

Year-End Reports of Council and Independent Committees

Although they appear in a single section for the convenience of readers who file them, the year-end reports of Penn's key standing committees range widely in content and purpose: The Research report sums up changes and refinements in policies affecting both faculty and administrators involved, for example, whereas Facilities has a guide to current and projected changes in the physical environment for the whole of the campus. Elsewhere, committee chairs report new problems their areas may face, and progress toward solution of old problems. Next week the names of incoming members and chairs of these committees are scheduled for publication.

Council Committee Reports

Academic Review	I
Bookstore	I
Communications	II
Community Relations	II
Facilities	III
Facilities Management	III
Facilities Development	III
Transportation and Parking	III
International Programs	IV
Library	IV
Personnel Benefits	V
Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics	V
Research	VI
Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid	VI

Independent Committee Reports

Long Term Total Disability Board	VII
Faculty Grants and Awards	VIII
Honorary Degrees	VIII
Open Expression	VIII
Student Fulbrights	VIII

COUNCIL COMMITTEES

Academic Review

During the 1984-85 academic year the Academic Review Committee reviewed four proposals for the establishment of organized academic units. These proposals had been submitted to the Committee by the Provost for advice.

On November 30, 1984, the full committee reviewed a proposal for a Center for Soviet and East European Studies, submitted by Professor Elliot Mossman, acting chair of the Slavic Language Department, and a proposal for the Alice Paul Center for the Study of Women, submitted by Professor Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, director of the Women's Studies program. The ad hoc subcommittee reviewing the Soviet and East European Studies Center proposal was chaired by Professor John A. Lepore. A second ad hoc committee reviewing the proposal for the Alice Paul Center for the Study of Women was chaired by Professor Adelaide Delluva. On the basis of these subcommittee reports, the full committee voted to recommend approval of both centers to the Provost.

The committee's advice on an affiliation agreement between the University and the Howard Hughes Medical Institute was sought by Dr. Richard Clelland, deputy provost. In this case, the committee as a whole read the full supporting materials. On the basis of this reading and the ensuing discussion, the committee recommended approval to the Provost on December 14, 1984.

The fourth proposal reviewed by the committee concerned the establishment of the School of Social Work Resources and Service Center. The proposal was submitted to the committee by Professor Louise P. Shoemaker, dean of the School of Social Work. The ad hoc subcommittee was chaired by Professor Elliot Mossman and made its report to full committee on April 25, 1985. The committee voted to recommend approval of the center to the Provost. In this, the final meeting, it was also suggested that the committee, in future years, might consider the pros and cons of gathering annual reports from each ongoing academic research center.

— Susan M. Wachter, Chair

Bookstore

The Bookstore Committee performed two general functions during 1984-85: oversight of the operations of the Bookstore and communication between the University community and the management of the Bookstore. The mandate of the Committee for either of these tasks is somewhat unclear. The University administration exercises ultimate authority over the Bookstore and its management, and the staff of the Bookstore is responsive to any direct communication from any member of the community. Nevertheless, this committee performs an important role in providing an additional mechanism for review of Bookstore activities.

The Bookstore currently operates to produce modest gains from its operations. The ability of the store to operate on such a sound financial footing is the result of the competent management which the store has had in recent years. The resulting surpluses are available to be used for major capital improvements which will, in the long run, lead to a better store. One such improvement currently being implemented is the computerization of the accounting, inventory, and ordering operations of the store. One result of the improvement should be the ability of the store to maintain a more diverse inventory of trade books. Another result should be the rationalization of the process of ordering and maintaining its stock of textbooks.

In the spring of 1984, the Bookstore created the Computer Shack as an on-campus outlet for the sale of computers and accessories. This was done on extremely short notice to allow the University to implement various agreements with manufacturers for the discounted sale of equipment to students, faculty, and staff. It is important for customers of the Shack to realize that it is not operated to make a profit, but merely to provide this service.

In the long-run, there are strategic problems that need to be addressed. The present physical facility is inadequate, both in terms of space and in terms of quality. On the other hand, the physical location of the store is nearly ideal for serving the University. The desirability of conversion to a Co-op, which has been a dormant issue for several years, needs to be periodically reexamined in light of current conditions.

In its "communication" role, the committee continued to articulate ways in which the store can be more responsive to the needs of the community. While many such suggestions are trivial or cosmetic in nature, they do tend to foster a greater sense of the Bookstore being "our" store. The entire text ordering and retailing policy came under scrutiny from both faculty and students. It was felt that certain improvements could be made in the way faculty members were apprised of problems and also that steps could be taken to make the text-book rush at the beginning of each semester less grueling for students. The manager has undertaken a review of all steps in the text-book process to attempt to identify areas of potential improvement. Other areas of consumer concern include the physical layout and aesthetics of the store and issues related to credit cards, check verification, etc.

In my opinion, the Committee could play a greater role in fostering communication between the community at large and the store's management. The existence and membership of the committee should be publicized to some extent, and members of the community should consider using their peers on the committee to communicate information or questions.

I also feel that an attempt should be made to provide greater continuity of leadership and membership on the committee. This might include designating "next-year's-Chair" during the current year. In addition, the committee could probably function with a smaller membership.

— R. Neil Vance, *Chair*

Communications

The Communications Committee met six times during the year. The initial discussion was an update on *Almanac* and the *Penn Paper* from the editors including a progress report on the status of the papers, a brief discussion of the budgets and some questions about content.

A problem that was identified and discussed by the committee was the speed of delivery of the intramural mail and the coordination of University mail with that to the Hospital and Medical School. Since the papers use the intramural mail system as their distribution mechanism this was an important issue for them as well. A meeting was held to discuss these problems with Mr. Steven Murray, director of business services for the University, and Mr. Thomas Golaszewski, director of distribution services for HUP, each in charge of mail distribution in the respective area. The goal of both systems is to move the mail within 24 hours from receipt into the system, either into another system or to the individual. Most of the problems seemed to be in delivery within individual buildings and in the connections between the services.

Because the committee had concentrated in the past only on written forms of communication at the University, a discussion of the Penn radio station was begun with Mr. Peter Cuzzo, manager of WXPB-FM. He discussed the goals, operation and organization of the station. The committee was quite impressed with the operation and felt that the station is important to the University and the community, and needs support to help renovate some of their outdated facilities.

The final meetings of the committee were used to consider the five-year plan for communications at the University that is being formulated by Ann Duffield and the Office of University Relations. An initial draft of this plan was reviewed and suggestions made. The committee was very favorably impressed with the ideas presented and the scope of the plan, and had several suggestions. This plan will undergo major discussion and revision this summer and will be ready for additional review in the fall. The committee feels that this plan is going to have a major impact on the University communications and believes that in the next few years it will be especially important and helpful to allow this committee to help in the formulation of the plan and then provide support when it comes to implementing the plan. We recommend that the University Council should make the Communications Committee a permanent committee instead of having it continue on a temporary basis. In this way it will be possible to have continuing input into the planning process and to have a mechanism to monitor and discuss specific problems as they occur.

—Barbara F. Atkinson, *Chair*

Community Relations

The Council Committee on Community Relations got a late start in conducting its business this past year because the chairperson of the committee was not appointed until late in the fall semester. Once the committee got underway, it held regular monthly meetings throughout the rest of the academic year.

As part of our endeavor to fulfill the committee's mandate to understand the University's major real estate transactions and their possible impact upon the community, we once again scheduled a series of meetings with various University officers who have responsibility for these matters. Among those who met with our committee were Barbara Stevens, assistant to President Hackney for his many community-related activities; Paul Levy, who has special responsibilities in regard to the development of the 3400 block of Walnut Street; Chris Van DeVelde, the new director of real estate; and Alexis Van Adzin, the director of Commonwealth and City Relations. Each of these meetings was designed to give our committee a briefing on what the University is doing and planning to do in relation to the communities upon which its activities have an impact. This is especially important in terms of real estate transactions and therefore most of our meetings were focused on these.

In this regard, the University Council passed a resolution this year which had been proposed last year by the Community Relations Committee. The resolution formalizes the responsibility of this committee to "have cognizance of pending real estate activities of concern to the community." It provides that the Chair of the committee shall meet quarterly or more often, if needed, with the Senior Vice President or her designee to be kept informed of any impending real estate transactions.

Given this mandate, the committee spent a major portion of its time trying to stay abreast of what was happening in the development of the property in the 3400 block of Walnut Street. We were pleased that an agreement had been reached in the lengthy dispute with the Sansom Street group, and were also encouraged that the planning for the development of the block seems to be incorporating serious attention to the community's concern about the quality of the design and the type of stores to be included in the project.

In addition to our regular monthly meetings, the committee continued to sponsor a series of community breakfasts, designed to bring together people from our neighboring communities with a number of members of the University. These breakfasts were organized by Jim

Robinson, the director of Community Relations, and included the following topics: "Illiteracy — A Challenge"; "West Philadelphia — An International City"; and, "Child Welfare/Prevention of Teenage Suicides". Each of the meetings was well attended and offered an opportunity for local residents to meet and to exchange ideas with people from the University. These breakfast sessions have provided the opportunity for a much-needed interaction between the University and its neighbors; it is one of the very few times that such an interaction takes place.

It has been suggested that among other topics to which this committee should address itself in the future, it would be appropriate to review the extent to which recommendations for the University's "Ties With The City" have been implemented. Other areas of concern continue to be safety and security, parking, transportation, and public education in our neighboring communities. In these and other matters, the committee hopes to serve the University and its neighbors where their interests and concerns interact.

—Stanley E. Johnson, Chair

Facilities

The Facilities Committee continued to make strong progress on several issues during the academic year. The committee met five times during the year, and the subcommittee on Transportation and Parking, chaired by Dr. Edward Morlok, met four times. Acting on the recommendation of the previous year's committee, the subcommittee on Classroom Space was disbanded; however, John Smolen, registrar of the University, continued to update the committee with the progress of the Advisory Committee on Classroom Space.* The concerns of the committee which were actively pursued during the year are divisible into two categories: Facilities Management and Facilities Development.

Facilities Management

Winterization: The committee investigated the manner in which the University prepared for winter when the campus shuts down over winter vacation. To address the committee's concerns over the many problems which occurred last winter (1983-84) Mr. Norman O'Connor, associate director of Physical Plant, and Mr. Alan Zuino, associate director of Residential Maintenance, briefed the committee on the intended prevention measures to avoid similar problems this winter. The committee received a copy of a memorandum from Arthur T. Gravina, director of Physical Plant, outlining the steps taken to minimize potential dangers and damage such as pipe freeze-ups and the like. Committee members remarked that communication links between Physical Plant and building administrators perhaps need to be strengthened. In addition, the committee would like to see some type of follow-up on this issue by next year's committee.

Housekeeping: In response to a concern that classroom maintenance was slipping, Mr. William Quigley, housekeeping manager, addressed the committee and indicated that one of the reasons the classrooms were not in as good shape was that no overtime for housekeeping was allowed this year. The University has contracted with a consulting firm, Bushie Associates, to study the housekeeping needs of the University and how to most efficiently provide this service. The committee suggested that posters used previously in classrooms be redone and placed in classrooms in order to encourage students to clean up after their evening use of classrooms for studying. In addition, the committee intends to view the final report of the Bushie group next year.

Energy and Trash: Members of the committee also expressed concerns regarding the City's trash problems and that perhaps the University should take a more active role in aiding the City to meet these problems for both the City's and the University's well-being. In a letter to Mrs. Helen O'Bannon, senior vice president, the committee urged the University to ask the contractor/engineering firm engaged in the cogeneration study to consider as one alternative the feasibility of adding a small pilot plant for trash to steam conversion and as another alternative to consider ways for multifuel combustion which would allow

burning both gas and trash. In addition, the committee strongly suggested that the University examine the possibility of recycling University trash. To date, no response has been received with respect to the final outcome of these suggestions. Due to the interest in energy related issues, members of the committee suggested that the subcommittee on Energy perhaps should be revived.

Landscaping: Both Mary Beermann, executive assistant, Student Financial and Administrative Services, and Titus Hewryk, director of Facilities Planning, reported to the committee regarding the lack of and need for landscaping in the superblock area. Mr. Hewryk recognized the needs of this area, indicated some proposals for the area; however, indicated the limitations are largely due to the lack of funding.

Asbestos Maintenance: The resurgence of the Asbestos Maintenance Program in the pages of the *Daily Pennsylvanian* prompted the committee to explore the charges leveled against the program with both James Miller, safety manager, and Matthew Finucane, environmental safety officer. They explained the recent problems and indicated the actions which were taken in the past and which will continue to be followed in the future with respect to safety and information dissemination to the University community as a whole.

Deferred Maintenance: Mr. Arthur Gravina, director of Physical Plant, briefed the committee on the Dober study which will indicate the deferred maintenance needs of the entire University. Mr. Gravina expects to brief the Trustees at the June meeting on the report and the capital costs associated with meeting the recommendations of the report. The committee expressed a desire to view a final copy of the report in the upcoming year.

Safety & Security: Finally, following up on a recommendation of last year's committee, closer links between the Council Committee on Safety & Security and Facilities were sought and successfully established. This linkage was strongly encouraged to continue as many of the concerns of the two committees overlap.

Facilities Development

Irvine Auditorium: As one might anticipate, the proposed Irvine renovation dominated much of the committee's fall agenda. Committee members served as reviewers of the Irvine report written by Dr. Charlotte Jacobson with the Office of Student Life. Furthermore, the committee forwarded its general approval of the renovation to both the President and Provost. The support of the committee, however, is contingent upon the resolution of three issues. First, the renovation must be entrusted to an architectural firm whose caliber equals that of Horace Trumbauer, the architect of the original building. Second, the endorsement is contingent upon the relocation of the student groups involved. Finally, the committee strongly encouraged direct negotiations between the University and parties interested in the Curtis Organ to resolve the issue of the relocation of the organ.

34th and Walnut: The members of the committee were pleased to see the resolution of the dispute between the University and the Sansom Committee. Paul Levy, real estate consultant, briefed the committee regarding the settlement. In addition, he displayed the University's plan for the 3400 block. The Facilities Committee also reviewed the Council Committee on Community Relations' report for suggested retail space in the 3400 development and elicited further suggestions. The committee intends to keep a watchful eye on the 3400 development to ensure that the retail space meets the needs of the entire University community.

Computing Network: Dr. David Stonehill, Vice President for Computing, addressed the committee with regard to the computer network of the campus. The committee would appreciate further updates as the computer networking proceeds.

Transportation and Parking

The subcommittee on Transportation and Parking continued to establish a solid relationship with University administrators Steven Murray, Hugh O'Doherty, and John Walters, Jr. The chair of the subcommittee, Dr. Edward Morlok, is commended for initiating and maintaining this excellent relationship between the Parking Office and the sub-

*Appendix available on request.

committee.

The committee endorsed the subcommittee's recommendation with regard to revised parking fees and supports them as they appear to be based on reasonable principles. In addition, at the request of the Parking Office, the subcommittee developed a statement on assignment of parking spaces, which the committee approved. The statement endorses the present policy of "first come, first serve"; however, recognizes that exceptions to this rule must occur. When exceptions do occur, the committee recommended that the Parking Administrator require documentation of claimed exceptions.

The subcommittee also developed a statement which would prohibit motorized vehicles and the riding of bicycles on designated walkways. The committee tabled the statement until next year when appropriate consultation with student groups, Community Relations representatives, and members of the administration can be coordinated to discuss codes of enforcement.

The subcommittee plans to re-examine the Policy Paper on Transportation Goals and Guidelines in 1985-86 in light of current data and trends. One should note that consistent membership on the Facilities Committee has allowed this subcommittee to act in a very positive manner.

Concluding Remarks

The committee continued to receive strong staff support from Virginia Scherfel, assistant to the vice president for Facilities Management. Her assistance was invaluable. The committee was pleased to see progress on recommendations made by the committee in prior years.

—Craig R. Carnaroli, Chair

International Programs

The Committee on International Programs met four times during the academic year 1984-85. At the suggestion of the previous year's committee we took as our major task, within the mandate of the committee, to seek out ways to increase student and faculty awareness of the University's international programs.

Our first job, obviously, was to find some way of measuring awareness of such programs. Note was made of the monthly newsletter of the Office of International Programs, *The International Dimension*, and of its distribution. The newsletter serves a real need in detailing international events at the University, though we have no way of knowing how widely it is used to increase attendance at such events. In related matters, the committee looked at issues concerning:

1. international conferences held at the University and the OIP's involvement in such arrangements;
2. the University's commitment to international education in terms of support for OIP in its promotion of international studies at Penn;
3. the possibility of increasing Penn's relations with developing nations without simultaneously decreasing our European connections, especially since most of our foreign students come from non-western nations;
4. improvement of existing mechanisms so that transfer of credits from study abroad can be made consistent and standards applied equally across the University;
5. a need for guidance in the evaluation of foreign transcripts for graduate admissions.

The committee sought specific information concerning the University's linkages with foreign universities. OIP supplied the committee with an inventory of such affiliations, mostly formal, but took note of the fact that informal contacts are probably several times the number of the more formal ones. The list is a preliminary one and is in continual flux. It was recommended that when corrections and additions have resulted in an updated list, summaries be distributed to the University's schools, departments and programs in order to inform the campus constituencies of existing linkages. The list will become part of an information program to inform the faculty of (1) possibilities for faculty exchange and (2) the ways in which such exchanges and linkages can be developed.

An examination was made of the various models for student exchanges including even and uneven exchanges, details of financing and tuition payments, housing and other living arrangements, transportation funding, with reference made to Penn-sponsored programs as compared

to programs of other U.S. institutions. It appears there are sufficient opportunities for undergraduates to study abroad. Considerable efforts are made to educate Penn students about such programs. The committee noted that only a small percentage of Penn undergraduates seem predisposed to the notion of study abroad, perhaps partly because many of our students are in pre-professional programs and might not consider study abroad compatible with career objectives. Ways were suggested to OIP to get a full reading on this matter as well as to increase contact with such students and their advisors.

Relative to formal faculty linkages with foreign educational institutions, it was suggested that specialized lists of such linkages for each school would be useful if sent to all department chairs. Such lists might contain the names of foreign contacts itemized by field so that one-on-one direct approaches from the University of Pennsylvania faculty could be facilitated. With regard to such exchanges it was noted that problems related to housing at Penn and to the lack of modest but dependable sources of income supplementation were endemic and should be an item for future committee study.

Student interest could be increased by having departments distribute to each of their students a one-page handout summarizing recommended study abroad programs. Interested students could then be directed to OIP for further information and assistance.

The committee recommended that future committee panels should concentrate on specific issues of concern by way of assisting and advising the OIP. It is also recommended that a greater degree of continuity be maintained between each year's committee personnel and the committee that follows. This could be achieved by the committee on committees' appointing committee members for several years, with either one-half or one-third of the members replaced by new members each year.

Finally, the committee wishes to place on record its support of an International Alumni Program designed to encourage and promote ongoing life-long contact between the University of Pennsylvania and its alumni, both foreign and American, living abroad.

— Kenneth S. Goldstein, Chair

Library

The Library Advisory Committee attempted to maintain continuity with the efforts of last year's committee by reviewing the current status of various problems and proposals that had come under discussion in 1983-84.

Members of the committee were pleased to learn that the Pew Memorial trust had granted the library \$1.5 million for technological development — a grant that had the enthusiastic support of the previous committee. Concerns about how far this grant would carry the greatly needed retrospective conversion of catalogue records were addressed by the director of Libraries. The grant will achieve conversion of the Library of Congress classification; Dewey classification would follow, but would require additional funding, for which current prospects appear relatively bright.

The previous committee had initiated discussion of a possible consolidation of the various science libraries, leaving the continuation of that discussion to the principals involved. Beyond the proposed merger of the two engineering library units, however, there appears to be no serious interest in a more far-reaching consolidation.

Among the recommendations made by the Library Committee in 1983-84 were an increase in the acquisition of science monographs and strengthening the measures used to encourage the return of books held for considerable amounts of time by faculty borrowers. Members of the committee and the library staff reported evidence of success in carrying out both of these recommendations.

The previous committee had expressed alarm at the low ranking our library had received in 1982 with respect to statistics on book expenditures compiled by the American Research Libraries Group (ARL). In 1982 we ranked 55th in the nation — a statistic that prompted the committee to urge the central administration to increase its support for the library. Members of the current committee were pleased to take note of

an 8% increase in the library book budget, an increase that was part of a pattern of increased support that has been in effect over the past three years. Current ARL statistics, in fact, show a leap in our library's national ranking with respect to book expenditures from 55th nationally in 1982 to 39th in 1983-84. The committee expressed its gratitude to the provost, who attended one of its meetings, for the increased support of the library. Members of the committee pressed the provost for an indication of whether the present pattern of increases could be expected to continue — a goal that would appear to be imperative if we are to keep books and journal acquisition commensurate with the research needs of the faculty. The provost responded that, within any given three-year period, the current pattern of increased support could, indeed, be expected to continue.

Other matters discussed included the proposed removal of the library from the subvention-fund budget, increased communication between the technological staff of the library and computer experts elsewhere on campus, recent increases in development efforts on behalf of the library, the asbestos problem in the library, and the testing of a new online database for the public catalogue.

—Lawrence F. Bernstein, Chair

Personnel Benefits

The Personnel Benefits Committee for the 1984-85 academic year had a busy agenda. In addition to the more routine matters that came before the Committee, the Committee's major function during the year was to analyze the possibility of the University of Pennsylvania considering a flexible benefits plan tentatively called PENNFLEX. The theory of such a plan would be to make more choices in benefits available to employees. The Committee thoroughly debated the rationale for such a plan, its strengths, potential problems, and how it most effectively might be used by employees of the University. During the period we had the assistance of a consultant from Tillinghast, Nelson & Warren, actuarial and benefit consultants and the University's enrolled actuary.

Specifically, the Committee felt that such a plan should move forward with appropriate communication based on the following general principles:

A basic tenet of the PENNFLEX Plan would be that anyone could opt for keeping the present benefit package for himself/herself and dependents or moving into one of the new plan options.

Any savings achieved through such a flexible benefits plan would go back to the faculty and staff in the form of additional elective benefits or cash compensation.

More specifically, a flexible benefits plan would have a core of benefits consisting of at least some level of group life insurance, medical insurance, disability income, and retirement benefits. This is to assure that everyone has at least certain minimal amounts of protection. After this, the plan would be designed so that an individual could either opt to remain where he or she currently is or could elect to obtain a core of benefits which would then free up additional credits that could be used for additional benefits, for example, increased life insurance over that provided by the current plan, or could take the credits in the form of cash.

The possibility also exists as part of a flexible benefits plan for the design of a tax-sheltered reimbursement account for medical expenses not covered by insurance or dependents' care expenses or both.

This is a very exciting development, and the Benefits Committee has indicated that the detailed plan should be drawn up so that appropriate communication with all segments of the University can be solicited before such a plan would be implemented.

In addition, some other changes or benefit improvements that were reviewed and approved by the Personnel Benefits Committee include:

Tax sheltering of subscriber contributions to health and dental plans effective June 1985 to coincide with the fiscal year 1985-86.

An increase in the monthly maximum benefit under the long-term disability plan from \$2,500 to \$3,500.

Benefit accruals under the staff retirement plan for plan members who continue to work full time for the University between ages 65 and 70.

Voluntary early retirement with actuarially adjusted benefits beginning at or after age 55 for plan members with 10 or more years of plan service.

Funding from the University to support the additional cost of

preretirement death benefit coverage mandated by the Retirement Equity Act (REACT).

Revision of the dental plans to provide for the continuation of coverage for dependent children who are full time students between the ages of 19 and 23 exclusive of orthodontic service, bringing the dental benefits in line with similar provisions in the medical plans.

It was a very exciting year, and I wish to congratulate the members of the Committee for their thorough and professional work throughout the year. They viewed the issues with a broad perspective from what would make sense for the University community as a whole.

—Jerry S. Rosenbloom, Chair

Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics

The University Council Committee on Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics has cognizance over recreation and intramural and intercollegiate athletics and their integration with the educational program of the University. The Committee consists of eight faculty members, two administrators, two A-3 staff representatives, two undergraduates and one graduate/professional student. The Director of Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics, the Vice Provost for University Life, the Dean of Admissions, and the chairpersons of the Captain's Council and the Women's Athletic Association are ex-officio members of the Committee.

During the 1984-85 academic year the Committee held six full meetings and met in subcommittees on several other occasions. The Committee reviewed on a regular basis developments within the athletic division, particularly those relevant to NCAA legislation and the physical improvement of campus athletic facilities, and addressed the following issues in detail:

1. Fan Behavior: In response to a continuing series of incidents during the 1984 football season that cast Penn fan behavior in an unfavorable light, the Committee took up the issue and established a subcommittee to develop a statement on fan behavior as a corollary to the University Policy on General Conduct. The statement reads as follows:

Fan behavior falls within the scope of the general conduct policy of the University which states that "All students of the University must conduct themselves at all times in a mature and responsible manner. The rights and property of all persons are to be respected regardless of time or place." Specifically this applies to behavior which is abusive and threatening to personal safety at University intercollegiate athletic events. Violations of these guidelines warrant disciplinary action as prescribed in the charter of the University Student Judiciary System.

2. Student Athletes: Through a subcommittee, the Committee undertook a major study on the academic progress and performance of Penn student athletes. The report analyzes the national picture, overall conditions at Penn relevant to student attrition and retention, and specific focus on varsity athletes. At this time, a final draft of the report is being written and it is expected that the Committee will have a report to the University community on the issue in fall, 1985.

3. Athletic Awards for Men and Women: The Committee reviewed and approved new rules and regulations governing athletic awards for men and women. The new guidelines apply to varsity athletes as well as to team managers and cheerleaders. The Committee approved the new guidelines in fall, 1984 and they immediately went into effect.

4. Ivy League Guidelines Affecting Athlete Admissions: The Committee discussed various Ivy League criteria governing the admission of student athletes and recommended that the University keep close tabs on the "161" issue and measure its effect, in particular, on the competitive balance within the league.

5. Development Plans and Capital Needs: The Committee reviewed the capital project needs of the athletic division and the long-range plans for the development of the athletic precinct.

6. Relationship Between Intercollegiate Athletics Performance and Fund Raising: The Committee reviewed the effect of competitive success in major intercollegiate sports on fund raising, particularly in the area of annual giving.

—Paul J. Zingg, Chair

Research

The Committee on Research met monthly during the academic year, dealing with three principal issues: computer software policy, animal research policy, and sponsored research. Its various statements and proposals have all been published in *Almanac*.

(1) A Proposed Policy Concerning the Development of Computer Software at the University was published April 16, 1985. Considerably modified from the Committee's fall 1984 draft (published for comment October 23, 1984), the 1985 document is now recommended by the Committee for adoption as University policy. It reflects many of the comments made following the 1984 draft, which were thoughtfully reviewed by a subcommittee chaired by Dr. Trevor Penning (pharmacology) with Dr. Robert Kraft (religious studies), Dr. David Stonehill (vice provost for computing), Dr. Gerald Porter (mathematics, and associate dean of computing facilities in the School of Arts and Sciences); Dr. Dan McGill (insurance), and Dr. David Garfinkel (computer and information science) as its members.

(2) The chair of the Committee was asked ex officio to join the January 15, 1985 Dialogue on Animal Research convened by Dr. Barry Cooperman, vice provost for research. (See *Almanac* February 19, 1985). The Committee's draft statement entitled "On Animal Welfare and Animal Experimentation" was published on April 30, 1985.

(3) Also on April 30, the Committee published for comment some proposed changes in University policy on Conflict of Interest in Externally Sponsored Research.

The 1984-85 Committee held preliminary discussions on the possible effects of both Department of Defense funding and industrial funding on academic freedom and the integrity of University research, with a particular concern for the effects of these fundings on graduate students' education.

— Helen C. Davies, Chair

Safety and Security

This is my report as Co-Chair with Julie Drizen of the Committee on Safety and Security for 1984-85.

The Committee on Safety and Security met monthly throughout the academic year, with the members of the University staff who serve, *ex officio*, as resource persons: Jim Miller, safety manager, Physical Plant, John Logan, director of Public Safety, May Morrison, director of Off Campus Living, Ruth Wells, director of Victim and Security Support Services, and Murray Burk, director of North Campus Residences.

One theme of the year's discussions was safety within campus buildings; and the committee's attention was directed to the chemistry building. With the help of appropriate campus departments, as a result of issues raised in the committee, a review was made and changes effected in fire extinguishers and fire safety measures in that building. In addition, the registrar's office was approached about the scheduling of classes for young children in the summer in that building where there is easy access to hazardous substances, and it was agreed that this kind of consideration will be taken into account in future scheduling of the use of space on campus in future.

When the Office of the Dean of SAS became concerned about lack of safety in Williams Hall, especially immediately preceding final exams in the fall term, and called a meeting of various campus representatives, the co-chair of the committee participated and plans were made through the Office of Student Life to provide safer alternative study space for extended hours through exams. That office, and especially Charlotte Jacobsen and Jim Bishop, at the urging of the committee, again activated such a plan at the end of classes in the spring term. The committee urges that this become a routine undertaking each semester.

As part of this latter effort it again became clear to the committee that as each building has different internal supervision, practices and problems it is necessary that there be an ongoing review and exchange of information carried out with building administrators as well as the Of-

fice of Public Safety, with regard especially to locking up procedures, safety equipment such as alarms, and emergency phones.

The issue of campus bus service and of the escort service has been a focus for the committee for the past several years. In January, at the invitation of the committee, Gary Posner, vice president for administration, and Steve Murray, director of Business Services, met with the committee to provide information on the history and the operation of the campus bus service. The committee in 1983-84 had recommended "the establishment of a Penn Bus route to serve the area bounded approximately by South Street, 22nd St. and Spring Garden . . . starting at 6:30 p.m." Again this point was raised and in spite of the financial constraints the committee asked that the Office of Transportation and Parking review the route and the proposed added loop, and that there be a mechanism for periodic review, every two years, to see how well the area served fits with the areas in which students and staff reside. Maye Morrison presented figures to show the increase in such residents to the east of the river.

Jim Miller, at the committee's request, reviewed the ongoing program of asbestos removal and encapsulation, and answered questions about the program. This, like many of the issues addressed by the committee, is and will be an on-going concern. And the committee provided a vehicle not only for various campus constituencies to raise questions and share information, but to propose ways of dealing with concerns of individuals and groups in the campus community.

In the spring Russell Muth, A-3 spokesperson, met with the committee to present a proposal for a campus-watch program. The committee was polled, and in principle agreed that such a program should be considered for presentation to the University as a whole, and be developed based on other community-watch programs. It was also urged that as part of the development of such a program, participants be given sensitivity training, along with safety training.

The committee meetings were not well attended. And although there is no doubt about the need for a committee to serve as a forum and catalyst, the pattern of meetings, and the possible role of sub-committees should be actively explored in the coming year.

—J. S. Adelman, Co-Chair

Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid

During the 1984-85 academic year this Committee met on Oct. 13, Nov. 30, Jan. 25, Feb. 15, Mar. 15, Apr. 19, and May 9. At every meeting W. J. Stetson and W. M. Schilling provided detailed verbal reports, sometimes supported by tabular or graphic material, on the business of the Offices of Admissions and Financial Aid, respectively.

At one or another of these meetings there were discussed: (a) Pennsylvania's Admission Plan for the incoming freshman class; (b) the substance of the McGill Report of 1967 and the manner in which its precepts and guidelines are implemented by the Admissions staff; (c) academic credentials for admission with respect to geographical area, majority and minority groups, and international students; (d) the rejuvenation of the Admissions Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences; (e) the impact on financial aid due to likely changes in the federal budget; (f) the University's endowment for undergraduate financial aid and efforts to expand it; (g) statistical summaries of applicants admitted during the year and of the prospective Class of 1989; and (h) the portion of the SCUE "White Paper" which is concerned with admissions. Items (d) and (f) were discussed with I. Berg and M. J. Williams, respectively. The consensus of the Committee appears to be that items (b), (c), and (d) can profitably be discussed in the next year as well.

Most of the meeting of May 9, 1985 was given over to presentations of reports from sub-committees and discussions of these reports. A summary of these matters follows and shows in parentheses the name of the sub-committee Chair.

Class Size (A. Scedrov): Class size is limited by a static physical plant and support and housekeeping services. The present and recent year's applicant pools suggest that Pennsylvania will have no difficulty

sustaining a class size of the order of 2200 and fine tuning to this size by transfer admissions for the foreseeable future. Concern has been voiced that the intended balance among the undergraduate schools can be subverted by high school seniors applying to the undergraduate school which they perceive to be a relatively easy "admit" and then transferring internally to the school of their real preference. It is clear that in the net The College loses ten to a couple score students each year to Wharton. The flux between The College and EAS is significantly smaller and shows no statistically significant trend. There is no known way to recognize any subterfuge in a student's application. In any case, the Admissions staff feels it reasonable that students in their very late teens may not fully understand their prospects and interests and should have every opportunity to change their undergraduate programs appropriately.

Faculty Participation in the Admissions Process (B. J. Spooner): This sub-committee was newly established this year. Its report concluded that the Admissions Office operates at a very high level of efficiency. Something is to be gained by increasing faculty visibility and participation in recruitment activities — a practice much desired by the Admissions staff — but there is always the limitation of faculty time. There exists sentiment for substantial weight to be given faculty opinion — inflected as it is by the classroom experience — during Slate Committee sessions when an applicant's academic and extra-curricular credentials are examined. The practicality of faculty participation in the pre-Slate scrutiny of applicants' records was examined. There was also propounded a rigorous rank-ordering by some academic index of all applicants. As a consequence of the availability of such an index data base, it would be possible to review the cases for applicants who were in the top N% but were rejected and those in the lowest M% who were accepted. A few procedures to implement such a review were examined with the expectation of faculty participation on the review panel. It is recognized that such a review procedure would have to work differently

during the separate Early Decision, Commonwealth Early Action, and Regular Admissions intervals. The essence of these ideas has been given a modest circulation among faculty and has not elicited uniform support because no weight would be given for intangibles, non-academic criteria, and potential for growth. Finally, there was expressed concern that there is no ready way to verify that the principles of the McGill Report are actually realized.

Financial Aid (A. L. Myers): In the previous year there had been concern about students' need for personal computers. The same concern surfaced this year and focused on a way to make attractive a credit plan so that students and their families would not face still another large expense. At some other institutions plans have been established which permit credit purchases of hardware at substantial discounts. Pennsylvania has waited too long to establish such an opportunity. The much more general problem of funding a college education in the face of federal retrenchments must be met by increasing the awareness of the value of that education not only to the student and to his family but to American society and culture at large.

Quality of Student Life (L. D. Miller): There has emerged the feeling that students are largely satisfied with the academic ingredient of their undergraduate years. The sub-committee noted with satisfaction that matriculated students are polled regarding the non-academic ambience of campus life.

Transfer Admissions (S. Barrett): There must be minimum uniformity of admissions standards for students transferring to the University even as early as their second college semester. This concern eventually spills over into any subsequent transfers among the undergraduate schools.

The Chair notes with satisfaction the efficient and helpful contributions of the ex-officio members of the Committee.

— R. H. Koch, Chair

INDEPENDENT COMMITTEES

Long Term Total Disability Board

University of Pennsylvania

As of June 30, 1985, ninety-nine Long Term Total Disability applicants were in benefit status. This is the first time since 1977 that the number has fallen below 100. During the 1984-85 year, 15 new applications were approved, 2 were disapproved, and 18 people were removed from the rolls. Of these 18, 10 died while receiving benefits, 7 retired, and one returned to work.

Six thousand and one members of the University faculty and staff are eligible for long term disability benefits, representing a total base payroll of \$158,815,856. The 1984-85 cost of the program, \$523,997, thus comes to 33% of eligible payroll.

The Long Term Total Disability Board met twice during the year. In addition, the Medical Subcommittee met in December to review the files of all disability recipients and held repeated consultations on individual cases. As has been done for several years, the Board utilized the services of the Health Evaluation Center of the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania, various medical specialists, and rehabilitation specialists in evaluating applications.

During its meetings the Board considered two appeals from University employees and one appeal from a Hospital employee who had been denied benefits. In each instance, the Board upheld the original finding.

Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania

In past years, data for the Hospital of the University has not been included in the report to Council. However, since the Hospital's disability program comes under the same Plan and Board as the University's, the Board concluded that comparable data for the Hospital should be included.

As of June 30, 1985, fifty-two Long Term Disability applicants were in benefit status. During the 1984-85 year, 10 new applicants were approved, 2 were disapproved, and 10 recipients were removed from the rolls. Of those 10, 5 died while receiving benefits, 3 retired, and 2 returned to work.

Two thousand four hundred and nine employees and staff of the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania are eligible for long term disability benefits, representing a total base payroll of \$49,628,561. The 1984-85 cost of the program to HUP was \$326,115. This comes to 65% of eligible payroll, approximately double the percentage for the rest of the University.

As a result of the cooperative efforts of the HUP Personnel Department and International Rehabilitation Associates, 10 LTD Benefit recipients were assisted with obtaining Social Security Disability Income Benefits. The offset of these benefits coupled with the savings from the two employees who returned to work resulted in future savings to HUP of \$1,112,820.

—Dan M. McGill, Chair

Faculty Grants and Awards

The Committee on Faculty Grants and Awards again solicited proposals from Penn faculty for 1985 summer Fellowships and Grants-in-Aid. Preference was given to Assistant Professors, as has been the case for the past several years. The Committee reaffirmed the need for such a grant program, emphasizing that it is one of the few sources of summer salary for junior faculty. Nonetheless, the Committee agreed that proposals of exceptional merit from senior faculty, such as the one from Professor Muhly, also deserve funding whenever possible.

For the second year the Committee followed the procedure of having every proposal read by two faculty, one in a closely allied field and the other in a distinct discipline. All proposals were read by the Chairman. It is strongly recommended that this or a similar procedure be followed in the future.

The following are some details of this year's applicant pool and awards:

Applications Received — 27
Fellowship Requests — 12
Grant-in-Aid Requests — 5
Requests for both Fellowship and Grant-in-Aid — 10

Funds Available — \$50,000
Funds Awarded — \$50,000
Fellowships Awarded — 11
Grants-in-Aid Awarded — 0
Both Fellowships and Grants-in-Aid Awarded — 5

A complete list of awardees, their departments, and the titles of their proposals is below.

— Terry L. Friesz, Chair

List of Awardees and Titles of Proposals

Rebecca Bushnell (English) — *Theaters of Prophecy: Classical Athens and Renaissance England*.
Lee Cassanelli (History) — *Tradition and Innovation: An Historical Approach to Survival Strategies in the Horn of Africa*.
Youssef Cohen (Political Science) — *Corporatist Democracy: The Political Economy of the Brazilian Fourth Republic*.
Thomas Connolly (Music) — *The Early Musical Iconography of St. Cecilia*.
Richard Estes (Social Work) — *The Social Progress of Nations: Phase II — 1980-1983*.
Rebecca Huss-Ashmore (Anthropology) — *Nutrition and Agricultural Strategy in Swaziland*.
Anna Kuhn (German) — *Literature is Utopia: Selected Essays of Christa Wolf*.
Vicki Mahaffey (English) — *Joyce and Authority*.
Ewa Morawska (Sociology) — *Insecure Prosperity: Jews in Smalltown Industrial America, 1870-1940*.
James Muhly (Oriental Studies) — *Copper and Tin Ingots and the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean Metals Trade: Sardinia, Crete and Cyprus*.
Susan Naquin (History) — *The Temples of Peking*.
Trevor Penning (Pharmacology) — *Substrate Specificity of Dihydrodiol Dehydrogenase*.
Paul Quirk (Political Science) — *Public Policymaking as Negotiation*.
Jay Reise (Music) — *Rasputin, opera in three acts*.
David Stern (Oriental Studies) — *The Mashal (Parable) in Rabbinic Literature*.
Robert Stine (Statistics) — *Resampling Methods for Time Series Analysis*.

Honorary Degrees

The report of the Honorary Degrees Committee consisted of the names submitted in December, 1984, to the president and Trustees, of distinguished persons recommended by the committee to receive honorary degrees at the May Commencement.

—Marvin E. Wolfgang, Chair

Open Expression

The Committee on Open Expression (COE) dealt with two major issues this past year:

1. Notification of campus events requiring monitoring by members of the Committee on Open Expression.

The COE passed a resolution requesting the Office of the Vice Provost for University Life to develop a system whereby that office is informed of all reservations of space, including classrooms, for meetings in which the identity of the sponsoring group is made known, so that effective decisions can be made concerning committee coverage. A representative from the Office of the Vice Provost for University Life assured the committee that such a system was in place for the 1984-1985 academic year. The committee was, in fact, effectively informed of events requiring monitoring and observation.

2. Investigation of an alleged violation of the Guidelines on Open Expression.

At the request of a member of the University community, the Committee on Open Expression conducted an extensive investigation of whether a violation of the Guidelines on Open Expression occurred on February 13, during Mr. Murray Dolfman's two afternoon classes. The committee unanimously found that a violation had occurred (see April 23, 1985 *Almanac* for the full scope of the committee's findings). As part of the investigation, the committee proposed a series of remedies for the general lack of knowledge of the Guidelines on Open Expression that it determined existed within the University community (also see April 23, 1985, *Almanac*).

It should be noted that the committee monitored a significant number of meetings and demonstrations this past year.

The Chair would like to express his appreciation to a most dedicated and hard-working committee, and to Robert C. Lorndale, associate secretary of the University, for his superb assistance and support.

—Ira Harkavy, Chair

Student Fulbrights

Our committee received 30 student applications this year. Each applicant was interviewed personally by one or another of the committee members during the evaluation process. Finally, the committee met for about four hours on October 25, 1984 to conclude its evaluation. Summaries of the evaluations (i.e. the "cover sheets") were completed on October 29, and the applications mailed express to the Institute of International Education, in New York City, in time for the October 31, receipt deadline.

To date we have received the following information regarding the 30 applications:

—"finalists", i.e. recommended by the U.S. National Committee to the Committees of the several "host" countries 14
—of whom 2 have been offered awards and 3 refused awards; for the remaining 9 we await information
—not recommended by the U.S. National Committee 13
—no information to date 3

It is particularly good news that one Penn student (Douglas Grob) has been offered what I believe is the only Fulbright-administered fellowship to the Peoples' Republic of China.

The final count for the 1983-84 academic year was that of 22 applicants from Penn 8 were offered awards (3 declined), and 14 rejected for awards.

Full details of both 1983-84 and 1984-85 Fulbright applications are available in the International Programs Office, if required.

Once again, on behalf of the committee in general and myself in particular, I would like to commend and thank the staff of the International Programs Office — James Yarnall and Elva Power in particular — for their friendly and very efficient work on the Fulbright applications. They made a pleasant but concentrated task as easy as possible for the committee.

—Bernard Wailes, Chair