

COUNCIL

And Independent Committees

Year-End Reports, 1985-86

For the first time, all thirteen of the University Council Committees' Year-End Reports and the reports of five standing committees known as Independent Committees are being published in one issue.

The work done by these committees makes an enormous contribution to University governance, decision-making and operations, and I believe I can safely express the gratitude of the entire University Community to the faculty, staff and students who volunteered their time and thought throughout the year. Through them we can discern a community voice in deliberations that touch on the teaching, research and University citizenship of all.

For the reader, I would like to suggest a multi-level examination of these documents.

First, have you had questions on how salary policy is arrived at, or why parking lots come and go? On the ways we are implementing or changing various approaches to faculty-student interaction, open expression and the like? Some of your questions may be answered here.

Second, if a topic interests you vitally, have you ever considered nominating yourself or a respected colleague of special expertise to serve on the committee addressing that issue? Far from being a closed club, committee membership is easily achieved by those who evidence a continuing interest. Are you aware that these committees also welcome your suggestions for agenda items?

Finally, if a committee proposes something new (as several do in the following pages), and asks for broad campus advice, do you send in your views or suggestions?

This University's mechanisms for broadly-based comment and consultation are second to none. Remember that you are welcome to participate. These reports are published for information and to enable you to share in the process.

—Roger Soloway, Chair, Steering Committee of Council

Council Committee Reports

Academic Review	II
Bookstore	II
Communications	II
Community Relations	III
Facilities	IV
Facilities Management	IV
Facilities Development	IV
Parking and Transportation	IV
Ways to Analyze The University's Facility Operation and Development Costs	V
"You Are Home at Penn" Task Force	V
Issues Recommended for Discussion and Action in 1986-87	V
International Programs	VI
Library	VI
The Budget	VI
Departmental Libraries	VI
Other Matters	VII
Personnel Benefits	VII
Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics	VII
Safety and Security	VIII
Research	VIII
Student Affairs	IX
Report on Student/Faculty Interaction	IX
Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid	IX
Report of the Special Admits Subcommittee	X

Independent Committee Reports

Faculty Grants and Awards	XI
Honorary Degrees	XI
Long Term Total Disability Board	XI
University of Pennsylvania	XI
University of Pennsylvania Hospital	XI
Open Expression	XII
Student Fulbright	XII

COUNCIL COMMITTEES

Academic Review

During the academic year 1985-86 the Academic Review Committee considered three proposals to establish Centers at the University, recommending two for approval by the Provost and returning one to the proponents for modifications. The Center for the History of Nursing (School of Nursing) and the Center for Computer Analysis of Texts (School of Arts and Sciences) were approved unanimously; the Center for Accounting Research (Wharton) was found to require further planning and returned to the proponents, with the invitation to resubmit the revised proposal next year.

—Elliott Mossman, Chair

Bookstore

The Bookstore Committee had a quiet year as neither the committee members nor the Bookstore manager had problems to bring before the committee.

The committee met with the Bookstore director in December at which time progress on Bookstore computerization and developments with respect to Computer Shack operation and plans for bookstore renovation were reviewed.

The committee has no present concerns or uncompleted items on its agenda.

—Charles S. Goodman, Chair

Communications

The committee met five times during the year and dealt with the following items which in its judgment were under its aegis as overseer of communications.

1. The roles of the *Almanac* and *Penn Paper* were discussed with the principals involved. Overlap of function is minimal but if *Penn Paper* is discontinued some of its functions would have to be absorbed by the *Almanac*. Net savings would be quite small in view of the need for an expanded *Almanac*. The committee concurs with the recent decision by President Hackney to delay for another year any action of discontinuing the present format of publications. The decision should be more long-range however to avoid a morale problem at *Penn Paper*.

2. The desirability of a research quarterly magazine which will embrace the wide range of research and scholarship found in the University was considered. While support for such an endeavor is easy to generate, there is little hard data to show the financial benefits of such publications. It is recommended that further study be made of such publications. A fruitful source of information would appear to be those institutions which have such publications: Penn State, Wisconsin, North Carolina. A cost-benefit analysis is indicated at these schools.

3. The News Bureau was examined during the year. This group appears to be active and effective in representing the University nationwide. Press coverage has increased and the bulk of it was of a positive nature.

4. Graduate student isolation was reviewed during the year. It appears that the report of the Advisory Council on Graduate and Professional Student Life of December 1985 has been acted on to some extent. This report which included a survey of graduate student needs and attitudes recommended a graduate student "place" for recurring social activity and a full-time administrative position responsible for coordinating graduate student activities. These recommendations have been responded to by the designation of the CA facility as a meeting place and the appointment of an associate director in the Office of Student Life to coordinate graduate student activities. This year has seen the appearance of a Graduate Gazette, but only one issue has been produced. It is recommended that the associate director for graduate affairs be made an ex-officio member of the committee to allow frequent updating of the actions of that office.

5. Recent installation of a campus cable network can make possible a new electronic information system for the campus. Electronic displays in each building which announce the day's activities are deemed highly desirable by the committee. Such a development is possible but requires considerable planning and efficient use of equipment at hand along with new items to be obtained. To keep this item in the foreground it is recommended that an appropriate and knowledgeable person from the office of Vice Provost Stonehill be assigned to the committee so that updating of programs can be screened regularly.

6. The new information center "Penncetera" will be functioning by the summer of 1987. This feature should provide an important service for the campus and public. It will partially support itself by retail sales of prestige items and will provide staff members with information about the University for those who need it. Its location will be at 34th and Walnut but it will have links to all corners of the campus. Its presence makes the development of an electronic information network and video display system a matter of some priority.

—Howard Myers, Chair

Community Relations

It is impossible to begin a report of the work done by the University Council Committee on Community Relations without acknowledging leadership given to University Community Relations by President Hackney and Assistant to the President, Barbara Stevens, and the Director of Community Relations, Jim Robinson. Their visibility in all the projects we explored to fulfill our mandates speaks to the commitment of our administration in this area. As a result, the committee assumed a third charge, advising the University community as to what is currently being done by the University in the community. The existing charges are:

1. to advise on the relationship of the University to the surrounding community. It shall work with the Office of Community Relations to assure that the University develops and maintains an appropriate relationship with the community, and

2. that "the chair of the Council Committee on Community Relations along with the director of community relations shall meet quarterly or more often, if needed, with the senior vice-president or her designee for real estate to be informed of impending real estate transactions that affect the community."

The areas selected for committee study were an outgrowth of common themes found in letters recommending projects that were received from President Hackney, Anthony Tomazinis, Chair of the Steering Committee of the University Council, and Jim Robinson, Director of Community Relations and the findings of an analysis of the history of the activities of the committee for the period from 1973-1985 prepared by the committee chair. Given the current activities on campus and in the community, the four areas chosen for our subcommittee activities were real estate, education, recreation and housing. The Community Breakfasts were continued, but for the first time they were used as a forum for the activities of the subcommittees. This had the advantage of providing continuity and follow-up for questions and related issues raised during the Breakfasts.

In the area of real estate, the subcommittee, under the leadership of Carolyn Schlie, explored 1) the status of the marketing study for the 34th and Walnut Streets site, 2) the development plans for the PGH site and 3) the uses of the Divinity School site. The February Community Breakfast was used to advise the University community on developments in these areas and identify questions that needed resolution. Members of the subcommittee discussed with the Facilities Committee concerns about the sufficiency of parking slots at the PGH site and worked with the ad hoc committee to plan for the tenancy at the Divinity School site. The resolution of the problem at the latter site expanded the existing educational complex, thus insuring the continued presence of an asset in the community.

In the area of education, the subcommittee, under the leadership of Renee Levine, explored the extent to which the University has enriched the quality of education in the local public schools as part of an effort to encourage University faculty/staff to reside in the University community. They met with administrative staff of the Powelton-Mantua Educational Fund and the Collaborative of the West Philadelphia Public Schools Project, and found that initiatives in this area have been furthered with the creation of the Collaborative for West Philadelphia Public Schools under the auspice of the West Philadelphia Partnership. President Hackney serves as chair of the Partnership and a steering committee of the Collaborative, composed of representatives of West Philadelphia businesses, educational institutions, parent groups and community organizations. The Collaborative's purpose is to develop, in conjunction with the public schools, resources and projects to enrich public education in West Philadelphia. It is staffed by Norman Newberg and began its work in April of this year.

The education subcommittee also found that many students at the University were actively involved in tutoring children in the elementary and secondary schools and in other projects to help the community. The March Community Breakfast provided a forum for increasing community awareness of these efforts. Members of the subcommittee investigated the possibility of making transportation available for students to travel to tutoring sites. The only resources available were very expensive. Consideration has also been given to ways in which these activities can receive ongoing visibility.

The subcommittee on recreation, chaired by Robert Glascott, found that a major issue in this area was the effect of the proposed cogeneration

plant on the community and on the availability of recreational space. The May Community Breakfast served as a forum for this issue. The University has planned for alternative sites for recreational space in the event that plans to build the plant are implemented.

Interest in encouraging University faculty and staff to live in the West Philadelphia area contributed to our exploration of issues concerning questions of housing. The subcommittee, chaired by Robert Figlio, met with real estate brokers, the Safety and Security Committee, and the Penn Watch program to identify the issues relating to housing. Two areas requiring action were brought to the subcommittee's attention. The first is the need to increase the number of lenders in the University Guaranteed Mortgage Program. The second is the importance of reviewing and revising the geographic boundaries for eligibility for the guaranteed mortgage program if faculty and staff are to be encouraged to live near the campus and assist in the continuing positive changes occurring in West Philadelphia. The subcommittee has planned a survey to determine 1) why faculty and staff do not choose to live in University City and 2) the extent to which the University Guaranteed Mortgage Program has influenced University City Housing patterns. Questionnaires have been developed and are expected to be distributed in the fall.

Members of the Community Relations Committee have also attended meetings of the University City Seminar convened by the administration to explore Penn's role as an urban institution. These members expressed the feeling that the work would be furthered if the group identified and included faculty and staff who had institutional experiences and memories in this area.

Recommendations for Academic Year 1986-87: As the year comes to an end we are aware that many of the concerns we were committed to examine have only just begun to be addressed. Therefore, our recommendations for the Academic Year 1986-87 include:

I. Re: Real Estate

- A. Continue to monitor the implementation of the Kravco Report findings for the quality of stores brought to 34th and Walnut Streets.

- B. Work with the Facilities Committee to insure that there is adequate parking at the PGH complex and elsewhere.

II. Re: Education

- A. Convene a Community Breakfast as early in the fall as possible to present the Collaborative for West Philadelphia Public Schools Project and its program to the University community.

- B. Contact the Office of Student Life early in the fall to explore in what way the committee can provide support in making student service projects visible.

- C. Give support to obtain free reliable transportation for students involved in such projects.

III. Re: Recreation

Continue to monitor the plans for cogeneration and issues generated thereby for the University community.

IV. Re: Housing

- A. Undertake the survey of University faculty and staff to determine the extent to which there is an interest/commitment to living in West Philadelphia and the issues that are raised from the outcomes of the study.

- B. Take the appropriate steps to increase the number of lenders in the University Guaranteed Mortgage Program.

- C. Review the geographical boundaries within which faculty and staff purchasing a home would be eligible for the University Guaranteed Mortgage Program.

V. Re: University City Seminar

The University City Seminar include faculty and staff who have been active in the University community area over the years in order to help provide focus and direction to this group.

VI. Re: Community Breakfasts

Attention be given early in the fall to a review and update of the mailing list used to invite individuals to the Community Breakfasts. This should be done annually.

The committee has been very active this year. I would like to thank all its members for contributing to accomplishing the agenda we prepared in the fall and for their active input in all of their considerations. I would also like to express our appreciation to Jim Robinson for staffing our meetings and taking responsibility for convening the Community Breakfasts.

—Renee Levine, Chair

Facilities

The Committee met seven times during the year, and formed a Subcommittee on Transportation and Parking which met a number of times. Action was taken on thirteen major issues, and two of them were prepared for discussion and approval by the University Council. The Council has passed both. The major issues carried forward to 1986-87 are the feasibility study of the proposed Student Union, the availability and fair pricing of parking for Penn faculty, staff, and students, methods for proper cost analysis of the facilities at Penn, and the "You are Home at Penn" task force. The major issues considered and the actions taken (in italics) are listed below.

Facilities Management

- **Housekeeping:** The Director of Physical Plant described the major problems associated with housekeeping and described the improvements which have been instituted, consisting primarily of better management and motivation of the housekeepers, and more direct budgetary responsibility of the individual schools for housekeeping costs.

The Facilities Committee has taken three actions aimed at helping to reduce housekeeping costs:

- *To reduce housekeeping costs associated with the fact that students eat and drink in classrooms and corridors, a resolution was prepared for Council to recommend to the Deans of the schools of the University to designate an eating area within each school, provided that it does not reduce the number of classrooms available. The resolution was approved by Council.*

- *The Committee recommended to Physical Plant to install appropriate signs in classrooms and auditoria, which prohibit eating and drinking, and signs and posters as appropriate to encourage people to toss trash only into trash receptacles. This has been adopted and is being implemented.*

- *To reduce cleaning costs associated with discarded issues of the Daily Pennsylvanian and its advertising inserts, the staff of DP and the Department of Physical Plant were asked to provide appropriately located places for discarding the debris. This has been put into effect.*

- **Asbestos removal and containment:** The Committee heard a report from the Director of Environmental Health and Safety about the ongoing removal of asbestos in the residences, and building reinspection and corrective actions. He indicated that the Facilities Planning Department reviews plans for renovations and the Department of Environmental Health and Safety inspects the area to see that asbestos is not disturbed. He added that signs are posted in areas which have been inspected and found to contain asbestos clearly marking the areas so that they are not disturbed by future work, and that asbestos does not need to be removed if it was not disturbed.

Facilities Development

Detailed reports were obtained from the Director of Facilities Planning, and discussed by the Committee. The major projects last year included 3401 Walnut Street, Hill House Kitchen, Annenberg Center Forecourt, 3400 Walnut Street, Bennett Hall, School of Engineering and Applied Science Facilities Development Plan, 38th and Spruce Street Development, Fisher/Lauder Building, Williams Hall Structural Repairs, Furness Building Renovation, Chemistry Laboratories Renovations-Phase I, Hayden Hall Renovations and Geology Storage Relocation, School of Veterinary Medicine Temporary Animal Facilities, Stouffer Plaza, Quadrangle Dorm Renovations-Phases V, VI, and VII, University Museum Roof Repairs and Life Safety, Franklin Field Structural Rehabilitation, Munger Athletic Complex, Mudd Biology Laboratory, Cyclotron, Planning of Clinical Science Research Building, Planning of Co-Generation Facility.

In the meantime several of these projects have been completed, some have changed scope, and a few have been canceled or deferred.

Two of the projects have been discussed in more detail:

- **The Cogeneration Facility:** In view of the important fraction of the University budget which is spent on energy costs, the University has asked the firm of Burns and Roe to prepare a feasibility study on the construction and operation of a facility that would generate steam and electrical power for its use jointly with AMTRAK, another major energy user. The estimated project costs range between \$55 million and \$82 million, with an estimated payback period of about 5-6 years. A major impediment to the project was the opposition of Philadelphia Electric

Company to provide the University with backup and auxiliary power. In the meantime the project's progress was slowed down until the situation with the possible sale of the PECO central steam heating plant to another company is clarified. *The Committee views favorably this planning phase and the project's possible implementation.*

- **The Wharton Executive Education Center:** This major project, with costs exceeding \$25 million and important impact on the University environment and life should be introduced adequately to the University community. *It was recommended that the choice of the location, the impacts, and the benefits to the entire University should be communicated to the University community.*

The processes of architect selection and capital budgeting for facilities development projects at the University were presented to the Committee by the Director of Facilities Planning.

Discussion was also held about the University's *Architectural Barrier Removal and Prevention Program* (ABRP) which is aimed at making the University more accessible to the handicapped. *The Committee on Facilities offered its full cooperation with this program (which is presently under the auspices of the Committee on an Accessible University), and recommended to the Committee on Committees that the Chair of the Committee for an Accessible University be made an ex-officio member of the Facilities Committee. This recommendation has been received favorably.*

- **Feasibility study for a Student Union:** Council asked the Committee on Facilities to conduct a feasibility study for the construction of a new Student Union, submit its report in December 1986, and continue to research and monitor the issue. Two of the major options that would be discussed at first are (1) better utilization and adaption of Houston Hall, (2) construction of a new building, possibly above the University Bookstore. *The Facilities Committee defined the Union to serve both undergraduate and graduate students, and determined that a Task Force for this study would be established, which is to include members from the UA, GAPSA, Office of the V. P. for University Life, the Facilities Planning Dept., and the Facilities Committee. Contacts were made with these groups, and final appointment of the Task Force, and the study, would start in fall 1986.*

This would most likely be the major project of the Committee in the fall semester 1986.

Parking and Transportation

- **Bicycle and motorcycle traffic on campus:** Such traffic on pedestrian walkways has once again been identified to be a safety hazard. Although few serious injuries result, the nuisance and the near-misses constitute an unpleasant and dangerous phenomenon on campus. A representative of the Department of Public Safety was invited to discuss this issue with the Committee and indicated that the Department has an internal policy restricting bicycle riding on campus. The problem so far has been in the actual implementation and enforcement of such a policy.

The Facilities Committee presented this concern to the Council Committee on Safety and Security with the recommendation that this group work with the Undergraduate Assembly and the Graduate Student Association to determine how to best implement and enforce this policy. This activity will continue in 1986-87, and a final resolution of the problem, which has been occupying the Facilities Committee for a number of years already, is sought.

- **Parking Availability and Fees:** The Director of Business Services and the Director of Transportation and Parking presented to the Committee the long-range parking plan for the University, and a plan to increase the parking fees for parking permit customers at a rate of 15% per year for the next 5 years. This would have doubled the fees during the 5-year period, increasing in effect the 12-month permit fees to over \$800.

It was noted that the parking demand far exceeds the available parking space: about 4200 parking spaces are available, and there are probably as many as 2800 people on the waiting list for a parking permit. To provide future parking space, about 60% of the parking fee goes towards the construction of parking garages, and the proposed increase in fees is necessary to at least partially meet this demand and increase the number of parking spaces from the present 4200 to 5161 in 1992. Parking shortage has recently become especially aggravated because of the loss of about 651 parking spaces between 1984 and the present, due to the conversion of surface lots to other uses. It was also noted by them that parking at

Penn costs about 1/3 of that at commercial lots in the area, and down to maybe 1/5 of the cost at lots in center city.

The Committee on Facilities found it inappropriate to burden the parking community with the costs of developing new parking garages or lots whenever surface lots were eliminated due to construction or other development. This concern was brought up before Council, and the Committee's resolution stating that *the University Council strongly urges the University administration to include parking requirements and budgeting in the planning process for new facilities and renovations, and to include plans for replacement of spaces lost due to new construction on existing parking lots* was approved by the Council.

To evaluate the need for the proposed parking fee increases, the Committee asked the Office of Transportation and Parking to provide detailed information on the annual budgets of the Transportation and Parking Department from 1982, and on the costs of providing new parking spaces. These were obtained, and the Subcommittee on Transportation and Parking recommended approval of the proposed 15% increase in fees. *The full Committee on Facilities then discussed this issue extensively, approved the planned increase in the number of parking spaces, and commended the Department of Transportation and Parking for its good and dedicated work, but voted down the proposed rate increase, with a recommendation to the Department to review ways for reducing costs and thus to reduce the fee raises. This was done, and finally the Committee approved an 11% increase in the permit parking rates for 1986-87. This increase went into effect on July 1, 1986. Rate increases beyond 1986-87 were withdrawn from discussion at this time.*

It should be noted that a fundamental difference exists between the views and policies of the University administration and those of many in the University community and in the Committee on Facilities, on the parking issue. Penn's parking program was established in the 1960's and was mandated to be self-sufficient. No University funds are directed to the project. Consequently, all costs of parking lot and garage construction, and parking facilities maintenance and operation must be fully-borne by the parking customers. When, for example, surface lots which cost a few hundred dollars per space to construct are eliminated due to the continuous development of the University and its neighborhood, they must be replaced by parking garages which cost at present \$7,000 per space, and the parking community must bear these costs too according to this policy.

The opposing view is that the type of work and learning that are characteristic of an academic institution require good, safe, and economical access practically around the clock. This is essential for maintaining Penn as an attractive, productive, liveable urban University. To mandate that this operation must be fully supported from the users fees is no more rational than mandating that separate fees should fully support each of the other facilities and services that the University has and provides, such as bathrooms, libraries, laboratories, use of office space, stairways, etc. Even worse, to deny parking to those who must have it due to their working conditions and hours, or safety considerations, is unacceptable. More details on these issues are in Appendix A.

• **A comprehensive University plan for transportation and parking:** A comprehensive plan for developing new parking garages exists. In providing parking for only a fraction of the University community which needs it, as well as in other ways, it favors major use of mass transportation to and from campus. At the same time, no long-range comprehensive plan for the transportation aspect was made evident. *The Committee expressed the opinion that if indeed mass transportation is to be encouraged for the campus community (as it ideally should be), the University, in collaboration with local businesses and with SEPTA and other transportation agencies, must prepare and implement a plan which offers easy and safe access to and from campus during extensive periods of the day and night, to be compatible with the schedules and lifestyle of the University community.*

• **Parking lot safety:** The Committee requested and obtained from the Director of Transportation and Parking information on measures being taken to provide the safety of parking lots and garages, and on the costs for improving safety, say by providing attendants at all of the parking garages. The annual cost for adding attendants to all presently unmanned parking garages was estimated to be \$140,000 if implemented, but the Department of Transportation and Parking did not feel this was necessary.

Ways to Analyze The University's Facility Operation and Development Costs

The Executive Director of Resource Planning and Budget, and the Senior Vice President were invited to describe the overall facilities operation and maintenance (O&M) costs for the University, and to help provide financial criteria for the evaluation of the effectiveness of this activity, possibly in comparison with other Universities of similar nature. Detailed data were presented to the Committee. Some of the most noteworthy items are:

- The annual budget for O & M and for development related to the replacement or modernization of facilities is about \$110 million, without the hospital.

- There is a backlog of deferred maintenance of about \$200 million. Recently the Trustees approved the increase of the deferred maintenance budget from \$1.4 million per year to about \$6.4 million per year for the next 5 years. It was noted by the Committee that even this increase may be highly inadequate: it would take thereby over 30 years to catch up with deferred maintenance, and deferred maintenance costs rise rapidly beyond present estimates if necessary maintenance is indeed delayed.

The Committee sought guidance from Council, in the following note: *"For its operations and associated planning, the Committee needs the costs of operating the University facilities, both in absolute dollars per year, and in some normalized form (such as dollars per student graduated, per research dollars won, etc.). This information is being obtained at present from the administration, but the development of proper cost-effectiveness criteria, and their comparison with peer schools is a subject recommended for discussion and advice by Council". This issue came up for discussion in Council, and some guidance was provided. More work should be done in this area next year.*

"You Are Home at Penn" Task Force

In discussing many of the issues under the Committee's purview, such as housekeeping, bike traffic safety, condition of classrooms, etc., it became evident that a more caring attitude of students, staff, and faculty towards the facilities and to each other would result in significantly lower maintenance and operation costs and a consequently lower rate of tuition increases, and in a much more pleasant human and academic environment for us all. Consequently, *it was recommended that a task force be established, at least temporarily named "You are Home at Penn," which would develop and oversee the implementation of ways to put this idea into effect. Some more detail is in Appendix B.*

One of the first activities would be to communicate these notions and attitudes to students from the time they receive their first applications information, and through freshman, upperclass, and new graduate student orientation meetings.

This initiative received the enthusiastic endorsement of the Vice Provost for Academic Life, the Dean of Admissions, the Registrar, the Senior Vice President, and the Presidents of the Undergraduate Assembly and the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly. Members from each of these offices and organizations and from the Facilities Committee joined the Task Force, whose final composition would be completed in fall 1986, and whose regular activities would also start at that time. *Members of the University community with strong interest or experience in this type of activity are invited to join; please contact the 1986-87 Chair of the Facilities Committee, Dr. Noam Lior (Room 111 Towne/6315).*

First steps in the indicated direction were already taken by the offices of the Vice Provost for Academic Life and the Dean of Admissions during the freshman orientation period this fall.

Issues Recommended for Discussion and Action in 1986-87

It is recommended that the issues of the Student Union, parking, bicycle and other vehicular traffic safety on campus, long-range plan for transportation, "You are Home at Penn," and the analysis of cost effectiveness of facilities related activities at the University, be amongst the issues to be considered by the Facilities Committee and by Council next academic year.

The issues of parking, and of bicycle traffic on campus are of unique concern, not because they are the most important, but because they come

up practically every year and take up an inordinate amount of the Committee's time. The parking issue also continues to create an inordinate amount of dissatisfaction and turmoil on campus. Both of these issues are not too difficult to resolve in a fairly permanent way if the Penn community, and particularly the University Council, decide to deal with them in an effective manner. We recommend that this indeed be done in the next academic year.

Acknowledgement

The Co-Chairs and the entire Committee would like to acknowledge the continuing dedicated and effective help rendered by the Committee's Secretary, Mrs. Virginia Scherfel.

—Ned Rote and Noam Lior, Co-Chairs

International Programs

The Committee on International Programs met six times during the academic year 1985-86. This is a greater number of meetings than the committee has had in past years, which is in part due to the fact that in our first meeting the members set up a rather extensive agenda for the committee's activities that necessitated some extra meetings.

One of the main topics of discussion during the year was the problem of integrating foreign students and scholars into the University community and making sure that they have adequate support services. The tragic death of an Indian graduate student in campus housing in the fall semester gave added impetus to the committee's attempts to devise proposals for enhancing the quality of the educational environment for international students and faculty on campus. In reaction to this incident, the committee submitted a resolution to the University Council recommending an immediate review of safety and security measures in University residences, particularly in graduate residences during the University holidays, and the undertaking of steps to enhance significantly support programs for graduate and professional students, especially international students. Two possibilities that the committee proposed be considered were developing a peer support program by pairing new international students with American students and strengthening the hosting program in cooperation with the International House of Philadelphia. The committee noted with pleasure that real progress had been made towards achieving this latter objective by the end of the spring semester. The Office of International Programs is taking steps to encourage faculty participation in the Philadelphia hosting program. The advisability of organizing departmentally based systems of peer advising was also discussed, particularly for first-year graduate students. The committee devoted considerable attention to reviewing current orientation programs and the orientation literature for arriving foreign students.

Financial difficulties experienced by foreign students were also discussed, a major concern being the increased costs of financing graduate education in the event of the passage of proposed new federal tax legislation, which would make graduate students' fellowships taxable. This would constitute a great hardship for many foreign graduate students, who pay taxes at the higher rates applicable to non-residents. The problems that our foreign student population may have in complying with current U.S. Immigration law requirements and the proposed changes in these requirements were considered, as well.

The committee looked at several proposed changes in federal funding levels for a variety of international exchange and training programs. The committee was particularly concerned by the proposals to eliminate federal funding for Title VI programs, which would cripple university language and area study programs, and the State Department's request to decrease funding for Eastern Bloc Training Programs. However, as no definitive budget plan had emerged by the end of the spring semester, the committee did not take any action in this regard. In the event that such measures—or changes in the taxability of graduate fellowships—appear likely to be passed, the committee recommends that appropriate steps be taken to mobilize members of the University community to inform Congress of the consequences that these measures would entail.

Also on the committee's agenda was discussion of two cooperative projects with the World Health Organization in Africa. These involve primary health care education and delivery and molecular biology training and research. These remain in a preliminary stage.

The committee left some unfinished business, which it proposes for possible consideration by next year's committee. Without meaning to

preempt the latter's choice of an agenda, the committee recommends that:

- 1) Our study abroad programs should be reviewed in joint meeting with the Study Abroad Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences.
- 2) Our housing facilities for visiting scholars from abroad should be assessed in comparison with the facilities offered by peer institutions.
- 3) The problems of medical costs and insurance for foreign students should be examined.
- 4) Foreign student enrollment trends in graduate programs should be studied, including the impact of higher foreign student enrollments in some fields on research programs and departmental planning.
- 5) Recommendations on contingency plans should be considered that could be used in dealing with unanticipated problems that may affect the safety of University students studying, training, or doing research abroad. (Examples of events that could create such problems are international terrorism and the Chernobyl nuclear accident.)

—Ann Mayer, Chair

Library

The Library Committee has met five times this year. During that time we have monitored the implementation of a new budget process in the library system. Our observations on that subject begin the report. At our first meeting we also decided to study the departmental libraries in the system, and our consideration of them is reflected in the second part of our report. Other matters of importance have occupied us briefly, and they are discussed in part 3.

1. The Budget

The Committee was briefed in the fall on the implementation of the new budget system, which apportions responsibility for library expenses among the schools of the University. We were immediately concerned about the threat which the new process posed to the orderly formulation of a budget and to the effective promotion of a strong, university-wide library policy. These worries were partially allayed by the Director's year-end report that in establishing the FY87 budget he had succeeded in obtaining cooperation from the committee of deans that was appointed by the Provost to advise him on library budgeting policies.

We are troubled, however, by indications that this success is based only on residual goodwill, which has temporarily overcome the adversary relationship promoted by the new scheme. Further, we are concerned by the heavy reliance now placed on the School of Arts and Sciences, which bears the largest share of supporting the flagship of the system, Van Pelt Library. This apportionment of responsibility appears to reflect patterns of use quite accurately, but the SAS possesses a tiny endowment and has a heretofore unproven record in fund-raising.

And finally, we note with genuine dismay that we have fallen from 39th to 45th place in the 1984-85 ranking of the acquisition budgets of North American university libraries, just published by the Association of Research Libraries. While the library administration has a record of exceptional management efficiency and ingenuity, their talents cannot overcome this exceptionally serious deficiency. It remains to be demonstrated that the new budget system can generate the level of library support that most of us probably assumed was already in place. The chairman has consulted with the Dean of Arts and Sciences about the importance of library support in the school's financial planning, and he will be meeting with the Provost at about the time this report is submitted.

2. Departmental Libraries

Our survey of the system's eleven departmental libraries (Annenberg, Biomedical, Chemistry, Dental, Engineering, Fine Arts, Lippincott, Math/Physics, Museum, Social Work, Veterinary) was based on interviews with librarians and members of users committees. It was designed to identify common issues. We did not investigate the circumstances of any single library in sufficient detail to make recommendations about it. Much of our discussion centered on two concerns shared by almost all of the libraries:

a. *Off-Hours Security and Staffing.* All of the departmental libraries depend on part-time student employees for evening and weekend staffing. In several cases a single student is left in charge. This skeletal staff cannot provide the branch libraries with the same standard of protection for patrons and collections that one finds in Van Pelt, where identifica-

tions of off-hours patrons are checked at the door and bags are always searched upon departure. Not coincidentally, it is during evenings and weekends that the libraries suffer most from crimes against patrons and their property and from the theft of books.

This is a matter of serious concern to the committee. Although crimes against persons have been fortunately few, great potential for misfortune exists in the labyrinthine basement of the Fine Arts Library, in the long, partitioned rooms of the Engineering Library, and in the Veterinary Library (located in what is at night a remote corner of the Veterinary School). Security is now provided only where individual deans have secured entire buildings in which branch libraries are located, reflecting what we fear may be the separate and unequal service into which the new budget process may drive the library system. This inequality is undesirable in all areas of service; it is unacceptable in matters of safety.

The committee therefore recommends that the University commit centrally budgeted funds to providing security for Van Pelt and the eleven branch libraries. Guards should be employed to check credentials and search bags. This is a matter which must be addressed by the University as a whole—as powerfully demonstrated by the events of the past year. Security questions should not be fragmented by the new library budget process, and no one should be compelled to choose between safety and the book acquisition budget. This recommendation is being carried by the chairman to the provost.

[At the request of the committee, Ruth Wells of the Department of Public Safety produced a report on library security which is available from the Office of the Secretary as an appendix. Her "Search Summary" lists 32 "incidents" in the branch libraries between 1 January 1985 and 2 June 1986. The major component of her recommended program can be put into effect if the measures outlined above are adopted.]

b. Equipment and Fittings Budget. Most of the branch libraries have broken or shabby equipment and fittings for which the budgetary responsibility for repair or replacement is unclear. In most cases, the furniture, carpets, drapes, etc., are presumed to lie within the responsibility of the landlord-dean. Nevertheless, in many cases, it is the library that repairs or replaces this material when the school declines to act. The branch librarians become beggars within the budget process, since no budget center is unambiguously responsible for these costs. The result is that many of the libraries do not provide working conditions equal to the caliber of work that we expect from our students and faculty.

The committee therefore recommends that the library central administration enter into an agreement with the landlord-dean of each library building that defines the financial responsibility for fittings and equipment. This must be done as soon as possible for those two libraries facing refurbishment in the near future (Engineering and Fine Arts).

3. Other Matters

The committee also briefly discussed a number of important questions which merit further consideration next year. It recommends that the 1986-87 committee continue to monitor the issues noted above while exploring these additional matters:

a. Libraries Used as Study Halls. The research facilities of the library system are regularly overtaken by the use of library spaces as general study halls. The materials being studied are often not library property. This problem seems to reflect the University's insufficient provision of quiet study spaces within the residential system, a matter which should be raised with the Vice Provost for University Life.

b. On-line Cataloging and Other Computer Issues. The on-line catalogue for Library of Congress holdings is expected to go into service in the fall, much to the credit of the library administration. The committee will naturally follow this undertaking with interest.

c. Shelf Space. Van Pelt and all of the branch libraries face an impending storage crisis. The proposed solutions rely heavily on compact shelving and off-site storage. The committee should review these plans.

d. Bathroom Conditions in Van Pelt. The committee discussed complaints against the profusion of often offensive graffiti in Van Pelt toilet rooms. Remedial action was promised by the Director, and this difficult problem should receive continued attention.

e. Asbestos Control in Van Pelt. The committee was generally heartened by reports of the program instituted to deal with this problem, but the project had not been completed at the time of our last meeting.

—David B. Brownlee, Chair

Personnel Benefits

The Personnel Benefits Committee had an exhausting year in 1985-86.

The Committee discussed at length and then endorsed tax sheltered reimbursement accounts for dependent care expenses. Implementation commenced January 1, 1986. It endorsed tax sheltered reimbursement accounts for medical and dental expenses (which would be below the 5% of AGI deductible allowed by IRS). It further endorsed a flexible schedule for life insurance benefits. After protracted and vigorous debate, the Committee endorsed a "Comprehensive Health Plan" as outlined in *Almanac* (March 4, 1986). The Pennflex Plan is tentatively scheduled for implementation by July 1, 1987.

Early in the year the Committee received advice from General Counsel's office on the taxability of the tuition benefit for graduate school at the University of Pennsylvania. A subcommittee was formed to suggest ways to restructure graduate tuition benefits into scholarship funds that might not be taxable. This work will continue with the cooperation of the Offices of the General Counsel and the Comptroller with a final subcommittee report due next year.

The Committee expressed concern over the performance of the CREF retirement fund as compared with alternatives available to the participants. It was dismayed over the inflexibility of TIAA/CREF with respect to options at retirement, transfer of funds, and limited cash out. It invited high level executives of TIAA/CREF to meet with the Committee to respond to these concerns. As a result of the Committee's concerns, and the response of TIAA/CREF, we recommended that all participants in the University of Pennsylvania defined contribution retirement plans review all materials provided by TIAA/CREF, Calvert, and Vanguard and discuss them, in the light of their own needs, with their investment advisor. A notice to this effect was printed in *Almanac* (April 15, 1986).

At its final meeting, the Personnel Benefits Committee re-affirmed the principle that any proposed changes in benefits or employee contributions be brought before it for consultation early in the year.

Next year's Committee will see the final report of the subcommittee seeking to restructure the present graduate tuition benefit and discuss implementation. It will also discuss additional health care options at both lower and higher premium levels than the "Comprehensive Health Plan." Raising the cap on the Major Medical coverage provided for retirees will also be on next year's agenda.

I am grateful to the members of the Committee and to the Benefits Office for their hard work on behalf of the entire University community.

—Ira M. Cohen, Chair

Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics

The University Council Committee on Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics is charged with advising the University Council and the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics on matters relating to recreation, intramural athletics, and intercollegiate athletics and their relation to the educational mission of the University. The Committee comprises eight faculty members, two administrators, one A-3 staff representative, two undergraduates, and two graduate students. The Director of Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics, the Vice-Provost for University Life, the Dean of Admissions, and the Chair of the Women's Athletic Association are ex-officio members.

During the 1985-86 academic year and the past summer, the Committee held five full meetings, and met in subcommittees on a number of other occasions. The subcommittees established for the year were the following:

- Academic performance of student-athletes.
- Admissions criteria for student-athletes.
- Facilities for recreation and intercollegiate competition.
- Financial aid for student-athletes.
- The Ivy Agreement.

The work of all but the last subcommittee has carried over into the present academic year. The Ivy Agreement was reviewed and found to be generally sound and applicable to the present reality. It was felt that the ban on spring practice for football is anachronistic and inconsistent with the policies for other sports. However, it was recognized that there is, at present, little probability of support for lifting the ban. The organization of the Colonial League for football and the anticipated collaboration

with the Ivy League was recognized as an area which will deserve future scrutiny.

Some data on the academic performance of regular-admit versus special-admit male and female students for the period 1977-80 have been received and reviewed, and no particular problems are apparent. The subcommittee on admissions and academic performance in the current year should make a strong effort to gather the remaining data needed to assess how we have been treating student-athletes and how well they have performed. This kind of analysis is needed before one can deal with the issue of the "161 Rule".

Much of the attention of the Committee was focused on the condition of the facilities for recreation and on the question of whether a usage-fee should be imposed on faculty and staff to generate income to improve the condition of the existing facilities. Cost estimates for the list of proposed improvements were not available in time for the Committee to make a recommendation during the past year, and this issue has been carried over to the present year. It is anticipated that a recommendation will be forthcoming from the present Committee in the near future.

The most important events during the past year from the perspective of the Committee were the hiring of Paul Rubincam as Director of Athletics, Ed Zubrow as Head Coach, Football, and Dennis Cochran-Fikes as Associate Director of Athletics. The Committee participated in the search committees for all three positions by way of membership of the chairman on these committees. It is readily apparent that all three searches produced extraordinarily well-qualified candidates for the positions, and one can anticipate nothing but health and success in recreation and intercollegiate athletics as we look to the future.

—Charles J. McMahon, Jr., Chair

Safety and Security

The Safety and Security Committee is charged with reviewing all aspects of safety and security of the University of Pennsylvania campus. Following is our report of issues addressed during the 1986 academic year.

This past year, the Committee has focused primarily on the on-campus residencies. In general, we found that the security systems in the residences needed improvement. For example, entry control systems were easily circumvented by individuals with criminal intent.

We are pleased to report that the Office of Student Life, the University of Pennsylvania Police, and the residents themselves have been working effectively toward solving these problems. Planning was undertaken in cooperation with security consultants, and a major restructuring of the security systems in the residences currently is being implemented. The use of new magnetic ID cards as well as secure entry portals will significantly reduce the number of unauthorized entries into these buildings. As important, the residents themselves continue to emphasize preventive measures. Heightened consciousness about security issues without the development of security paranoia or infringement on University life should be the objectives.

Campus security is a major challenge on a campus as large and complex as ours. The Campus Police are well-trained and well-organized, and appear to be performing their duties efficiently. We recommend, however, that more police officers patrol the major walk-ways during off-peak periods. Officers now patrolling in cars might be assigned to patrol interior walk-ways instead. These patrols would have greater mobility if they used small maneuverable vehicles such as motor scooters.

The complexities of campus life and the ebb and flow of faculty and students have convinced us that a volunteer program such as Penn Watch cannot consistently and dependably meet campus security needs. We recommend that Penn Watch be organized to supplement, but not to supplant, Campus Police functions.

Lighting in several areas of the campus needs to be improved. The areas behind Houston Hall and Franklin Field are most inadequately illuminated. In addition, more frequent surveillance of the viability of existing lighting is required. A recent campus walk revealed several areas where lights needed to be repaired.

This year campus crime statistics have been published in the *Daily Pennsylvanian* and in the *Almanac*. These data should be used by

students and faculty to evaluate the safety of their own buildings and sections of campus on an on-going basis. The information also provides a measure of the effectiveness of campus security and safety systems.

The Committee spent a great deal of time discussing problems involving interpersonal relations. Incidents of callous and inconsiderate interactions among students were a major concern. Those of us in leadership positions must remember that we set the tone for interpersonal relationships on campus generally.

Other issues involving relationships among University members included acquaintance rape and assault. The Committee strongly recommends that such behavior be exposed and dealt with severely. Faculty, staff, and students themselves can help combat such pernicious behavior by speaking out on the issues and assuring that crimes are reported promptly.

The issue of bicycle safety on campus has been brought to the attention of the committee. We believe that the volume of pedestrian traffic on Locust Walk and on Hamilton Walk are incompatible with bicycles or other wheeled recreational vehicles. These two Walks should be restricted to pedestrian traffic.

The Committee also has been concerned with the hiring of private security personnel who work at various locations on campus but who are not responsible to the Office of Public Safety. We recommend that the credentials of all potential private security personnel should be reviewed by Public Safety. Those hired should be oriented by University personnel, and their performances should be monitored on an on-going basis.

In the final analysis, the safety and security of the University's campus rests on our awareness as faculty, staff and students of problems, and on our reactions to events that happen to us and to our fellows. This past year, a graduate student was murdered on campus, and sexual harassment and threats of physical violence by a teaching assistant toward an undergraduate student were alleged. These incidents were intensely discussed at all levels of the University. The responses to these tragic events were swift and appropriate. The Committee feels that the response has resulted in meaningful and permanent improvements in campus safety and security systems and in University policies.

—Sheldon Jacobson, Chair

Research

The past academic year was a very busy and productive time for the University Council Committee on Research. A number of major items were dealt with and are listed below:

1. In the wake of the NIH grant suspension, the Committee conducted a survey to identify those Principal Investigators affected in order to determine the consequences of their delay in funding. Individuals were referred to Associate Dean of the Medical School, Jim Fergusson who was appointed by the Committee to negotiate exceptions with the Office of Protection of Research Risks at NIH.

2. A revision to the Conflict of Interest Policy (*Almanac* March 20, 1985) and The Policy On the Development of Computer Software (*Almanac* April 30, 1985) were presented by the Committee to the University Council (March 19, 1986) and were passed unanimously. We are particularly delighted with the passage of the Computer Software Policy since this resembles neither the existing patent or copyright policy of the University. It is a policy unique to Computer Software and represents the first of its kind in academia.

3. Guidelines were published for the Protection of Students Involved in Sponsored Research (*Almanac* February 18, 1986). We are currently waiting the recommendations of the appropriate student bodies before we progress further in this area.

4. In wake of the concern over Star Wars Sponsored Research (Strategic Defense Initiative) the Committee published salient features of existing University Research Policy and how this relates to contracts offered by the Department of Defense (*Almanac* May 6, 1986). In addition a draft policy concerning the Exclusion of Foreign Nationals From Specific Research Areas was published (*Almanac* May 6, 1986). The latter policy has drawn some negative comments and requires revision.

In the coming academic year the University Council Committee on

Research will revise the draft policy on exclusion of foreign nationals, it will undertake a thorough study on the break-down of indirect costs and how the proposed cuts in this area will affect the research enterprise at Penn.

As Chair of the University Council Committee on Research I would like to thank the members of last year's committee for their tireless work.

—Trevor M. Penning, Chair

Student Affairs

The Student Affairs Committee has been compiling a report on Faculty/Student Interaction since 1984-85. Although several drafts have been formulated over the years, the final report is below.

The committee was also concerned with the abuse of alcohol at the University. This committee met with the Alcohol Concerns Committee and reviewed an excellent film made at this University called "Alcohol at Penn." It was the consensus of this committee that the graduate and professional schools with their high levels of stress, along with the prevalence of happy hours, might create atmospheres conducive to the abuse of alcohol. Therefore, it was suggested that the Council of Deans review this excellent film and that the individual graduate schools have Alcohol Abuse Awareness programs.

There were several agenda items which were not covered this year due to problems with secretarial help and lack of attendance by the student representatives on this committee.

—Linda P. Nelson, Chair

Report on Student/Faculty Interaction

A subcommittee of the Student Affairs Committee, consisting of Vivian Seltzer (Social Work) and John Anderson (English), was formed in the late fall of 1985 to consider the question of student and faculty interaction at Penn. After a number of meetings, this subcommittee reported back to the full committee, giving an informal report in February of 1986. What follows is a very brief, written version of that report.

The subcommittee found that the following were forces acting against faculty and student interaction at the University: 1) the usual dispersment of faculty at the end of the day, often to homes far removed from our urban, West Philadelphia campus; 2) the physical and architectural fact that campus, with its unintegrated, piecemeal living arrangements (fraternities and sororities; high rises; Grad Towers and Law Dorms; College Houses, essentially unrelated one to the other; off-campus housing); 3) the unattractive, unappealing atmosphere of many of those University-provided housing arrangements; 4) the frequent absence, or at least perceived absence, of an intellectual atmosphere among undergrad students; and 5) the obvious physical threat posed by the physical location of Penn in a declining urban environment inhibiting free movement after dark.

The subcommittee also suggests that the following student priorities mitigate against better faculty-student relationships: 1) the usual, and expected, socializing, especially among undergraduates; 2) study; 3) extracurricular activities; 4) athletics, both active and spectator; 5) trips home and away over weekends; 6) competing events, such as work on the *DP* and the like.

The subcommittee noted faculty priorities, as well: 1) the effect of overload (Departmental duties, School and University committee work, office hours, as well as the obvious chores of teaching, grading, and counseling); 2) family responsibilities; 3) the pressure to publish; and 4) the absence of incentives for better student and faculty relationships in view of overload.

We also noted the effects of large classes; and the distinction, not often made (but important to us), between simulated "palship" on the one hand and the way that small classes are apt to build natural, unstudied, and, above all, genuine relationships between faculty and students; sexual, racial, and homophobic harassment awareness; the very obvious differences in the financial capabilities of our schools.

Our conclusions were these, that: 1) given the size of this University, with its various Schools and their wide and divergent pedagogic posture, financial resources, and faculty responsibilities, "global planning" seems

both unmanageable and unlikely to succeed to any great extent; 2) yet, as things stand, overload, physical offices, pressures, and the like are such that the faculty is not predisposed to give too much more in the way of their energies to faculty-student interaction. Therefore, we believe that changes at the University-wide level can only be brought about through non-naturally evolving strategies, probably involving a system of overtly stated rewards to the faculty—and this we do not recommend—or through a massive infusion of money to fund a University-wide College or House system, replacing both high rises and fraternities (and sororities), much as Princeton has in recent years. This latter proposal, we think very much to be desired; but we doubt interest (and financial support) would be forthcoming on the part of the Trustees and administration.

Thus, we suggest that planning ought to be on the level of Schools or Departments with efforts toward making individual offices and facilities more comfortable and conducive to interaction of a personal scale. This being the case, we recommend simply that the University Council and our Committee seek to deal with realistic goals—the freshman experience might be one, for example; or else the problems faced by our international students, for another—and that we acknowledge in the meantime that, given the circumstances and the pressures, the Penn faculty have done and give much evidence that they will continue to do an honorable and solid job of instructing, advising, and, in many other ways, helping Penn students.

Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid

The Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid met seven times during the 1985-86 academic year. Its two subcommittees (Faculty Participation and Special Admissions) met numerous times and conducted a number of interviews. The Committee as a whole was charged by the Chair of the Steering Committee of University Council to . . . "produce a review and update of the 1966 McGill Report on Admissions." In addition, the McGill Report itself, which is the official policy on admissions of the University of Pennsylvania, states that the admissions procedures should be kept under continual review by the Admissions Committee to make sure that they are producing the results intended.

The Admissions Office is like a well oiled machine, digesting about 100,000 pieces of paper, scheduling interviews for many of the 13,000 applicants, and having it all come together for the selection committee meetings. The decision to embark on a policy of geographical diversity has been implemented successfully with the students from the non-traditional areas (outside of the northeast) growing from 15% to over 40% in a few short years. This was accomplished by aggressive recruiting, increased travel by the Admissions staff, and cooperation from the alumni across the country. During this massive change, the overall academic quality of the applicants and the matriculants (as measured by SAT scores, Achievement scores, and class rank) has not changed appreciably and the number of applicants has increased.

While the McGill Report is the official admissions policy of the University of Pennsylvania, and its general statements are still being followed twenty years later, there are a number of areas where some changes have taken place and one section of the report that has never been implemented. In the committee meetings, there was no discussion of modifications to the McGill Report as the members of the committee seemed to feel that it is still a valid, useful document and a good base to upon which to build our admission policy. (This does not mean that there is complete agreement with everything in the Report, but there was no great call for tinkering with it at this time.) The questions that arose during the year concerned whether the Admissions Office was following the McGill Report, and if the changes that had been instituted were beneficial. Since it appears that most of the changes were evolutionary in nature, they will be reported on here, as they have never appeared in an Admissions Committee report before.

1. The McGill Report recommended that children of alumni of the undergraduate schools receive certain benefits in admission. The present policy extends those benefits to *all Penn alumni*.

2. The McGill Report set up certain "Special Admission" categories and set the number to be admitted under these categories at 10%. The Report added another 5% for applicants with outstanding personal

attributes such as creativity, motivation, and leadership ability, as well as candidates from a background that would enrich the social and cultural environment of the campus. These were not to enlarge the number of matriculants of the type that would be accommodated by special procedure. The present policy seems to be to admit approximately 15% of the class on the basis of special procedures, as this 5% has been lumped with the 10%.

3. The McGill Report states that the top 25% of the matriculants in each school should be selected only on the basis of objective evidence of intellectual ability. The admissions procedure has slipped somewhat in this regard and a certain fraction of the truly exceptional and outstanding applicants to Penn are not being accepted under this criterion. There was considerable discussion in committee and out of committee on this issue, but it was not resolved.

4. A major portion of the McGill Report has never been implemented. Section IV of the report concerns validation of admissions procedures. Throughout the report there are requests for follow-up studies, information, etc. on the criteria being used. *None of this is being done on a routine basis.* A few studies have been carried out, but this is over a twenty year period. As an example of this, the McGill Report lists a number of "indications of failure" which are to be used when selecting (or not selecting) students. These were based on a report produced by John Free of the Counseling Service several years before the 1966 McGill Report. Not only have these indicators never been verified to see if they still have any validity twenty years later, but *no copy of the report on which these indicators are based can be found.*

Both of the subcommittees produced a report. The report of the subcommittee on Special Admits is below. The other subcommittee produced a resolution on Geographical Diversity. This resolution was rewritten after committee discussion, then edited and amended by the main committee, approved, and sent on to the Steering Committee of Council.

The members of the Admissions Office were very cooperative and generous with their time in providing the Committee with much of the information which we felt we needed to understand the admissions procedures.

—Howard Brody, Chair

Report of the Special Admits Subcommittee

The charge of the Special Admits subcommittee was to examine special admission procedures, to compare current practice and results to McGill report recommendations, and to study application, admission, and matriculation statistics.

Subcommittee members met with three undergraduate deans: College dean Ivar Berg, and Patricia Schindler and Christina Chen from his staff; Wharton dean Marion Oliver; and Engineering dean David Pope. There was also a meeting with Oliver's predecessor, Matt Stephens. Conferences were further held with Bill Brest concerning admission statistics, and with Stanley Jarocki, assistant director of Athletics, and Pippa Porter, director of minority recruitment in the Admissions Office.

The McGill report recommends special admission procedures for (1) athletes, (2) individuals from economically poor backgrounds, (3) children of faculty, staff, and alumni, and (4) applicants from special interest categories. Ten percent of each entering class is recommended for admission on the basis of special provisions. The percentages of places in an entering class were stipulated to be (1) up to 5 percent, (2) up to 3 percent, and the balance of 10 percent to be formed from categories (3) and (4). A further category, consisting of up to 5 percent of each entering class, was set aside for applicants selected "purely on the basis of subjective and diversity factors." The intention was to select "applicants having outstanding personal attributes such as creativity, motivation, and leadership ability."

The present practice diverges from the McGill report recommendations. The target for special admits is now 15 percent, rather than 10. Essentially, the 5 percent allocation for applicants showing outstanding leadership, motivation, and creativity has been added to the 10 percent special provisions category. This has been the practice for approximately the last dozen years. Admissions Office officials have cited an August 1, 1972 report authored by a committee chaired by Thomas Wood. The McGill report stated, "... there is considerable doubt in the minds of the Committee members that this percentage (i.e., 10 percent) will accommodate the special needs of the University but the Committee strongly urges that the line be drawn at this point for the time being." Further, the report remarked, in referring to the 3 percent figure for applicants from economically poor backgrounds, that the number of applicants in this category "who can meet the minimum standards of acceptability is much smaller than this allotment would accommodate." Noting that "... the University is committed to a policy of actively recruiting" Blacks, it added, "Thus these—and perhaps more—spaces may eventually be needed for the group." Recent and current figures show the percentage for category (2) is approximately 9 percent.

Admission and matriculation figures for 1985 are shown in Tables 1 and 2 for all categories and for each undergraduate school. Percentages are displayed for each of the special categories. The admission percentages for all special categories combined are 14.83 (College), 10.05 (Engineering), 1.96 (Nursing), 18.95 (Wharton), and 14.22 (total). The corresponding matriculation percentages are 20.35 (College), 13.40 (Engineering), 1.41 (Nursing), 20.54 (Wharton), and 18.76 (total).

Last year an ad hoc committee on special admissions was appointed by the Dean of The Wharton School in response to several concerns, including that the rate of special admissions has been too high. Table 3 shows admission and matriculation percentages for the last eleven years for Wharton for three categories.

Concern has been expressed that the diversity category is sheltering some de facto special admits. Table 4 displays admission and matriculation counts according to PI. It is not possible to draw firm conclusions from the table, but some questions are raised by the existence of low PI admits in the diversity category. To fully understand the figures in the table inspection of the application folders would be necessary.

Athletic admissions in the special category appear to be consistent with the McGill target. Since the Ivy League adopted the 1610 floor and the athletic profile (the admissions profile of all recruited athletes must be within one standard deviation of the "normal" profile), athletic admissions are closely regulated and monitored.

The subcommittee offers these recommendations:

1. The 15 percent target for special admissions is being exceeded in some cases, notably Wharton. Clearly the demand for such admissions differs among the undergraduate schools. More careful monitoring of special admissions and greater care in avoiding large percentage fluctuations from year to year are needed.

2. It is not clear whether de facto special admissions are entering via the diversity category. A detailed examination of admissions records is needed to resolve this question.

3. Figures from the Admissions Office report total admissions and matriculations in several categories disaggregated according to PI. These categories include SI, athletic, MRP, alumni, and faculty/staff. There is some multiple counting of individuals in these figures, and special and nonspecial admissions are combined. Full disaggregation of these data is desirable.

4. Studies should be undertaken on a continuing basis to monitor the academic performance of special matriculants and compare their performance to that of academic and diversity matriculants.

—Paul Shaman, Chair

Faculty Grants and Awards

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

Applications Received: 27
Fellowship Requests: 10
Grant-in-Aid Requests: 0
Requests for both Fellowship and Grant-in-Aid: 17
Funds Available: \$50,000
Funds Awarded: \$50,000
Fellowships Awarded: 11
Grants-in-Aid Awarded: 0
Both Fellowships and Grants-in-Aid Awarded: 4

List of Awardees and Titles of Proposals

Francis Brevart, German—*The German Volkskalendar and other Astrological Treatises of the Late Middle Ages.*

Linda Brodkey, Education—*Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 of the ms., Reading and Writing Academic Prose.*

Linda Brown, Nursing—*The Incidence and Pattern of Breastmilk Jaundice.*

Lynne Edwards, Education—*Required Covariance Structure for a Univariate Analysis of a Repeated Measures Design.*

Wendy Flory, English—*The American Ezra Pound.*

Alan Fridlund, Psychology—*Facial Expressions of Emotion.*

Avery Goldstein, Political Science—*Structural Constraints on Political Behavior and Outcomes in the People's Republic of China, 1949-1985.*

Solange Guenoun, Romance Languages—*Towards a Theory of Absolutism: Where are the Queen's Two Bodies?*

Mary Frances Jett, Nursing—*Regulation of Human Sperm by Ca²⁺ and Cyclic Nucleotides.*

Kenneth Kraft, Oriental Studies—*Zen: Contemporary Views.*

George Mailath, Economics—*The Impact of Private Information and Signaling on the Choice of Capital.*

Maureen Quilligan, English—*Illumination and the Interpretive Tradition of Christine de Pizan's Livre de la Cite des Dames.*

Lewis Shoemaker, Statistics—*Analysis of Variance Using Count Data Techniques.*

Charles Thayer, Geology—*Biotic Disturbance and the Fate of the Paleozoic Fauna.*

Kathryn Woolard, Education—*Language Conflict in the United States: An Analysis of San Francisco's 1983 Voter Initiative Against Bilingual Elections.*

—Janet C. Pack, Chair

Honorary Degrees

The major activity of the Committee was review of the qualifications of candidates whose names had been submitted to the Committee for consideration for awarding of an Honorary Degree at the May 19, 1986 commencement of the University. The following names were recommended by the Committee and approved by the Trustees:

Dr. Julius Axelrod
Dr. Michael S. Brown
Mr. Athol Fugard
Dr. Herman P. Schwan
Dr. Lawrence Stone
Mr. John Wideman

The Committee on Honorary Degrees also directed attention to special convocations held by various schools within the University. A policy was formulated by the Committee for the awarding of honorary degrees at special convocations. A copy of the proposed policy that was sent to the Trustees for their approval is below.

—Marilyn E. Hess, Chair

Resolution on a Policy for Awarding Honorary Degrees at Special Convocations

Intention: Concerned about the number of special convocations within the University at which honorary degrees have been awarded and also about the lack of sufficient time available for review and assessment of merits of the honorary degree candidates selected by faculty members of schools sponsoring special convocations, the University Council Honorary Degrees Committee formulated a series of guidelines, which were subsequently evaluated and endorsed by the Trustee Committee on Honorary Degrees. The Trustee Committee on Honorary Degrees proposes them as University policy.

Resolved, that the number of special convocations within schools of the University be limited to occasions that mark significant anniversaries or similar occasions and that ordinarily there should be no more than one special convocation in any given academic year; that the number of honorary degrees awarded at special convocations normally be limited to half the number awarded at Commencement; that the names of the prospective candidates for honorary degrees, accompanied by a brief resume of their accomplishments, be submitted to the University Council Committee on Honorary Degrees prior to inviting the candidates to accept an honorary degree from the University and, under ordinary circumstances, no less than six months before the planned convocation; and that the University Council Committee on Honorary Degrees pass names on to the Trustees Committee on Honorary Degrees in a timely fashion.

Long Term Total Disability Board

University of Pennsylvania

During the 1985-86 year, ten new applications for long term disability benefits were approved, three were disapproved and fourteen people were removed from the rolls. Of these fourteen, four died while receiving benefits, eight retired and two returned to work. As of June 30, 1986, ninety-four disabled persons were receiving benefits.

Five thousand six hundred and ninety members of the University faculty and staff are covered by the self-administered long term disability benefits program, representing a total base payroll of \$161,867,397. The 1985-86 cost of the program was \$533,268, including expenses incurred for services of International Rehabilitation Associates (IRA), medical examinations and other related costs. The long term disability costs for this fiscal year represented .33% of the 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 University of Pennsylvania Hospital, International Rehabilitation Associates and various medical specialists in evaluating applications.

During its meetings, the Board considered three 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.

University of Pennsylvania Hospital

During the 1985-86 year, fourteen new applications for long term disability benefits were filed. Of these, ten applications were approved, two were disapproved, one applicant withdrew her application before action was taken and one applicant died before action was taken on her application. As of June 30, fifty-one disabled persons were receiving benefits.

During the same period, twelve recipients were removed from benefit status; six died while receiving benefits, five retired and one returned to work.

Two thousand seven hundred and thirty-five employees and staff of the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania are covered by the long term disability benefits program, representing a total base payroll of \$62,694,891.74. The 1985-86 cost of the program to HUP was \$330,193.54, including expenses for IRA, medical exams, and other related costs. The long term disability costs for this fiscal year represented .445% of eligible payroll.

As a result of the cooperative efforts of the HUP Personnel Department and International Rehabilitation Associates, twelve long term disability recipients were assisted in obtaining Social Security Disability Income Benefits. The offset of these benefits coupled with the savings of the one employee who returned to work resulted in undiscounted savings to HUP of \$994,031.

Summary of Actions Taken: Fiscal 85-86

	University	Hospital
Applications Received:	13	14
Number Approved	10	10
Number Disapproved	3	2
Number Withdrawn	0	2
Removal from Disability Rolls:	14	12
Recovery and Return to Work	2	1
Retirement	8	5
Death	4	6

—Dan McGill, Chair

Open Expression

The Committee on Open Expression met 14 times during the 1985-86 academic year and concluded the following two cases:

1. At the request of a member of the University community the Committee on Open Expression conducted an investigation to determine whether or not the Guidelines on Open Expression were violated at the May 1985 Commencement. The Committee unanimously found that a violation had occurred and communicated this result to all responsible parties involved. As part of this communication, the Committee recommended that the Administration, through the Vice Provost for University Life and the Vice President for Administration ensure that members of the Office of Public Safety and monitors from the Office of Student Life acquire a thorough knowledge of their responsibilities with respect to the Guidelines on Open Expression.

2. At the request of a member of the University community, the Committee conducted an investigation to determine whether or not violations of the Guidelines occurred on January 17, 1986 in the President's office. The Committee determined that Section III.D.1.a of the Guidelines proscribing demonstrations in offices containing sensitive records, Section III.D.2.a proscribing demonstrations in private offices and Section IV.C indicating that failure to obey the instructions of the Vice Provost or the Vice Provost's delegate will in itself constitute a violation, were all violated.

In addition, the Committee had five other requests brought before it for determination. Of these, the Committee determined that one of them should not be investigated, one was withdrawn by the requester and two are being carried over to the academic year 1986-87.

A member of the University community submitted three questions on the interpretation of the Guidelines to the Committee and requested that the Committee respond to them. These were considered by the Committee at its May 15, 1986 meeting. The relevant portion of the minutes of that meeting are given below:

Extract of the Minutes of May 15, 1986

"The committee discussed each question and arrived at responses as set forth below.

Question 1. According to Part II, Section B, Subsection 8 of the Guidelines, "[t]he committee shall not attempt to decide whether the individuals involved have in fact committed the acts charged, but rather whether the acts in question constitute a violation of the guidelines." (emphasis added). I am unsure concerning the authority of the Committee to conduct a factual inquiry when the Committee is specifically enjoined from deciding whether, as a matter of fact, any individual has violated the Guidelines. The Committee is ostensibly empowered only to decide whether the "acts in question" violated the Guidelines.

I ask that you interpret Part II, Section B, Subsection 8 of the

Guidelines so that I may understand the basis and authority of your request for a fact-finding meeting.

Response: The committee is charged under Guidelines Provision II.B.8, with "evaluating and characterizing" incidents. In order to evaluate and characterize it may first hold hearings and gather facts.

Question 2. According to Part III, Section B of the Guidelines, "[t]he substance or the nature of the views expressed is not an appropriate basis of any restriction upon or encouragement of an assembly or a demonstration." If some "demonstrators" have been allowed to engage in expressive conduct and speech in the past through *ad hoc* authorization, is there a violation of the Guidelines if the Administration fails to extend equally such authorization without regard to the content of expressive conduct or speech involved?

Response: This question covers a wide spectrum of possibilities. All members of the University community are obligated to follow the Guidelines. The committee is of the view that a pattern of bias must be well and unequivocally established to be relevant to a determination of violation of the Guidelines.

Question 3. According to Part I, Section A of the Guidelines, freedom to receive information is determined to be a fundamental right. According to Part I, Section C of the Guidelines, "[t]he University should be vigilant to ensure the continuing openness and effectiveness of the channels of communication among members of the University on questions of common interest." These principles in general, and the law of the State of Pennsylvania in particular, require that meetings of the Trustees of the University not be closed meetings. Is there a violation if certain students feel in good faith that they have been frustrated in their attempts to attend a Trustees' meeting and were left with no realistic recourse to achieve communication with the Trustees other than to engage in a demonstration?

Response: All demonstrations are expected to be conducted in accordance with the standards set out in Provision III of the Guidelines. A belief of demonstrators that others have violated, or are violating, the Guidelines or the law does not justify their own violations of the Guidelines. Members of the University community who feel that others have violated the Guidelines have the right to bring the matter to the Committee on Open Expression."

I hereby express my thanks and appreciation to all members of the Committee on Open Expression for the great amount of time and energy they gave to the Committee, and for their commitment to the principles of open expression.

The Committee's special thanks are extended to Robert C. Lorndale, Associate Secretary of the University, whose dedication and extraordinary abilities made the Committee's work possible.

—Louis A. Girifalco, Chair

Student Fulbright

We forwarded twenty-five applications to the national Fulbright selection committee, from a variety of fields but with several each from anthropology, art history, philosophy and physics. So far, four fellowships were received (one declined) and four more are still pending. The successful candidates were:

David Albert, going to Austria in art history; Leslie Blacksberg, going to Belgium in art history; Leslie Brown, going to Italy in art history. Lisa Klopfer, going to Indonesia in anthropology, declined her award.

With four applications still pending, we do not know how well we did on the whole. There were some discrepancies between the Penn committee's notions of ideal candidates and the successes we saw (some we thought were real stars, were apparently unsuccessful). This is perhaps to be expected, given the variation in number of applicants and degree of competitiveness of the various programs to which people apply.

The work of the committee, though very intense for a short period, is interesting and satisfying to the extent that we do get some hits. Last year's work was made more difficult because of the scheduling of the fall break, which coincided with the week which the national Fulbright schedule necessitates using to read and review applications. Perhaps we will be luckier with scheduling this year.

—Margaret A. Mills, Chair