustees, faculty, students, and staff collecting comment for transmission to the Trustees; (2) A group of Trustees joining the University Council meeting in November or December; or (3) A group or groups of Trustees meeting under arrangements sponsored separately by the Faculty Senate, the UA, GAPSA, and the A-1 and A-3 Assemblies.

Those groups and individuals with views on the process of communicating with Trustees are urged to be in touch with their University Council representatives on the matter.

Thomas Eulich

Anthony R. Tomerius

FALL SENATE MEETING: WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1985.

## Call: Honorary Degrees

The University Council Committee on Honorary Degrees welcomes suggestions for recipients of honorary degrees for Commencement on May 19, 1986. Nominations (including background biographical information) should be submitted in writing to any member of the committee or to Kerstin Tousignant, Office of the Secretary, 121 College Hall/CO. The deadline is October 31.

Committee members include: Marilyn E. Hess, chair, 67A Med/G3; Russell L. Ackoff, 400 VH/CS; Ellen Fuller, 421 NEB/S2; William G. Grigsby, Rm. 11, 3400 Walnut/CF; Paul J. Korshin, 119 BEH/D1; Haralambos N. Kritikos, 330 MB/D2; Alfred J. Rieber, 207 CH/CO; Albert J. Stunkard, 133 S. 36th/17; Jonathan Draluck, 3706 Locust Walk, Philadelphia PA, 19104; Gary Lowitt, 4034 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA, 19104; Ann J. Banks, 165 Stouffer, 3700 Spruce/G8; Kathleen Kelley, 2620 Brown Street, Philadelphia, PA, 19130.

## Progress Report: Establishing a Dependent Care Reimbursement Account

In a letter that was published in *Almanac* on July 9, 1985, I responded to an inquiry from a number of faculty and staff on the possibility of establishing a child care (dependent) tax-sheltered account. I asked Gary J. Posner, vice president for administration, to head a review to determine if the University could offer a dependent care reimbursement account sooner than previously anticipated.

*In summary, and barring any unforeseen difficulties, it is anticipated that the Administration will seek to establish a dependent care reimbursement account ("Account") effective as close to January 1, 1986 as possible.* Following is a brief synopsis of the project status:

1. In July, Human Resources/Benefits was asked to determine the "feasibility of an early implementation of a plan for direct payment or reimbursement of University employees' qualified dependent care expenses."
2. Their study and subsequent findings indicated that, while it is preferable to delay the introduction of the Account to coincide with other possible benefit changes on July 1, 1986, providing employees with early tax-sheltering of salary for dependent care purposes is a priority.
3. Discussion ensued with other University offices, and external consultants during the months of July and August to determine the scope of the Account, necessary federal legal requirements and critical operational concerns.
4. On July 31, Gary Posner, Jim Keller, (manager of Benefits), and Rita Doyle, (assistant manager), met with Dr. Joyce Randolph of International Programs, Ellie DiLapi of the Women's Center, Dr. Janice Madden of Regional Science, Margaret A. McGee of Budget Analysis (for the Administrative Assembly), and Winnie Smart of Student Life (for the A-3 Assembly), who had indicated that they wanted to discuss "the merits of the University providing child care as a covered benefit and of sheltering part of our salaries for dependent care expenses."
5. That meeting helped to clarify the issues and, when combined with the advice of the Benefits Office, provided for a positive reaction to the establishment of such an Account subject to: a) consultation with the Personnel Benefits Committee of the University Council in the fall and, b) resolution of legal and administrative concerns.

### Actions to be Taken

1. The Administration will bring a recommendation to establish a *Dependent Care Reimbursement Account* to the Personnel Benefits Committee at their first fall meeting.
2. Assuming the Personnel Benefits Committee determines that this approach is proper, the account may be established for salary reduction purposes as early as January 1, 1986.

However, interested participants should be aware that there could be a lag of a few months between the time salary reductions are made and the reimbursements are available, since a paid receipt for the actual day care expense must be presented to the University before the reimbursement check can be drawn in the name of the account holder.

Federal regulations require that funds be disbursed solely for dependent care. So, salary deductions not used for day care by the end of the year cannot be refunded.

3. In the interim the Benefits Office will:
  - prepare the necessary plan documents;
  - work with UMIS to ensure proper salary reduction from paychecks;
  - undertake a legal review of all relevant documents to insure compliance with relevant legislation;
  - design appropriate reimbursement mechanisms (e.g. how will employees actually get reimbursed, etc.) in conjunction with the Office of the Vice President for Finance;
  - prepare communication materials detailing the plan provisions;
  - enroll those interested in the Account.

While the review has produced a positive recommendation, a cautionary note should be issued since the establishment of such an Account is complicated and needs to be done right the first time. While the Account could be delayed in implementation, it is our desire to "dismantle the barriers" and implement a *Dependent Care Reimbursement Account* early in calendar 1986 for the benefit of University faculty and staff.

—Helen B. O'Bannon, Senior Vice President

# Report of the Committee on Administration: On Revision of the Rules

April 9, 1985

At the behest of the Senate Executive Committee, Jacob M. Abel, the Chair of the Faculty Senate, charged the Senate Committee on Administration to consider a number of proposed changes in the Rules of the Faculty Senate. Proposals for changes were also made in several communications the Committee received from the members of the Senate. The Committee notified the faculty of the major issues it was going to consider through the *Almanac* January 29, 1985. The Committee invited members of the Senate to communicate with it or to attend an open meeting on February 7, 1985. Several faculty members availed themselves of this invitation.

## Recommendations in favor of changes

The following changes are recommended by the Senate Committee on Administration for adoption by the Faculty Senate:

1. The 12 at-large seats on the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) should be abolished. Ten new constituency seats should be created, with 4 of the new seats to the School of Arts & Sciences, 4 to the School of Medicine, 1 to the School of Veterinary Medicine and 1 to the Wharton School. Recommended realignments of the constituencies in each of these four schools are in the appendix. If the faculty of any school sees a more logical division of itself into constituencies that do not exceed the number assigned to that faculty in our recommendations, the Senate Committee on Administration will consider such suggested changes before introducing the proposal for action at the fall Faculty Senate meeting.

If this recommendation is adopted, the Senate Executive Committee would consist of 45 members rather than 47 as at present; 36 would be elected by constituencies, 6 would be officers, past officers or officers-elect of the Senate, and 3 would represent assistant professors. Half the constituency representatives and two of the assistant professor representatives would be elected for their two-year terms in the even-numbered years and half of the constituency representatives and one of the assistant professor representatives in the odd-numbered years. To start the system with the new alignment of constituencies, elections for all constituencies would be held in February 1986. The even-numbered constituencies would elect representatives for a two-year term and the odd-numbered would elect representatives for a one-year term.

The advantage of having at-large members, it was recognized, was the possibility that such members would be more likely to take a university-wide view of problems than members elected by particular constituencies. From another standpoint, it was suggested that a leavening influence in SEC might be obtained by the selection of at-large members from groups or with viewpoints which might not be represented in members elected by majority voting in the constituencies. To promote this outcome, the Nominating Committee might have to be instructed to bear in mind the desirability of balancing the kinds of views represented by the elected representatives. In opposition to this approach it was suggested that this bordered on instructing the Nominating Committee to seek out unrepresentative members for appointment or election to the Senate Executive Committee. In support of the elimination of at-large seats it was suggested that the present plan of election leaves it open to small, well-organized groups to exercise an undue influence on the selection of at-large representatives.

Consideration was given to reducing the size of the Senate Executive Committee, but it was felt the present size was not unduly large. A smaller size would of course provide less representation. An important of the present proposal is that it reduces the disproportion between the size of the faculties in the schools of the University and the number of representatives they have. However, every school retains one representative no matter how small its faculty.

2. The size of the Nominating Committee should be expanded from 9 to 12. Twelve nominees should be selected by the Senate Executive Committee from SEC's membership. The present provisions for nominations to the Nominating Committee by petition and voting by mail ballot should be retained. Nominations by petition would not be re-

stricted to SEC members; any member of the Senate could be nominated.

The legitimacy of SEC's nominees would be more firmly established since it would be able to nominate only elected constituency representatives for service on the Nominating Committee. Also, by the time in the academic year when the Nominating Committee has to be chosen the members of SEC would have become acquainted with one another and their selection of the members of the Nominating Committee would thus be better informed than is likely to be the case with the present procedures.

3. The provision for a SEC Committee on Committees, substantially as already adopted by SEC, should be made part of the Senate Rules. The Committee consists of 7 SEC members elected by SEC. It is now recommended that the Chair and Chair-elect of the Faculty Senate be added to the Committee with voting rights. It is also proposed that the Chair of the Committee be selected by SEC upon the recommendation of the Chair of the Senate.

The existence of this Committee has greatly increased the efficiency with which the burdensome task of staffing the Faculty Senate committees has been carried on. The Chair and Chair-elect should not be excluded from the process of choosing committee members.

4. Nominations for constituency representatives will not be considered valid unless accompanied by a statement that the nominee has agreed to stand for election. This rule will apply also to write-in candidates on the mail ballot. (The latter provision was adopted by SEC, but not yet incorporated in the Rules of the Senate.)

The present rules which do not require advance consent often lead to a large number of nominations from a constituency, the large majority of which involves persons who refuse the nomination. With 18 constituency elections taking place at the same time, the need to find out which nominees agree to stand for election places a large burden on the Faculty Senate Office.

## Proposals considered and rejected by the Committee

1. A requirement that the Nominating Committee nominate more than one person for each vacant post, thus insuring contested elections.

The Committee considered this proposal in connection with nominations for membership on the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty and the offices of Chair and Secretary of the Faculty Senate. In the case of the committees, an important reason for continuing the present practice of requiring the Nominating Committee to propose only one candidate for each post was mainly that this method lends itself to the selection of well-balanced committees. For example, the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty should include at least some persons whose fields of specialization make them particularly knowledgeable about the issues before this committee. The argument was made here and in connection with the question of contested elections for the Senate Chair that selection through a faculty-wide ballot among different candidates would hardly be well informed. This was based on the view that interests and knowledge of most faculty members tend to be focused on departmental affairs and their acquaintances limited largely to departmental colleagues or colleagues in closely related areas. On the other side, it was suggested that contested elections would stimulate members of the faculty to take a greater interest in the affairs of the Faculty Senate and to inform themselves about the alternative candidates.

An important consideration was the impact of the contesting of elections on the willingness of members of the faculty to agree to be candidates. This is particularly relevant in the case of the Chair of the Senate. The person who serves in this post has almost to suspend his or her professional career for the better part of three years. It is not surprising that even without having to weigh the possibility of being defeated in an election, our colleagues have sometimes been loathe to make this sacrifice, and that it is not unusual for Nominating Committees to encounter refusals. Of course no one knows the extent to which the

number of refusals would increase if there were contested elections. If it is believed that the pool of suitable candidates is limited, contested elections would have the further disadvantage of eliminating some from service as Chair since defeated candidates would be unlikely to stand again.

The fact that a number of professional societies have contested elections was advanced in support of adopting the method for the Senate Chair. Against this it was suggested that the professional society model is not applicable because, among other reasons, it is much easier to recruit nominees for the largely honorific posts of heads of professional societies than for the burdensome post of Faculty Senate Chair.

Finally, it was felt that the disadvantages of providing for the nomination of only one candidate by the Nominating Committee were offset by the ease of nomination by petition. Nominations by petition may well be a better way of having contested elections than multiple nominations by a Nominating Committee. The petitioners can give their own answers to perplexing questions that would be faced by a Nominating Committee concerning the choice to be presented to the Senate. Should two nominees differ from each other in their philosophies of University life and governance or in their perceived leadership qualities? Each year's Nominating Committee would have to work out these issues and find two plausible candidates to reflect their answer.

The recommendation was therefore to continue the present rules including the provision for nomination by petition requiring the signature of twenty-five members of the Faculty Senate.

2. A proposal providing for the recall of the Faculty Senate Chair, Chair-elect, Secretary or Secretary-elect.

It was felt that the one-year term of office is so short that much of it is likely to have elapsed before events could transpire that would make some faculty members wish to institute recall proceedings. In addition, motions of censure can be proposed at regular meetings or at easily-called special meetings (by 20 petitioners).

3. A proposal that the three assistant professor members of the Senate Executive Committee be elected by assistant professors in a mail ballot.

The desirability of having the views and interests of assistant professors represented on SEC was accepted by all. The present method involves their selection by SEC from nominations made by assistant professors. The basic problem is that there is little cohesion among the assistant professors and the selection of representative persons is thus extremely difficult. Each nomination most often comes to the Senate Executive Committee with the support of only one person. It is difficult to see how voting by assistant professors, given their low level of information about each other would be an improvement over SEC selection.

#### A revision already approved

The Committee has also revised the Rules to reflect the Senate action on November 16, 1983, eliminating the replacement pool of alternates for vacancies on the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility. The changes strike out language governing the election and succession to office of alternates and increase the number of persons to be elected annually from two to three.

#### Appendix, Rules of the Faculty Senate

##### Members of the Senate Executive Committee

**Officers of the Senate:** Chair of the Senate  
Chair-elect of the Senate  
Secretary of the Senate  
Secretary-elect of the Senate

**Past Officers:** Past Chair of the Senate  
Past Secretary of the Senate

**Constituency Members:** Thirty-six faculty, elected by constituency for two-year terms.

1. Annenberg School
2. Arts & Sciences: American civilization, history
3. Arts & Sciences: anthropology, history of art, music
4. Arts & Sciences: astronomy, mathematics
5. Arts & Sciences: biology
6. Arts & Sciences: chemistry, geology, history & sociology of science
7. Arts & Sciences: classical studies, German, Romance languages, Slavic languages
8. Arts & Sciences: economics

9. Arts & Sciences: English, general honors
10. Arts & Sciences: folklore & folklife, linguistics, philosophy
11. Arts & Sciences: Oriental studies, religious studies, South Asia regional studies
12. Arts & Sciences: physics
13. Arts & Sciences: political science, regional science
14. Arts & Sciences: psychology
15. Arts & Sciences: sociology
16. Dental Medicine
17. Education
18. Engineering: computer and information science, electrical engineering, systems engineering
19. Engineering: bioengineering, chemical engineering, civil engineering, materials science and engineering, mechanical engineering and applied mechanics
20. Fine Arts
21. Law School
22. Medicine: allergy & immunology, cardiology, diabetes, endocrine, infectious disease, gastroenterology, pulmonary, renal
23. Medicine: anatomy, biochemistry & biophysics, pathology

24. Medicine: anesthesia, obstetrics & gynecology, radiation therapy
25. Medicine: dermatology, ophthalmology, orthopaedic surgery, otolaryngology, psychiatry, research medicine
26. Medicine: general medicine, hematology-oncology, hypertension, rheumatology, neurology, physical medicine & rehabilitation
27. Medicine: human genetics, microbiology, pharmacology, physiology, therapeutic research
28. Medicine: pediatrics
29. Medicine: radiology, surgery
30. Nursing
31. Social Work
32. Veterinary Medicine: animal biology, pathology
33. Veterinary Medicine: clinical studies-New Bolton Center, clinical studies-Philadelphia
34. Wharton: accounting, decision sciences, health care systems, insurance, statistics
35. Wharton: finance, legal studies, public policy & management
36. Wharton: management, marketing, social systems sciences

#### Further matters considered by the Committee

The Committee made recommendations on several issues which it regards as advisory to SEC or to the Chair of the Senate. They do not call for SEC or Senate action in the opinion of the Committee, but the details of the actions are being forwarded to SEC and will of course be made available by the Faculty Senate Office to any interested member of the Senate.

##### Senate Committee on Administration

*Edwin C. Baker (law)* *Irving B. Kravis (economics), Chair*  
*David P. Balamuth (physics)* *Elizabeth M. Petras (regional science)*  
*John S. de Cani (statistics)* *Martin Pring (physiology &*  
*Elizabeth Flower (philosophy)* *Medical School computer facility)*  
*Anne P. Keane (nursing)* *Sheldon Rovin (health care systems)*  
 ex officio:  
*Senate Chair, Jacob M. Abel (mechanical engineering)*  
*Senate Chair-elect, Anthony R. Tomazinis (city planning)*

#### Dissent by Dr. A. R. Tomazinis

There are two points on which I would like to establish my clear dissent with the committee's report.

First, I dissent completely with the committee's report on the change of the Nominating Committee. The problem I saw with the Nominating Committee presently is that it is not responsive enough to the sensibilities of the rank and file of the Faculty Senate members and instead follows inputs from SEC much too much. Increasing its size is a good change, but transforming this most important committee into what in effect will be a subcommittee of SEC is just about the worst thing I can think of. It will be a mockery of an independent committee. What the Senate really needs is a Nominating Committee which is truly independent of SEC and therefore not subject to the parochialism that SEC has so frequently demonstrated in the past. Such an independent Nominating Committee can be formed only if it is selected by the Senate membership at large, by those attending the November Senate meeting, and out of a list of candidates properly proposed by members of the Senate well in advance. The mechanics for such a Nominating Committee are simple and the promise great.

Second, I believe that the faculty is deeply desirous of taking part in the selection of the Senate's leadership through annual elections. Although the present Senate rules make elections possible through a petition process, as it was done in the last two years, the mechanics are still cumbersome and tend to produce more tension than most of the faculty members would like to see on campus. The way to accomplish both is really simple. All it takes is to change the Senate rules so that the Nominating Committee nominates two candidates for each position of Senate officers. The elections that would follow would permit the faculty to choose its leadership and to convey annually its preferences and nuances. I hope that sooner or later we would come around to instituting the desirable democratic process in this most important aspect of Senate life.

## 1985 Internal Grant Program Announcements: November 8

### Apple Development Grant

**Purpose:** To support innovative programs in the use of computers in instruction and research. Emphasis will be placed on proposals submitted by departmental or school curriculum committees that define the long-term role of computing in a complete curriculum. Proposals by individual research or instructional efforts will be entertained but will receive less emphasis.

**Provides:** Equipment to seed curriculum development, or to move existing curricula in new directions. The program does not support needs for simple computer capacity or replication of existing systems.

**Typical Grant:** One to three Apple Lisa computers configured with a hard disk, expanded memory, development software, and networking equipment to interconnect to existing Macintosh computers.

**Number:** Thirteen development systems will be available in fall, 1985. There will be no grants awarded in spring, 1986 nor the 1986-87 academic year.

**Procedure:** A proposal of two pages, maximum, should be submitted by the department to the Dean of the school. *Proposals* should discuss: activities to be performed under the grant, the equipment required, requirements for University support outside the grant, and an evaluation mechanism. Strong emphasis will be placed on proposals that plan outgoing support structures for curriculum development in the department or school. A curriculum plan should accompany departmental or school proposals.

**Deadlines:** Proposals should be submitted to the Dean or a designate by Friday, November 8.

**Evaluation:** After approving the proposals, the Dean will forward them to the Vice Provost for Computing. A committee representing the schools will review the proposals. The Vice Provost will then make an award to each School as a single dollar amount for all proposals. The Dean will determine the allocation of that amount among the School's proposed projects.

**Award Date:** The Dean will be notified of the award by January 2. Planning support will be available at that time. Equipment will be available in January, 1986.

### Educational Development Fund

**Purpose:** To support the integration of computer technology into the curriculum.

**Provides:** Development grants provide personnel support to help create new curricular material, research expenses leading to new computer-based curricular directions, or expenses to import and convert curricular material from other schools. The program does not support the expense of operating, monitoring, or maintaining ongoing teaching laboratories. Planning grants for departmental or school-wide planning efforts that integrate computers into complete curricula are also available.

**Typical Grant:** Development grants provide up to

\$10,000 per faculty member to be used over a one year span toward summer stipends, student wages, or release time. Planning grants approximate \$2,000 per planning effort.

**Number:** About thirty development and planning grants will be available in fall, 1985. It is expected that the program will be repeated in the 1986-1987 academic year.

**Procedure:** A proposal of two pages, maximum, should be submitted to the Dean of the school. *Development grant proposals* should discuss: activities to be performed under the grant, the relevance of those activities to the purpose of the grant, the funding required, requirements for University support outside the grant, continuing support requirements, and a project evaluation mechanism. *Planning grant proposals* should indicate the area of curriculum planning to be undertaken, the purpose of the funding, and approximate equipment needs.

**Deadline:** Proposals should be submitted to the office of the Dean by Friday, November 8.

**Evaluation:** After approving the proposals, the Dean will forward them to the Vice Provost for Computing. A committee representing the schools will review the proposals. The Vice Provost will then make an award to each School as a single dollar amount for all proposals. The Dean will determine the allocation of that amount among the School's proposed projects after consultation with the Vice Provost.

**Award:** The Dean will be notified of the award by January 2. Funds will be available at that time.

### IBM Threshold Grant

**Purpose:** To support innovative programs in the use of computers in instruction and research. This is the last year of the grant. Heavy emphasis will be placed on proposals submitted by departmental or school curriculum committees that define the long-term role of computing in a complete curriculum. Proposals by individual research or instructional efforts will be entertained but will receive less emphasis.

**Provides:** Equipment to seed curriculum development, or to move existing curricula in new directions. Innovative approaches or work on new areas are a feature of this program. The program does not support needs for simple computer capacity or replication of existing systems. (Support for planning proposals is available from the Educational Development Fund.)

**Typical Grant:** Equipment such as IBM PC computers, networking equipment to interconnect a laboratory, a small shared instructional computer system, or networking equipment to support the use of student-owned computers in a defined curriculum. (Planning support grants will approximate \$2,000).

**Number:** Fifteen equipment grants will be available in fall, 1985. It is expected that another twenty to thirty grants, resulting from planning proposals submitted in the fall, will be awarded in spring, 1986. The program will not be repeated in the 1986-87 academic year.

**Procedure:** A proposal of two pages, maximum, should be submitted by the department to the Dean of the school. Both proposals for equip-

ment, and planning proposals that form the basis for an equipment proposal in spring, '86, will be entertained. *Proposals for equipment* should discuss: activities to be performed under the grant, the equipment required, requirements for University support outside the grant, and an evaluation mechanism. Strong emphasis will be placed on proposals that plan outgoing support structures for curriculum development in the department or school. A curriculum plan should accompany departmental or school proposals. *Planning proposals* should indicate: the area of curriculum planning to be done, the purpose of the funding, and approximate equipment needs for spring '86.

**Deadlines:** Proposals should be submitted to the Dean or a designate by Friday, November 8. Departments or schools sponsoring successful planning proposals will be asked to submit an equipment proposal by March 1, 1986.

**Evaluation:** After approving the proposals, the Dean will forward them to the Vice Provost for Computing. A committee representing the schools will review the proposals. The Vice Provost will make an award to each School as a single dollar amount for all proposals. The Dean will determine the allocation of that amount among the School's proposed projects after consultation with the Vice Provost.

**Award Date:** The Dean will be notified of the award by January 2. Planning support will be available at that time. Equipment will be available after January, 1986.

### United Parcel Service Grant

**Purpose:** To support the use of computer technology in research and graduate instruction.

**Provides:** Support in areas not covered by the IBM Threshold grant to design, construct, and use computer technology in research and graduate instruction, particularly in areas relevant to the interests of the United Parcel Service. Examples include public policy studies, urban issues, transportation and related problems, sociological analyses, political decision systems, and information flow models.

**Typical Grant:** Up to \$10,000 per faculty member to be used over a one year span toward summer stipends, student wages, or release time.

**Number:** About twenty such grants will be available in fall, 1985. It is expected that the program will be repeated in the 1986-1987 academic year.

**Procedure:** A proposal of two pages, maximum, should be submitted to the Dean of the school. The proposal should discuss: activities to be performed under the grant, the relevance of those activities to the purpose of the grant, the funding required, requirements for University support outside the grant, continuing support requirements, and a project evaluation mechanism.

**Deadline:** Proposals should be submitted to the Dean or designate by Friday, November 8.

**Evaluation:** After approving the proposals, the Dean will forward them to the Vice Provost for Computing. A committee representing the schools will review the proposals. The Vice Provost will make an award to each School as a single dollar amount for all proposals. The Dean will determine the allocation of that amount among the School's proposed projects after consultation with the Vice Provost.

**Award:** The Dean will be notified of the award by January 2. Funds will be available at that time.

## Report to Members on Sheltering Child Care

Those of the administrative and professional staff who attended our June assembly will recall that following a presentation on the flexible or "cafeteria" benefits proposals now being studied at the University, a number of members raised questions about the new federal tax provisions for tax-sheltering a portion of child-care payments. Since this provision can be used only if the employer makes certain arrangements, the Assembly's executive committee asked that the 1985-86 chair write to Human Resources about the University's plans. The following exchange of correspondence took place. More important, the steps Mr. Posner projected in his response have since been taken by the Administration.\*

### Letter to Mr. Posner

On behalf of the Executive Committee of the A-I Assembly, I would like to express our support of the proposed Penn Flex benefits plan which was described to us by Jim Keller at our Annual Meeting in June.

One of the major issues which surfaced during Jim's presentation was child care, both as an element of a benefits package and in terms of the ability to tax shelter child care payments under recent revisions to the tax code. His response at that time was that dependent care would be part of the Penn Flex program but that earlier implementation of the tax shelter was administratively impossible. While we fully appreciate the complexities in implementing a program such as Penn Flex, we are also mindful of the financial pressures that child rearing places on the working family. Thus we urge you and your staff to give every consideration to an early implementation of Penn Flex and, if possible, expeditious establishment of a mechanism under which our employees can take advantage of any tax savings available under current legislation.

The A-I Assembly is vitally interested in any proposed changes to our benefits program and is ready to participate in their review through the Executive Committee, our representative to the Personnel Benefits Committee, and meetings of the membership. We look forward to continued exchanges of information with you and your staff on these issues.

—Shirley Hill, Chair

\*See page 2, this issue.

\*\*Almanac September 3, page 6.

## Response

Thank you for your letter of August 9, 1985.

We are looking forward to a busy fall with the Personnel Benefits Committee as we proceed to investigate flexible benefits for employees. The support of the Penn Flex concept by the A-I Assembly is appreciated and your representatives on that committee, through their support, can assist in moving the concept to reality.

We take seriously the Assembly's suggestion that Penn "give every consideration to an early implementation" of Penn Flex and tax sheltering of child care payments. In terms of implementing a dependent care reimbursement account, you are aware that I have been asked to review our capability to introduce such an account possibly in advance of the July 1, 1986 date that was previously anticipated. Margaret McGee, representing the Assembly, and other individuals met recently with Mr. Keller and me to discuss this matter. We hope to introduce a proposal to the Personnel Benefits Committee at their first meeting this fall along those lines and are investigating currently what costs and other problems need to be addressed to insure the account meets the needs of employees efficiently and with minimum bureaucracy.

I look forward to working with you and the Assembly during the coming year and would be happy to meet with you and the Executive Committee at any time on issues of mutual concern.

—Gary J. Posner, Vice President for Administration

In the coming year, the Administrative Assembly will continue to consider questions raised by members of the A-I staff, and to reflect your views in various forums. Our member on the Personnel Benefits Committee, Kristin Davidson, will follow the progress of Penn Flex proposals, and our representative on the University Council, Jacqueline Matthews, will be pleased to hear from any member of the administrative/professional staff on topics coming before the Council for discussion (Note that on October 9, two important topics are the investment policy in South Africa, and the Report of the Committee to Survey Sexual Harassment.) There will again be an annual meeting in the spring term, where we expect to follow the tradition of having information reports from members of the University. And, please feel free to bring questions and suggestions to me or to any member of the Administrative Assembly's elected executive board.\*\*

—Shirley Hill, Chair

# Speaking Out

## Extent of Harassment

The Report of the Committee to Survey Harassment at the University of Pennsylvania has clearly and quantitatively presented the range and percentage amounts of sexual harassment on our campus. The percentages are important to know, but the absolute numbers give an even greater impression.

We obtained figures from various University offices from which we calculated the total number of women in the four categories that were sampled. At the time of the survey the women at the University numbered 3842 undergraduates, 5219 graduate and professional students, 350 standing and associated faculty and 3006 staff (A1 and A3), i.e. 12,417 women.

We applied these figures (which probably have an error of less than 1 or 2%) to all the percentages in Table 1 and 2 of the report. On the assumption that the experiences of the whole population at risk were similar to those of the respondents—an assumption used by the Committee in their "Summary of Findings," this showed that, if all the harassment occurred during the academic year of 32 weeks, the number of women in all the 4 categories who suffered A, B or C type harassment was on the average 7 new cases per day from people in authority and 10 new cases per day from peers. These were distributed as follows (in round numbers): 5 new cases per day for students, 1 new case per week for faculty and 9 new cases per week for staff from people in authority and, respectively, for new cases, 9 per day, 1 per week, and 7 per week from peers.

For 5 years or the total time at Penn, whichever was least (and by the end of the spring term the average undergraduate had been at Penn for 2.5 years), the figures are:

—for subgroup B ([b] unwanted pressure for dates, [c] unwanted letters or phone calls of a sexual nature or [f] unwanted pressure for sexual favors) 1057 women were harassed one or more times by people in authority and 3173 by peers;

—for subgroup C ([e] unwanted deliberate touching, leaning over, cornering or pinching or [g] actual attempted rape or sexual assault) 1440 women were harassed by people in authority and 2588 by peers;

—for subgroups A, B or C (where A was [a] unwanted teasing, jokes, remarks or questions of a sexual nature, or [d] unwanted sexually suggestive looks or gestures) 3721 women were harassed by people in authority and 5200 by peers. (Some of these women were harassed by both persons in authority and by peers.)

It is of concern that 29 of the 1446 respondents from the random sample of 2564 women surveyed reported unwanted pressure for sexual favors and 9 reported attempted rape or sexual assault. Since the population at risk was 12,417, the actual numbers of these women must be much greater and at least about 140 and 44. If there was no nonresponse bias these numbers would be 249 women exposed to unwanted pressure for sexual favors and 77 suffering from attempted rape or sexual assault.

A comparison of the survey questionnaire

and the published report shows that far more information must have been accumulated than has been published, for example: which schools contain most of the harassers; is there a relationship between the percentage of women faculty and students and the amount and types of harassment to which they are subjected; what percent of untenured, tenured-track women are harassed before being considered for tenure and by whom; what fraction of student harassment occurs in fraternities and dormitories; how many women have left the University because they had been sexually harassed; what are the total number of harassments (i.e. actual incidents), since in the published figures a woman who is harassed more than once and even by more than one harasser is recorded as only one case in that category? We know from direct reports that some harassers have harassed the same woman many times and many women at least once.

The magnitude of the harassment described in this careful report has not surprised us. We knew it from numerous direct reports from students, faculty and staff during the past three and a half decades at the University. However, we hope that many more people will now realize just how serious the problem is and will help to bring about the necessary changes in attitudes and behavior at our University.

—Helen C. Davies, Professor of Microbiology

—Robert E. Davies, Benjamin Franklin Professor of Molecular Biology and University Professor

## OF RECORD



### Guidelines on Open Expression (Excerpts)

*The following excerpts (Parts I and III) of the Guidelines on Open Expression are printed annually at the request of the Committee on Open Expression. Part II deals with the make-up and responsibilities of the Committee on Open Expression; Part IV sets forth the responsibilities of the Vice Provost for University Life in maintaining the right of open expression under the Guidelines; and Part V covers the application of the Guidelines to non-University groups. The full text of the Guidelines is in the Undergraduate and Graduate Bulletins, and available as well from the Office of the Secretary, 121 College Hall.*

#### I. Principles

A. The University of Pennsylvania, as a community of scholars, affirms, supports, and cherishes the concepts of freedom of thought, inquiry, speech and lawful assembly. The freedom to experiment, to present and to examine alternative data and theories; the freedom to hear, express, and to debate various views; and the freedom to voice criticism of existing practices and values are fundamental rights which must be upheld and practiced by the University in a free society.

B. Recognizing that the educational processes can include meetings, demonstrations, and other forms of collective expression, the University affirms the right of individuals and groups to assemble and to demonstrate on campus within the limits of these guidelines. The University also affirms that right of others to pursue their normal activities within the University and to be protected from physical injury or property damage.

C. The University should be vigilant to ensure the continuing openness and effectiveness of channels of communication among members of the University on questions of common interest. To further this purpose, a Committee on Open Expression has been established as a standing committee of the University Council. The Committee on Open Expression has as its major task: monitoring the communication process to prevent conflicts that might emerge from failure of communication, recommending policies and procedures for improvement of all levels of communication, interpreting these guidelines, investigating alleged infringements of the right of open expression of any member or members of the University community, advising administrative officers where appropriate, and participating in evaluation and resolution of conflicts that may arise from incidents or disturbances on campus.

D. For the purposes of these guidelines, the "University community" shall mean the following individuals:

1. Persons who are in attendance as students or who have been in attendance in the past and are currently on an unexpired official leave of absence.
2. All persons who are employed by the University. This includes faculty, staff and administrative employees.
3. Trustees and associate trustees of the University.

E. For the purposes of these guidelines, a distinction is drawn between the terms "meeting" and "demonstration." A meeting is a gathering in a University facility previously reserved for the purpose. A demonstration is a gathering in a University facility not previously reserved for the purpose.

#### III. Standards

A. The right of individuals and groups peaceably to assemble and to demonstrate shall not be infringed.

B. The substance or the nature of the views expressed is not an appropriate basis for any restriction upon or encouragement of an assembly or a demonstration.

C. The University should permit members of the University community, upon suitable request, to use any available facility or meeting room for purposes of open or private discussion.

1. The policies and procedures for assigning University facilities should be determined by the president or his delegates.
2. The Committee on Open Expression should be consulted in the determination of the substance of the policies and procedures and the manner of their publication by the University.
3. The policies and procedures should specifically address situations involving groups composed entirely or predominantly of persons not members of the University community.
4. Before a request of a University group to use any facility is rejected, for reasons other than the prior commitment of the facility or the like, the president or his delegate should consult with the Committee on Open Expression to obtain the advice and recommendations of that body.

D. Groups or individuals planning or participating in meetings or demonstrations should conduct themselves in accordance with the following standards:

1. Conduct that causes injury to persons or damage to property or which threatens to cause such injury or damage, or which attempts to coerce action under threat of such injury or damage, is not permissible.
  - a. Demonstrations should not be held inside laboratories, museums, computer facilities, libraries, offices which contain records protected by law or by existing University policy such as educational records or student-related or personnel-related financial records or the like, because of the risk of loss, damage or destruction of rare or irreplaceable documents, collections or equipment.
  - b. Meetings and demonstrations should not be held in places where there is a significant hazard of fire or building collapse or falling objects.
  - c. Meetings and demonstrations should not interfere with the operation of hospitals, emergency facilities, communication systems, utilities, or other facilities or services vital to the continued functioning of the University.
2. Meetings and demonstrations should be conducted in a manner that keeps within reasonable bounds any interference with or disturbance of the activities of other persons. The reasonableness of conduct may be determined by such factors as the time and place of the demonstration and the general tenor of conduct.
  - a. Demonstrations should not be held inside libraries or private offices, or inside classrooms or seminar rooms in which meetings or classes are being held or are immediately scheduled.
  - b. Meetings and demonstrations should not interfere with free and unimpeded movement in and out of buildings and rooms and through all passageways. This will generally be satisfied if at least one-half of each entrance, exit, or passageway is free from obstruction of any kind.
  - c. Noise level is not of itself a sufficient ground for making a meeting or demonstration improper, but may possibly, in particular circumstances, interfere and disrupt the activities of others in an impermissible way.

## EXHIBITS

**Art-in-Science V Series 1985-86: Artist-in-Resource**—a three artist, three phase exhibition sequence of site-referenced projects begins with Phase I: Premise, contest/project proposals. University City Science Center, Monday-Friday 9 a.m.-5 p.m. Through October 4.

## FITNESS/LEARNING

**6 International Folk Dancing**, open to faculty, staff, students and alumni families; for beginners, basic dances will be taught; 2-4 p.m., Room 245, Houston Hall. \$2 per couple, family or person (Alumni Relations).

**Counseling at the Penn Women's Center**: free and strictly confidential counseling for faculty, students and staff; 9 a.m.-5 p.m. Monday-Friday, Room 119, Houston Hall, Ext. 8611.

## TALKS

**7 Finding and Applying for Grants and Fellowships**; Maggie Morris, assistant dean for administration, Graduate Division of Arts and Sciences; Roger Abrahams, professor of folklore and folk-life; Julia Miller, placement counselor, Career Planning and Placement; 4:30 p.m., Room 235, Houston Hall (Graduate Student Career Seminar Series).

## Deadlines

The deadline for the weekly calendar update entries is Monday, a week before the Tuesday of publication. The deadline for the November pullout calendar is Monday, October 14. Send to *Almanac*, 3601 Locust Walk/C8 (second floor of the Christian Association Building).

## University Citifest—An International Celebration

Penn will join with its University City neighbors for an October 19 and 20 festival of West Philadelphia's ethnic diversity, cultural richness and neighborhood pride. University Citifest/International begins at noon and runs to 5 p.m. both days. Headquarters is a tent to be pitched at 38th and Market, but a free bus called Citiloop takes visitors to the several dozen other locations where food, shows, displays and hands-on activities are set up for all age groups.

At the Marketplace tent itself will be performances on the hour (the last Sunday one by the area's own Philadanco), plus food, plus amusement rides from Europe, plus language lessons—the rudiments of some 12 languages spoken in the area (and native speakers to visit with), plus lessons in American sign; and training in hieroglyphics in a University Museum booth in the tent. At the Museum's home base, 33rd and Market, will be film, dance, exhibits and hands-on activities incorporating Japanese traditions, Indian ritual, Middle Eastern customs and Caribbean food and music.

Some samples: *The Karate Kid* screened at 10:30 a.m. Saturday; calypso at 1:30 the same day; the mime-dance drama *Krishnattam* at 8 that evening. On the 20th two films in the World Culture series: *A Zenana* and *So Far from India*.

At International House on Friday, October 18, at 7:30 p.m. and Saturday, October 19 at 7:30 p.m. is the Philadelphia premiere of *All Under Heaven*, a film about modern China done by West Philadelphia residents Carma Hinton and Richard Gordon. *Small Happiness*, the first part of their Long Bow Trilogy of which *All Under Heaven* is the second part, will be screened Friday at 4 p.m. and Saturday at 9 p.m. Admission is \$3, \$2 for International House members, students and senior citizens. International House (Chestnut between 37th and 38th) is also the backup location for the Marketplace booths and shows in case the weather is too tough for tenting.

As the free Citiloop bus circles continuously through the University City area, it can drop off and pick up visitors to:

- The University City Science Center's art-show-in-a-diner, where Phil Simkin has invented "IFACTS" (Institute for Creative Thoughts and Stuff) as "a parallel conceptual art resource and mock academic research facility" mirroring the Science Center itself.

## Memorial Service: Dr. Irwin

The memorial service for Dr. Francis Irwin, emeritus professor of psychology who died July 8 at the age of 80, will be held Thursday, October 24, at 4:30 p.m. in the Rare Books Room of Van Pelt Library. All members of the University are invited to attend.

- The University City Arts League's exhibition, *Jewels of the Atlas: Berber Rugs and Textiles from Morocco*, at 4226 Spruce.

- Garden Court's International Food Fair and Flea Market at 47th and Spruce, with some 20 tables of edibles, collectibles and crafts.

- Squirrel Hill's forest paradise at 48th and Chester, a mural/collage/environment done in conjunction with Rouse Urban Partners and the Anti-Graffiti Network.

- Clark Park concerts, the ICA exhibition of Siah Armajani's designs, and the Bush Fire Theatre's production of *Take on a Life or Live in a Crowded Color Cocoon*.

There are also walking tours—one of them through the Penn campus for a look at the buildings by Cope and Stewardson, Furness, Saarinen, Kahn, and Mitchell/Giurgola. (Houston Hall at 1 p.m. and 3 p.m. each day). The other, through the early "streetcar suburb" of Spruce Hill with its Victorian heritage, leaves from the University City Arts League at noon, 2 p.m. and 4 p.m. each day. The Foundation for Architecture sponsors the walking tours, and there are nominal charges with reduced rates for the under-12.

Some 20 restaurants in the area are planning special menus, reduced prices and in some cases live entertainment. The ethnic/international flavor prevails in music: Brazilian jazz at Eden, Mexican music at Smart Alex, bluegrass at the White Dog, and bluegrass plus Cajun to go with Creole Night at the Palladium.

For a finale, Citifest has signed up Grucci Fireworks for pyrotechnics at dusk on Sunday, October 20—viewable from the communities surrounding 38th and Market.

University's Citifest/International's sponsors—the University Citigroup, a non-profit coalition of organizations—seeks volunteers to help Saturday and Sunday, October 19 and 20, 9 a.m.-5 p.m. Interested faculty, staff or students are asked to call the Citifest coordinator Kim Brown at 386-5757.

## Almanac

3601 Locust Walk/C8  
Philadelphia, Pa. 19104  
(215) 898-5274 or 5275.

The University of Pennsylvania's journal of record and opinion is published Tuesdays during the academic year and as needed during summer and holiday breaks. Guidelines for readers and contributors are available on request.

EDITOR  
ASSISTANT EDITOR  
EDITORIAL ASSISTANT  
STUDENT ASSISTANTS

Karen C. Gaines  
Marguerite F. Miller  
Mary Corbett  
Catherine E. Clark  
Mary A. Downes  
Leah C. Gardiner  
Michael S. Markowitz  
John J. Neumann  
Leonard S. Perlman

ALMANAC ADVISORY BOARD Chair, Arnold Thackray; Linda Brodkey, Lucienne Frappier-Mazur, Henry Hiz, Alfred Rieber, Anthony R. Tomazinis, Michael Zuckerman, for the Faculty Senate; ... William G. Owen for the Administration; ... Carol Carr for the Librarians Assembly; ... John Hayden for the Administrative Assembly; ... Joseph Kane for the A-3 Assembly.



**At the Ross:** Larry Rivers's sketch of *The Congregation*, graphite and colored pencil, is in the Rivers show, *History of Matzah: The Story of the Jews*, at the Ross Gallery in Furness through November 20.