

Almanac

Tuesday, September 15, 1987

Published by the University of Pennsylvania

Volume 34, Number 4

The Unmeltable Class of 1991: A Record High

A record-breaking 2525 freshmen arrived at Penn this fall, prompting the creation of new freshman "clusters" in Grad Towers and Low Rise North.

A yield of 52% and virtually no "melt" sent Penn about 250 students above projections for the year, the Admissions Office said. Places had been offered in April to some 4600 of the 13,000 applicants, which at traditional yields of 46-47% would have produced a class of 2100-2200. This would have been subject to a summer "melt" or erosion during the annual national shuffle in which students drop out after having accepted, particularly if they have accepted a second choice but find a belated offer from their first-choice school when it delves into its waitlist.

In May, Admissions began alerting key offices that the yield was running high—especially in The College. In June and July, they waited in vain for signs of melt, and by August were facing the fact that only one or two students had dropped out (whereas a normal "melt" would be about 150). This meant that Penn was

"first choice" to a greater number, but also meant the greater number had to be fitted into classrooms and dorms. Among the steps taken to absorb them:

The College: Associate Dean Ivar Berg's staff began to plan with departments to increase instructional resources selectively, as well as to advise and register larger numbers. Among oversubscribed courses that had to be expanded as The College enrolled an increase of some 207, according to Assistant Dean Kristyne Nicholls, were Japanese, Latin, Slavic Languages, philosophy, psychology, math and economics. Despite some queues and crowding as school opened, praise was being distributed by week's end to the Registrar, CUPID and others for the smoothness of move-in and registration.

Residential Living: The influx of freshmen coincided with—and put pressure on—the University's first full-scale implementation of the Freshman House or "cluster" system, where the goal has been that all freshmen who are not otherwise members of a College House live together and are provided with an on-site pro-

gram including academic advising. A number of academic planning and task force deliberations have looked to this system as a way to shrink the psychological size of the University and build class identity.

Freshman communities already existed in or were planned for the Quad, Hill House, King's Court/English House, and selected floors of the hi-rises. To minimize crowding in these communities, and at the same time avoid scattering freshmen into odd vacancies in non-freshman sites, Dr. Carol Kontos and the Residential Living staff in cooperation with College Advising created two new freshman communities:

- **Pennhouse** is the students' unofficial name for the four top floors of Graduate Tower B, where 120 freshmen are placed with R.A.s and advisors. With some modest renovations the space was made more houselike through the creation of lounges or common spaces on each floor.

- **Low Rise North**, where about half the space has been general housing and the other half devoted to W.E.B. DuBois House, absorbed 80 freshmen. Dr. Kontos said LRN was a prime choice for a freshman cluster because the building already had a strong faculty presence (History Lecturer Allen J. Green and Administrative Aide Flora Taylor) and was well provided with lounges and common spaces.

A stepped-up effort was made by Off-Campus Living to place graduate students and upperclassers who normally might have taken at random the spaces that were organized into freshman clusters, Dr. Kontos said. As OCL Director Maye Morrison left the University (with her husband, former SSW Assistant Professor John Morrison, for Aurora, Ill.), Acting Director Carolynne Martin took charge in August.

Ann Hart of the International Programs Office said members of the University have responded to their call for temporary housing of newly arriving international students, that temporary placements have been brief and there is "no crisis" in settlement of students from abroad in primarily off-campus housing.

Note: A Convocation Address by Acting VPUL Kim Morrison, on pages 3-4, gives a profile of the Class of 1991.

Trustees: A Provost Confirmed . . . New Treasurer Named

In addition to approving—with ovation—the selection of Dr. Michael Aiken as Provost, the Executive Committee of the Trustees last week acted on the reappointment of Wharton Dean Russell Palmer, and on the previously-announced vice presidencies for Dr. Barbara Butterfield (Human Resources) and Arthur Gravina (Facilities Management).

The trustees then voted the appointment of Scott C. Lederman as University Treasurer. Mr. Lederman, who has been director of investments, takes office as treasurer immediately, succeeding Frank Claus, who becomes

associate vice president for finance. Mr. Claus will continue as director of the Penn Plan, and will work on the creation of a new Student Financial Center among other projects.

Scott Lederman is a Chartered Financial Analyst who took his B.S. at Rensselaer in 1964 and rose to Captain in the U.S. Army before joining the Wharton School staff as director of administration in 1969. He later took his MBA at Wharton, in 1977.

When a senior vice presidency for management was created at Penn in 1972, Mr. Lederman became executive assistant to its incumbent, Paul Gaddis. In 1975 Mr. Lederman moved to the investments unit, then organized as a wholly-owned subsidiary called Franklin Investment Company, of which he was vice-president. In 1982, Mr. Lederman became director of the Investments Office as presently structured. In this post he has overseen the management, under the Trustees Investment Board, of Penn's pooled income endowment, short-term investments and pension plan assets as well as over 100 individual trust funds. Under his management the investments office underwent computerization and the development of new cash management, reporting and financial modeling systems.



Scott Lederman . . . and Frank Claus with Penn Plan Assistant Director Diane-Louise Wormley

INSIDE

- Senate: Committee on Students, p. 2
 - Class of '91 Profile (Morrison), pp. 3-4
 - Actions on Safety, p. 4
 - Of Record: Revised Judicial Charter, pp. 5-7
Religious Holidays, p. 8
 - Speaking Out; Update; CrimeStats, p. 8
- Pullout: CRC's Penn Printout**

1986-87 Report of the Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy

July 17, 1987

The Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy met four times during the academic year. The major items on the agenda were (1) the role of the faculty in the admissions process, and (2) the Honor Code.

1. The committee invited Professors Howard Brody and Paul Shaman, co-chairs of the University Council Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid, as well as Dean of Admissions Lee Stetson, to participate in our discussions on the role of the faculty in the admissions process. The general consensus of the discussions was that the faculty should play a larger role than they have in recent years. But the committee had difficulty coming up with concrete proposals for increasing their involvement. Professor Brody took the opportunity to make a concrete proposal to Dean Stetson on behalf of the Department of Physics. According to this proposal, the Physics Department would attempt to become a model department in respect to the admissions process by means of the following program (parts of which are already being carried out):

a. The Admissions Office should send to the department the names of prospective students who have expressed any interest in physics; of students who are accepted by Penn and have expressed an interest in physics; of students matriculating to Penn who have expressed an interest in physics; of the science teachers who recommend the students who major in physics or do exceptionally well in physics here at Penn. The faculty will in each case make themselves available to interview and follow up.

b. In addition, Physics Department faculty members are willing to talk to groups of students on campus, as well as individual students; to do local traveling and attend meetings with prospective students and regional admissions officers; to visit specially targeted high schools with the regional admissions officer, especially where the chances of finding outstanding physics prospects are high; and to do admissions work in the course of their normal professional travel.

Dean Stetson welcomed Professor Brody's proposal, and the committee also expressed the hope that this pilot program on the part of the Physics Department would lead to similar initiatives from other departments.

The committee also paid particular attention to the monitoring function that is explicitly assigned to the faculty in the McGill Report, and recommended that this function should be more clearly defined and articulated—possibly as a major task for the committee's agenda in 1987-88.

2. In addressing the Honor Code, the committee was responding to the following general criticisms that had come in from faculty members. Although there is much to be said in favor of the current code, as it stands it has the following deficiencies: it takes too long to resolve cases; it has removed control of the process from the hands of the faculty; it inhibits action on the part of the faculty (because of the time and work it requires for justification of a case) and encourages instead either inaction or a form of informal bargaining with students suspected of any transgression. As a result the cause of academic integrity is not being adequately served.

The committee invited the following people to participate in its discussions: Professors Henry Teune, Edward Shils (Judicial Administrator), Paul Korshin; Vice Provost James Bishop; Dean Joseph Bordogna, Vice Dean Marion Oliver (who was represented by Executive Assistant to the Dean Anita Kravitz) and Associate Dean Ivar Berg. Discussions were also held with Eric Lang, chair of the Undergraduate Assembly, and other students.

There appeared to be a general consensus among Deans and students and among faculty who have some experience of application of the current Honor Code, that there is room for improvement. After lengthy

discussion, the committee recommends that the Honor Code be modified according to the following principles:

a. The question of academic integrity should be separated from other aspects of the Student Judicial System.

b. The system for dealing with breaches of academic integrity should be revised in order to (i) allow students to continue to play an important role, (ii) reestablish the authority of the faculty, (iii) continue to provide for maximum possible separation between inevitable variation in personal examining styles on the one hand, and the necessary uniformity of "honor" procedures on the other.

In order to achieve these goals the committee proposes the following revision:

a. The Instructor's Role. When an instructor determines that a student has cheated (as defined by the present Honor Code, Sections I and II), the prerogatives of the instructor (which do not require consultation with other authorities, but which relate only to the student's performance in the course in question) include all of the following actions:

i. Require resubmission of the assignment in question.

ii. Fail the assignment in question.

iii. Assign any grade for the course including the grade of X (construed as a grade, as permanent as any other grade, to be explained on the key to transcripts as a sign of academic misconduct).

The instructor may also wish to impose more severe sanctions, in which case he or she may recommend the following to the Honor Court:

iv. Suspension for any recommended period.

v. Expulsion.

All actions by the instructor must be initiated within ten days of the submissions of the suspected work or the last date for the submission of grades to the registrar, whichever is later. It is the instructor's responsibility to notify the student in writing of his decision to act under provisions i-v.

b. The Student's Right of Appeal Against the Instructor. Within 30 days of receiving a decision by an instructor as noted above, a student may appeal the finding to the Honor Court. A student may also ask the Honor Court to remove a notation of previous misconduct from his or her transcript, if that mark was not identified as permanent.

c. The Honor Court. An Honor Court shall be established to review instructors' recommendations of expulsion and suspension and to hear students' appeals and requests for deleted notations. It shall be constituted and conduct itself as stated in the present Honor Code, Sections III and V, except that the chairs of hearing panels shall be faculty members.

d. Students' and Instructors' Right of Appeal Against the Honor Court. Within 30 days of receiving a decision of the Honor Court, a student or instructor may appeal its decision to his or her dean (or a committee appointed by the dean to hear such appeals). If the dean or the committee determines that new evidence has been brought forward, the matter shall be referred back to the Honor Court for a new hearing.

In addition to these major items the committee also discussed a number of other matters relating to the academic dimension of student life, especially with regard to residential living. Although these other discussions did not lead to any specific recommendations, the topic was considered to merit further discussion and is suggested for inclusion in next year's agenda.

David Brownlee (history of art)

Peter Freyd (mathematics)

Richard Hosier (city and regional planning)

Brian Spooner (anthropology), chair

Neville Strumpf (nursing)

English Willis (pediatrics)

Ex officio:

F. Gerard Adams (economics), Senate Chair-elect (1986-87)

Roger D. Soloway (medicine), Senate Chair (1986-87)

The Making of the Class of 1991

You are the 235th freshman class of the University of Pennsylvania. As such, you join a long and distinguished line of Pennsylvanians and a proud tradition of academic excellence.

You bring with you a unique set of individual characteristics. Over the course of this year, we hope these attributes will not only be strengthened, but will help to forge your identity as a class, an identity that will hold together as you move through your freshman, sophomore, junior and senior years, and, beyond your present range of thought, will link you together as you become alumni of this institution.

You will have heard that this is, perhaps, the only time preceding your Commencement in which you will be brought together formally as a class. In other words, your identity is bracketed, at the beginning and at the end. But, in fact, if you examine it closely, you carry with you *multiple* identities contained within your single Penncard—all of you belong to a school—Nursing, Engineering, Wharton, or the College—most of you belong to a residential community—in the Quadrangle, King's Court/English House, Penn House, Harrison, or Low Rise North. You may belong to a special program; you will certainly, at some time, belong to a major. You may, in the future, belong to a College House or to a fraternity or sorority. Your *individual* identity over the next four years will be multi-faceted.

But how will you forge your identity as a *class*? Fifty years ago, it might have seemed simple. You might have been given a small handbook like the one I hold in my hand, "The Student Handbook of the University of Pennsylvania for 1937-1938." Perhaps some of you have grandfathers who might have saved a copy. I say "grandfathers" because such a book would only have been given to men and the references are to men throughout. Your identity as a freshman would have been regulated by a set of conditions that now have the air of folklore. First, the matter of definition:

"Any student properly enrolled in the Freshman Class who has not had one full year of college customs at this or any other institution shall be regarded as a Freshman, and as such must obey the following regulations." Here is a sample of those regulations:

—Freshmen must wear caps bearing the letter which designates their school.

—Freshmen must wear white socks and black ties.

—Freshmen are required to wear their class buttons at all times.

—Freshmen are held responsible for all notices and other announcements made through the columns of *The [Daily] Pennsylvanian*.

—Freshmen must not enter or leave Logan Hall, College Hall, Bennett Hall, or the Fine Arts Building, by the front door.

—Freshmen must memorize every Pennsylvania song and cheer.

—Freshmen must carry matches for the use of upperclassmen at all times.

—Freshmen must use "Sir" in addressing all Upperclassmen.

—Freshmen must speak to all other Freshmen when passing on the campus.

I should add that these regulations were enforced by a Vigilance Committee made up of other students.

In today's light, these conditions seem archaic, but they probably had the effect of forging class links on the basis of shared experience. Forging class links is still important today, developing class identity *still* encouraged, but we hope the basis is more substantive, based more on what you can *do* than on what you can't, based more on the channeling of your energy, and the developing of your talent to its fullest, than on pigeonholing or standardizing you into a mold.

Your identity as a class begins with what each of you as individuals, brings to this place, at this time. Let me tell you something about who you are in ways that we can measure. The statistics are impressive. First of all, you are the largest freshman class we have ever had, not because we have admitted more students, but because more of you have chosen to come to Penn than ever before. There are nearly 2500 of you, 250 more than we had expected, but equally welcome.

Fifty-five of you are enrolled in the School of Nursing, 366 in the

School of Engineering and Applied Science, 415 in the Wharton School, and 1697 in the College of Arts and Sciences.

You come from all over the world—143 of you come from five continents and 45 different countries, ranging from Argentina to Zimbabwe. You are truly an international class.

You represent 48 states. Alaska, New Mexico, Idaho, South Dakota, West Virginia and Vermont have each sent one representative, but you travel in good company. 222 of you come from our Far West region of Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon and Washington, with 185 of you from California alone.

Eighty-six of you come from the Southwest states of Arizona, New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas, 35 of you from western states of Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Nevada, Nebraska, South Dakota, Wyoming and Utah.

The North Central states of Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, Wisconsin and West Virginia continue to increase their presence at Penn, sending 212 students to this year's freshman class. (We have responded in turn by sending a Provost to Indiana and a Vice Provost to Ohio!)

The South Central states of Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi and Tennessee have sent 36 of you, more than ever before.

Our South Atlantic region of Virginia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Maryland, Georgia, Florida, Delaware and the District of Columbia have sent 278 freshmen, with an additional 13 from Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Another 238 of you come from the North Atlantic region of Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont and Rhode Island. Of these, 107 come from Massachusetts alone.

Some 280 of you come from our neighboring state of New Jersey, 428 of you from New York State and 564 from our Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the largest single continent. In context, more than 40% of you come from outside the mid-and north-Atlantic states, so you are a national as well as an international class.

In addition to your geographic diversity, you are also racially and ethnically diverse. More than 22% of you are identified as members of racial minority groups. This year, we have 175 Black, 20 Chicano, 73 Latino, 290 Asian and 3 American Indian freshmen.

And 44.5%, that is, 1128 of you, are women. In particular, there are more women in Engineering that we have ever had before. More than 14% of your class, 364 students, have had mothers or fathers who attended Penn, and nearly 3%, 93 of you, are daughters or sons of faculty and staff members of the University.

Approximately 65% of you have come from public high schools, 28% from private schools, and nearly 7% from parochial high schools.

As you can see, you are a class whose diversity will not only enrich our community, but will enable you to learn as much from each other as you learn from your courses and classwork.

It goes without saying that you are a very bright class — 189 of you have been designated Benjamin Franklin Scholars. 283 of you have earned major scholastic awards in your high schools. Nearly half the members of your class have served as National Honor Society Presidents.

Clearly you have been academic leaders. But you have also demonstrated significant leadership in other areas. 486 freshmen, almost 20% of your class, have been captains of a varsity sport. Eight of you have been identified as having Olympic potential. Nearly 10% of you have distinguished yourselves in journalism, and will find ample opportunity to continue those interests at Penn. 18% of your class have played significant roles in music and the performing arts, either as first chair, lead or with starring roles in state or national groups. More than 10% of the members of your class have spent significant time holding half-time jobs. In fact, 26 of you have direct experience in owning and running your own businesses.

(continued on page 4)

That is what you look like collectively. Individually, some of you are equally impressive. Within your midst, you have: a professional magician who has performed nationally and abroad . . . a Gold Medal winner in Chemistry and a member of the Westinghouse Honors Institute . . . a State equestrian champion in the working Hunter class . . . a State Girl's Gymnastics champion who is also an expert in car repair . . . a poet and novelist with three novels published so far . . . an Assistant Concert Mistress of a Long Island Youth Orchestra . . . a State and National Triathlon Champion . . . a public transportation expert who has designed more efficient bus routes . . . a state sheep and wool queen and prize winning lamb cook . . . a rancher who owns, raises, and brands cattle.

You even have among you a direct descendant of Benjamin Franklin.

You have much to learn from such diversity. Take the time to know each other. With so much energy, skill, and talent, what will you become?

Some of you will continue to do as you have always done; others will branch out in totally different directions. Some of you will change your minds many times; others will have sharp moments of revelation in a particularly riveting course, or at the hands of a particularly mesmerizing professor. Perhaps 10% of you will go to medical school and many others to equally exciting areas within the health professions, or law, or business. Many of you will work within the growing service sector of our economy. And for those of you who attended the Discovery and Mean-

ing lecture the other night and heard Dean Bordogna speak, you heard that many of you will work with new technologies, problems and applications that cannot even be envisioned now, let alone taught. For the solving of these, the content of what you learn here will never suffice. It will be the process of learning itself—learning how to learn—that will make the difference and allow you to function as leaders in the 21st century.

How will you meet these challenges? Will you respond with commitment and integrity to the academic and social choices before you? Will you recognize and respect the value that each of you, and each of us, has for each other within an academic community? Will you understand that *your* personal and cultural history, joined with that of every member of your class, will play a role in the way that each of us interprets reality, and will you recognize that an understanding of history, as Professor Rieber pointed out on Sunday night, is essential to understanding our future? Will you focus your collective vision on the long-term gain, on the imagined landscape, and will you take the risk that offers the possibility of reaching it?

If you can agree to *these* conditions for *your* class identity, then I can turn to the President, to the Deans and members of the Faculty, to my colleagues and to your fellow students, and say with pride, "It is my *privilege* to present the Class of 1991."

Kim M. Morrisson

Action on Security: Three Concentric 'Rings'

The University is a security conscious campus. We are deeply concerned about providing a safe place for students and residential faculty and staff to live while maintaining an atmosphere of openness and accessibility vital to university life.

Over the past several years, we have taken important steps to improve security and safety in the residences. These steps have included installing dead bolts and peep holes in most residents' doors and alarms in remote restrooms and laundry areas, implementing sign-in procedures in all residence halls, monitoring lobby desks by students and/or full-time receptionists in most residences on a 24-hour basis and by professional guards during low occupancy periods, and providing extensive training to all residential security personnel regarding their safety and security responsibilities.

In response to more recent concerns about security in and around the residences, we hired a team of experts in the spring of 1987 to recommend additional actions to enhance residential security. The security consultants submitted their report to us in June. This report makes valuable short- and long-term recommendations for improving the safety of campus residents by making changes in procedures, personnel and the physical attributes of residence halls and surrounding areas.

Security Consultants' Report

We have carefully reviewed each recommendation in the security consultants' report with the responsible university divisions and with many members of the university community. As a first step, we have appointed George Koval, executive director of Student Financial and Administrative Services within the Division of University Life, as Project Manager for implementation of the security recommendations. To implement the recommended changes as quickly as possible, we envision the recommendations as fitting into three rings of security.

The first ring of security focuses on securing the outermost perimeter of the residence halls by, for example, securing fences, gates, windows, garages and exterior doors, and installing additional emergency phones near the residences. We have already acted on many of the recommendations pertaining to this area, including:

- initiating a design and bid process to install bars, beginning on November 1, on Quad bathroom windows and all residential windows below 7 feet;
- locking the street side doors of Low Rise North and Van Pelt;
- increasing police patrols by the Law Dorms; and
- securing exterior service doors to mechanical rooms in the Quad.

The second ring of security focuses on safety inside the residence halls at the entry level. We have also implemented many of the recommendations in this area, including:

- hiring contract service guards for the evening and night shifts at the Quad, Kings Court/English House, Grad Towers and the High Rises;
- providing escorts for delivery persons in the High Rises;
- recoring interior house entrance doors in the Quad to new keys; and
- improving the quality of student security staff through higher wages, uniforms, and increased expectations and supervision.

We have set target dates in October and November for beginning and/or completing work on other recommendations pertaining to these two rings of security. Most of these high priority tasks require either consultation with students and residential faculty and staff, or outside bids, or architectural plans (such as redesigning lobbies to accommodate Penn Card readers) before work can begin. Tasks requiring consultation include:

- installing additional bathroom locks or alarms in the Quad;
- installing Penn Card readers at Kings Court/English House, the High rises and the Quad; and
- developing or revising policies and procedures for dealing with security violations.

The Project Manager is now arranging meetings for September with students and staff to discuss their needs and desires concerning some of these recommendations. He is also contacting contractors and architects to discuss appropriate designs for construction changes.

The third ring of security focuses on security within the residence halls, beyond the lobby level. We have already completed some of these recommendations, including:

- installing and/or repairing peepholes and mortise or dead bolt locks on all residents' doors; and
- developing educational programs for residents in which Public Safety personnel play a major role.

We believe that several recommendations related to this area should be further evaluated, with student and residential faculty and staff consultation, after we have satisfactorily implemented recommended changes to the perimeters and entrances of the residences.

All of these steps are important and vital in providing a safe environment. However, we are committed to the view that security is every individual's responsibility, first and foremost, for her or himself, and then for the members of the community in which we live. No amount of technology can compensate for lack of personal attention to security.

—Helen B. O'Bannon,
Senior Vice President

—Kim M. Morrisson,
Acting Vice Provost for University Life

Charter of the University Student Judicial System

I. Statement of Purpose

The Student Judicial System exists to investigate and resolve alleged violations of the University's rules, regulations and policies by students. The system provides for notice of charges, opportunity for settlement or hearing, judgment by University community members, and the right to appeal, thus ensuring fundamental fairness to all parties involved.

Persons involved in a dispute may avail themselves of advice from other members of the University community including the Judicial Inquiry Officer (the "JIO") and the Ombudsman to help them achieve reconciliation. If the parties fail to reach an agreement, the aggrieved student, faculty or staff member may formally file a complaint with the JIO.

II. The University Hearing Board

A. Jurisdiction

1. There shall be a University-wide board of original jurisdiction to be known as the University Hearing Board (the "Hearing Board"). Except as provided in paragraphs 2 and 3 of this Part II.A and Part V (Resolution by the Vice Provost for University Life), it will have exclusive original jurisdiction in all cases brought by students, faculty or staff members arising under regulations of the University against persons who are registered as students, or students who are on an unexpired leave of absence.

2. The Hearing Board shall have no jurisdiction in cases involving infractions of the Code of Academic Integrity, or infractions committed by graduate and professional students that lie within the original jurisdiction of a hearing board or other decision-making body established by the school in which the student is enrolled.

3. The Hearing Board shall have no jurisdiction in cases involving infractions of the University's parking regulations, which are heard by the Parking Violations Board.

B. Composition

1. The Hearing Board shall consist of 30 undergraduate students, 30 graduate or professional school students, and 30 faculty members.

2. The Nominations and Elections Committee of the Undergraduate Assembly shall select the thirty undergraduate student members to serve on the Hearing Board. The Graduate and Professional Students' Assembly shall select thirty graduate/professional students to serve on the Hearing Board. Student members shall be in good academic and disciplinary standing. The Senate Executive Committee shall select thirty faculty members to serve on the Hearing Board. In the event that any of the above nominating bodies provide fewer than thirty Hearing Board members, the Judicial Administrator shall select replacements at random from the appropriate group.

3. The Hearing Board will sit in panels of five members each. Each panel will consist of one undergraduate student, one graduate or professional student and three faculty members. The JA shall select panels from among the respective student and faculty pools.

4. The members of the Hearing Board shall serve for two year terms and their terms shall be staggered to provide continuity. If any Hearing Board member is unable to serve for any reason, a replacement shall be selected in the same manner that the original Board member was chosen.

5. No member of the Hearing Board may simultaneously serve as the Appellate Officer. If a member of the Hearing Board ceases to be in good standing at the University, the JA shall remove him or her from the Hearing Board and a replacement shall be chosen in the appropriate manner.

III. Staff

A. Judicial Administrator

1. The Provost, with the advice and consent of the Steering Committee of University Council, shall appoint a Judicial Administrator (the "JA"), preferably a qualified faculty member, who shall administer this Charter and preside over hearings. The JA is responsible for overseeing the procedural integrity of this System. She or he will, for example, consider and resolve prehearing challenges to jurisdiction or procedures; alert the Hearing Board to procedural consequences of its actions; advise the Hearing Board of inconsistencies between the demands of fairness and its actions at any point in the proceedings; and consult as appropriate with faculty members and others about procedural issues and convey their advice, together with the JA's recommendations, to the Hearing Board.

2. The JA shall serve at the pleasure of the Provost.

3. Upon request, the JA shall refer a complainant or respondent to an advisor and shall maintain a list of advisors for this purpose.

4. The JA may advise respondents, complainants and their advisors on procedural matters.

5. Upon a showing of good cause by the JIO, complainant, or respondent, the JA may grant a reasonable extension of any time limit set forth herein.

B. Appellate Officer

1. The Steering Committee of the University Council will appoint an Appellate Officer at the beginning of each academic year, preferably from among tenured faculty members who have had experience with the student judiciary (e.g., former Ombudsmen or those who have served on hearing panels). She or he shall serve for a one-year term, which may be renewed. The Appellate Officer shall hear and decide appeals of decisions made by Hearing Board panels.

C. Judicial Inquiry Officer

1. The Vice Provost for University Life (the "VPUL") shall appoint a Judicial Inquiry Officer (the "JIO") whose duties under this Charter shall include investigating complaints against students under the regulations of the University; determining whether charges against students should be brought before the Hearing Board and/or before other bodies; resolving by agreement charges against students; presenting evidence supporting charges in hearings before the Hearing Board; testifying as a fact witness before the Hearing Board; recommending sanctions to the Hearing Board after a determination of guilt; maintaining records of cases; preparing and compiling statistics on cases arising under this Charter, which shall be available at the offices of the JIO and JA and/or at Van Pelt library; and ensuring that agreements and sanctions are enforced.

2. The JIO shall be a University employee, and shall serve at the pleasure of the VPUL.

D. In any case in which a staff member cannot perform her or his duties, an alternate may be designated using the procedures applicable to the staff member's position.

IV. Procedures

A. The Complaint and Investigation

1. Any student, faculty member or staff member who believes that a student has violated University rules or regulations may file a complaint, preferably written, with the JIO. Complaints made to others may be referred to the JIO. Within a reasonably prompt time after the filing of a complaint, the JIO shall inform the JA and the accused in writing of the complaint. The written notice shall cite the regulations, rules, or policies alleged to have been violated and shall describe the alleged acts constituting the violation. The

notice shall also enclose a copy of this Charter and a copy of the regulations, rules, or policies alleged to have been violated. The JA shall decide questions of jurisdiction and may, when appropriate, refer a complaint to a University official other than the JIO.

2. The JIO shall investigate complaints within the jurisdiction of the Hearing Board and shall decide if there is reasonable cause to believe that an offense has been committed. The JIO shall make the determination of reasonable cause ordinarily after conducting a preliminary investigation. The JIO may interview any appropriate witness, including a potential respondent. All witnesses have the right to consult with an advisor, as defined herein, while being interviewed, and the JIO shall inform them that anything they say may be introduced as evidence.

3. In light of evidence uncovered by the investigation, the JIO may add charges beyond the scope of the original complaint, may add additional students as respondents and may dismiss charges as unfounded.

4. The University may proceed under this Charter regardless of possible or pending civil or criminal claims arising out of the same or other events. The JIO, with the concurrence of the VPUL, after consulting with the General Counsel, shall determine whether the University shall, in fact, proceed with charges against a respondent who also faces related charges in a civil or criminal tribunal. If the University defers proceeding with charges against a respondent in light of related charges in a civil or criminal tribunal, the University may subsequently proceed under this Charter irrespective of the time provisions set forth in sections IV.A.1 and IV.B.1.a.

5. At any time after the filing of a complaint, the JIO, after consulting with the JA, may place a "Judicial Hold" on the academic records of a respondent for the purpose of preserving the status quo pending the outcome of proceedings under this Charter. A Judicial Hold may prevent, among other things, registration, the release of transcripts, and the awarding of a diploma.

B. Procedures for Hearings

1. Preliminary Procedures

a. The JA shall convene a panel of the Hearing Board and set a time and place for hearing after being informed by the JIO of the complaint. The hearing shall be scheduled reasonably promptly with due regard for the time required for all parties to prepare.

b. The JA shall notify the complainant, respondent, and witnesses by hand delivery or certified mail, return-receipt requested, of the hearing place, time and date, at least ten days before the hearing date. This notice will also contain the names of the panel members assigned to hear the case. If this notice is given by mail, it shall be deemed to be effective when mailed.

c. Within a reasonable time and in any case not less than two days before the hearing, the JIO, the complainant, and the respondent shall exchange among themselves and with the JA copies of the exhibits to be introduced, the names of witnesses to be called and a brief summary of the testimony expected to be presented on direct examination. In exceptional circumstances, when a witness or exhibit becomes known or available immediately before the hearing, the JA may at his or her discretion admit the witness or exhibit or reschedule the hearing.

d. If a party anticipates that a key witness will be unavailable for a hearing, the party may preserve the testimony of the witness on tape and introduce it as evidence at the hearing. All interested parties, including JIO, the JA, the complainant and the respondent, must be notified in advance of the time, place, and date of the testimony. All parties who would be permitted to cross-examine such a witness at a hearing may cross-examine the witness on the tape.

e. Upon receiving a written request by any party, the JA may expedite proceedings involving graduating students or students who are about to take a leave of absence or study elsewhere.

2. Disqualification of Panel Members

a. Members of the Hearing Board panel shall disqualify themselves from hearing a case if they believe in good faith that their capacity for making an objective judgment in the case is or may reasonably appear to be impaired. Members should not disqualify themselves for any other reason.

b. A respondent or complainant may object for specific cause to any panel member assigned to hear the case; the objection must be written and received by the JA at least forty-eight hours before the hearing. Upon ruling that a challenge is valid, the JA, after notifying the respondent, complainant, and JIO, shall replace the challenged member with another from the same category.

c. A respondent or complainant may object for good cause to the replacement member within a reasonably prompt time of the member's appointment, but no later than the beginning of the hearing. The JA shall rule upon the objection.

3. Conduct of Hearings

a. All hearings shall be held in appropriate University facilities designated by the JA and shall be private unless both the respondent and complainant request an open hearing in writing to the JA. The JA may in any case limit attendance at a hearing to ensure fair and orderly proceedings.

b. The JA shall preside over all hearings but she or he shall not vote with the panel on either a verdict or appropriate sanctions.

c. The JIO shall present at the hearing relevant evidence supporting the charges.

d. All hearings shall be conducted in such a manner as to permit the panel to achieve substantial justice. Participants and observers will conduct themselves in accordance with these objectives.

e. Formal rules of evidence shall not apply. Evidence, including hearsay evidence, shall be admitted if it is relevant and not unduly repetitious, and is the sort of evidence on which responsible persons are accustomed to rely in the conduct of serious affairs.

f. The JIO, the respondent, and the complainant shall have the right to present and cross-examine witnesses.

g. No evidence other than that received at the hearing shall be considered by the panel.

h. The panel may proceed to hear the evidence against a respondent in her or his absence, upon proof by the JA that the required notice was provided.

4. Advisors

a. At hearings before the panel, each respondent and each complainant may be accompanied by an advisor who is a member of the University community (student, faculty or staff). If criminal charges are pending against a respondent, she or he may be accompanied by an advisor who is an attorney who is not a member of the University community; however, the attorney may not address the panel except as provided below with respect to advisors generally.

b. During the hearing, the advisor may consult with her or his advisee, but may not address the panel, except that the advisor may make a summary statement to the panel before the panel begins its private deliberations. The time allowed for such summary shall be set by the JA.

5. Decisions of the Panel

a. The panel's deliberations shall be divided into two separate stages:

- (i) determination of guilt or innocence; and, if guilt is determined,
- (ii) recommendation of a sanction.

b. The panel shall presume a respondent innocent until proven guilty by a preponderance of the evidence.

c. If the panel finds a respondent guilty, the JIO shall inform the panel of any previous offense and sanction or settlement and recommend a sanction. The respondent and the complainant may present evidence or otherwise respond to the JIO's proposed sanction.

d. All decisions shall require a majority vote of the panel.

e. As soon as possible after conclusion of the hearing, and in all events within ten days, the panel shall present its written opinion, including findings of fact, and the panel's conclusions therefrom, to the respondent, the complainant, the JA and the JIO.

6. New Evidence

a. Upon the discovery of new and material evidence, the respondent, complainant or JIO may petition the Hearing Board for a new hearing by filing a written request with the JA stating the evidence to be presented and the reason for the failure to present the evidence initially. The JA shall furnish a copy of the petition to the other parties, who may respond in writing.

b. If the JA concludes that it is reasonably possible that the new evidence would alter the original panel's judgments, then the original panel, or as many members as are available, shall rule on the petition, considering (among other relevant factors) the reason for the respondent's, complainant's or JIO's failure to discover or present the evidence initially and the likely effect of the omission upon the original decision.

c. A new hearing, if granted, shall be before the original panel and shall be limited to the new and material evidence.

7. Settlements

a. The JIO, in consultation with the complainant and JA, may settle the complaint at any time after the complaint has been filed and before final disposition of appeal, if any.

b. Settlements shall be written, signed by the respondent, who shall waive further proceedings under this Charter, and the JIO.

8. Failure to Appear or Cooperate

a. A fair, conclusive adjudication of a dispute under this Charter depends

on the cooperation of all involved persons, including complainants, respondents, and witnesses. Therefore, all community members who may be interviewed are obliged to provide honest, complete statements to the JIO and to the Hearing Board in order that disputes may be equitably resolved as quickly as possible.

b. Sanctions

(i) The panel may recommend that any sanction authorized by this Charter be imposed upon a student who is a complainant, respondent or witness and who fails, without good cause, to appear for a hearing after receiving notice thereof or fails, without good cause, to cooperate with the investigation of the JIO. However, a witness may not be required to incriminate her or himself.

(ii) A student who receives a sanction under this section may, within ten days, file a petition with the JA for removal of the sanction or for a hearing under this Charter on the propriety of the discipline. The petition shall state the reasons for the student's failure to appear or cooperate. The panel that recommended the sanction, or as many members as are available, shall rule on the petition, considering (among other relevant factors) the reason for the student's failure to appear for the hearing or cooperate with the JIO.

(iii) A hearing, if granted, shall be conducted in accordance with the procedures contained in this part IV.B.

V. Resolution by Vice Provost for University Life

A. Purpose

This part provides a simpler, less formal, alternative judicial procedure, which recognizes the special character of the University and its desire to function as a community. In cases in which the complainant and respondent choose to use this procedure, this section establishes the authority of the Vice Provost for University Life to hear complaints and evidence, decide guilt or innocence, and impose sanctions.

B. Procedures

1. Within a reasonably prompt time after filing a complaint, a complainant who wishes the VPUL to hear the matter shall so notify the JA. Within a reasonable period after receiving notice of the complaint, a respondent who wishes the VPUL to hear the matter shall so notify the JA. Upon receipt of a request from one party, the JA shall seek the consent of the other party to use this procedure.

2. If both parties agree to use this procedure, the JA shall forward a copy of the complaint to the VPUL, who shall arrange a conference among the VPUL, the respondent, the complainant, their advisors, and the JIO, at which conference the JIO, the respondent and the complainant may present relevant evidence.

3. At the beginning of each academic year, the VPUL shall nominate for the approval of the Steering Committee a delegate to act as hearing officer under this procedure for any cases which the VPUL cannot hear. Upon approval of the delegate by the Steering Committee, the delegate may assume all the duties and authority of the VPUL under this procedure for cases that the VPUL cannot hear.

4. The VPUL shall make a written decision, including findings of fact, reasonably promptly and shall provide a copy of such decision to the JA, the JIO, the complainant, and the respondent.

5. The VPUL may impose any sanction authorized by this Charter.

6. The respondent may ask the VPUL to reconsider her or his decision within five days of receipt of such decision. No other appeal process is permitted.

7. The decision of the VPUL on all aspects of the matter, after reconsideration, if requested, shall be final.

VI. Operation of the System

A. For the purpose of calculating days, only the fall and spring academic terms shall be considered, except when a complaint is filed against a student enrolled in either of the summer sessions, in which case the summer sessions also shall be considered.

B. Unless otherwise provided, days shall be counted on a calendar basis, including Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays.

VII. Suspension Pending Hearing

A. In extraordinary circumstances, when a student's presence on campus is a threat to order, health or safety, the VPUL may suspend a student temporarily, pending a hearing of charges against the student.

B. The JIO and the JA shall expedite the hearing of charges against a suspended student upon the student's request.

VIII. Sanctions

A. Available Sanctions

1. The panel, acting under Part IV may recommend to the VPUL and the VPUL, after receiving such recommendation, or after hearing evidence under Part V, may impose any reasonable sanction against a respondent, including, but not limited to, warning, reprimand, fine, restitution, disciplinary probation for a specified period, withdrawal of privileges, indefinite probation (i.e., probation whenever and as long as the respondent is a full or part-time student at the University), term suspension (ordinarily not to exceed two years), indefinite suspension without automatic right of readmission, or expulsion. The panel, acting under Part IV, shall recommend and the VPUL shall decide whether the sanction should appear on the transcript of any individual respondent, and, if so, for how long.

2. Any sanction available under the Charter is available to the JIO in informal settlements.

B. Enforcement

1. The JIO shall ensure that sanctions are enforced. In performing these duties, the JIO shall have the cooperation of the Office of Student Life, the respondent's Dean, and other appropriate University officers. No sanctions shall be enforced until the appeal process is completed.

2. The JIO may place a Judicial Hold on a student's records or take other action necessary to enforce a sanction.

IX. Appeals

A. The Appellate Officer shall have exclusive jurisdiction to decide appeals from determinations by a panel.

B. Procedures

1. A respondent, complainant or JIO must submit any appeal to the Appellate Officer, in writing, with a copy to the other parties and the JA, within ten days of receipt of the panel's decision; the appeal shall state in detail the specific ground upon which it is based, and shall attach a copy of the charge and the decision.

2. Upon receipt of an appeal, the JA shall provide the Appellate Officer with any exhibits considered by the panel in reaching its decision.

3. The Appellate Officer shall review the appeal within ten working days of his or her receipt of it. Upon request of the JIO, the complainant or the respondent, or upon his or her own motion, the Appellate Officer may hear oral argument.

4. The Appellate Officer shall issue his or her decision reasonably promptly, but no later than thirty days after receipt of the notice of appeal.

C. Scope of review

1. Appellate review shall be limited to material and prejudicial procedural error, error in the interpretation or application of the relevant University regulations, and the severity of sanctions. Findings of fact may be reversed only if unsupported by substantial evidence.

2. Upon finding error, or that the facts were not supported by substantial evidence, the Appellate Officer may vacate or reverse the decision, or remand the case for appropriate proceedings.

X. Confidentiality of Judicial Records and Proceedings

A. The identity of individuals in particular cases before the JIO, the University Hearing Board, the VPUL, or the Appellate Officer, and all files and testimony, are confidential, in accordance with University guidelines concerning the confidentiality of student records pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, as amended.

B. When guilt is determined, the Dean of the respondent's school shall be informed and the record of the case shall be made available to him or her.

XI. Reports

A. Subject to the requirements of Part X above, the JIO, in consultation with the JA, shall make public reports at the beginning of each year and extraordinary reports on such occasions as necessary. The purpose of the reports is to inform the University community about the character and extent of the work of the Judicial System.

B. The reports of the JIO shall deal both with cases that go to hearing and with cases that are settled before hearing, and shall include information such as the overall number of cases handled during the preceding year, broken down by cases that were settled and cases heard by panels, general descriptions of the type of cases handled, the number of cases in each general category, the range of sanctions imposed, the numbers of determinations of guilt and innocence, and so forth. Extraordinary reports shall inform the University community about the outcome of certain exceptional cases, as determined by the JA.

Religious Holidays

I remind faculty and students that Rosh Hashanah is Thursday, September 24th and Friday, September 25th, and that Yom Kippur is Saturday, October 3. No examinations shall be given or assigned work made due on these days.

Some students observe other important religious holidays in the fall term. The University policy on religious holidays (*Almanac* February 20, 1979) does not prohibit examinations on those holidays, but students who are unable to take such examinations because of religious observances have a right to make-up examinations if they have made alternate arrangements with their instructors. University policy provides that students should inform their instructors of the need for such arrangements within the first two weeks of a term.

—Richard C. Clelland, Deputy Provost

Update
SEPTEMBER ON CAMPUS

Change of Date

The University of Pennsylvania and the Creation of the Constitution; an exhibit at Van Pelt Library listed in the September pullout to begin September 11, has been rescheduled to open September 19.

CONFERENCE

22 Nuclear Arms Control: 1988 and Beyond; featuring Ambassador Ralph Earle II, chief delegate, Salt II Negotiations, 1978-80, Dr. Kurt Gottfried, nuclear physicist and director of the Union of Concerned Scientists, and Dr. Richard Ned Lebow, professor of government and director of peace studies, Cornell University; moderated by Robert Mundheim, dean, Law School; 3:30-5:30 p.m., Room 100, Law School. Reservations for reception to follow, Ext. 6304 (Lawyers Alliance for Nuclear Arms Control, University of Pennsylvania Law School).

FILMS

PUC Film Alliance

Thursdays in Irvine Auditorium; \$2.50.

17 *Staight Time*, 8 p.m.

Easy Rider, 10 p.m.

ON STAGE

21 *Every Mother's Son*; a drama by Phillip Karnell about a teacher's excursion into the wilderness with his handicapped students. Admission: free. Reservations and information: 222-5000 (Philadelphia Festival Theatre for New Plays).

TALKS

17 *Recognizing and Dealing with the Suicidal Patient*; Martin Goldberg, director, Marriage Council, 1-2 p.m., seminar room, Marriage Council, 4025 Chestnut St. (Marriage Council of Philadelphia).

23 *Issues of Possible Child-Bearing*; Edward Monte, Ph.D., Senior Staff Therapist and Director of South Jersey Clinic, Marriage Council of Philadelphia; 1-2 p.m., seminar room, Marriage Council, 4025 Chestnut St. (Marriage Council of Philadelphia).

Department of Public Safety Crime Report

This report contains tallies of Part I crimes, a listing of Part I crimes against persons, and summaries of Part I crime in the two busiest sectors on campus where two or more incidents were reported between August 31 and September 13, 1987.

Total Crime: Crimes Against Persons—2, Burglaries—15, Thefts—30, Thefts of Auto—1, Attempted Thefts of Auto—2

Area/Highest Frequency of Crime

| Date | Time Reported | Location | Incident |
|--|---------------|--------------------|--|
| Crimes Against Persons | | | |
| 09-11-87 | 2:57 PM | 3700 Block Spruce | Gold chains and rings taken. |
| 09-13-87 | 1:43 AM | Levy Park | Cash taken—suspect believed to have weapon. |
| Spruce St. to Locust Walk, 39th St. to 40th St. | | | |
| 09-03-87 | 5:35 PM | Harrison House | Stereo & computer system taken from locker. |
| 09-06-87 | 7:17 AM | 3900 Block Locust | Tags taken from unattended vehicle. |
| 09-06-87 | 5:49 PM | Harrison House | Items taken from locker during summer break. |
| 09-07-87 | 10:49 PM | Harrison House | Items taken from locker during summer break. |
| 09-08-87 | 12:25 PM | Harrison House | Items taken from locker during summer break. |
| 09-08-87 | 12:25 PM | Harrison House | Items taken from locker during summer break. |
| 09-08-87 | 12:25 PM | Harrison House | Items taken from locker during summer break. |
| 09-08-87 | 12:25 PM | Harrison House | Items taken from locker during summer break. |
| 09-08-87 | 7:42 PM | Harrison House | Radio taken from secure room. |
| 09-09-87 | 2:23 PM | Harrison House | Items taken from locker during summer break. |
| 09-10-87 | 12:48 PM | Harrison House | Items taken from locker during summer break. |
| 09-10-87 | 7:06 PM | St. Mary's Church | Youth apprehended after stealing purse. |
| 09-11-87 | 11:06 PM | Van Pelt House | Rear wheel taken from bike in basement. |
| 09-13-87 | 4:42 PM | Harrison House | Both wheels taken from otherwise secured bike. |
| Locust Walk to Walnut St., 36th St. to 37th St. | | | |
| 08-31-87 | 11:04 AM | Annenberg Center | Money taken from unattended wallet. |
| 09-01-87 | 3:15 PM | Annenberg School | Wallet taken from unsecured desk. |
| 09-07-87 | 10:42 AM | Annenberg School | Radio taken from secured office. |
| 09-08-87 | 3:42 PM | Annenberg School | Ladies wristwatch taken from secured room. |
| 09-10-87 | 4:44 PM | 3600 Block Walnut | Unattended purse taken. |
| Spruce St. to Locust Walk, 36th St. to 37th St. | | | |
| 08-31-87 | 5:33 PM | Steinberg/Dietrich | Wallet and contents left unattended & taken. |
| 09-06-87 | 5:26 PM | Psi Upsilon | Cassette player taken from unsecured room. |
| 09-11-87 | 11:39 AM | Steinberg/Dietrich | New books taken from lobby. |
| 09-11-87 | 2:10 PM | Steinberg/Dietrich | Purse taken from backpack. |
| Locust Walk to Walnut St., 39th St. to 40th St. | | | |
| 09-07-87 | 11:23 AM | High Rise North | Numerous items taken from locker. |
| 09-07-87 | 12:26 PM | High Rise North | Secured bike taken from handrail. |
| 09-08-87 | 4:31 PM | High Rise North | Household items taken from locker. |
| 09-09-87 | 1:02 PM | High Rise North | Items taken from locker during summer break. |
| University Ave. to Walnut St., Expressway to 32nd St. | | | |
| 09-01-87 | 7:32 PM | Hollenback Dr. | Person with stolen battery apprehended. |
| 09-06-87 | 12:26 AM | Lot #5 | '85 Chevy: steering column damaged. |
| 09-07-87 | 6:11 PM | Stewart Field | Gym bag with wallet & contents taken. |
| 09-10-87 | 11:38 PM | Lot #5 | Chevrolet Celebrity taken from lot. |

Safety Tip: The campus has more than 200 emergency telephones to provide rapid communication to University police. These telephones are located in yellow boxes with blue lights above them. If you need assistance or wish to report a crime, open the phone box and lift the receiver. The phone will ring at the University Police Headquarters.

Speaking Out

Move-In Experience

Like most of our incoming freshmen, I had my first direct experience of move-in on Saturday, September 5th. I spent about four hours touring all the sites, talking with students and their parents, and hearing again from parents at the Parents' Orientation Program in the afternoon. It was a tremendously upbeat experience and I want to thank publicly Carol Kontos, director of Residential Living, Lynn Horner, director of Residential Maintenance, John Logan, director of Public Safety, their staffs, the large numbers of student staff, Laura Fuller and Bob Tintner, Rene Singleton and New Student Week volunteers who did such an outstanding job of assisting 2500 students in a very short period of time. It is a pleasure to pass on the many compliments I heard about the helpfulness and friendliness of Penn students and staff.

Everyone associated with move-in deserves a great round of applause!

With pleasure,

—Kim M. Morrisson, Acting Vice Provost

Almanac

3601 Locust Walk, Philadelphia, Pa. 19104-6224
(215) 898-5274 or 5275.

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

EDITOR Karen C. Gaines
ASSOCIATE EDITOR Marguerite F. Miller
EDITORIAL ASSISTANT Mary Corbett
STUDENT ASSISTANTS Catherine E. Clark, Amy E. Gardner, Michelle Y. Holloway, Lisa A. Richardson, Daniel B. Siegel
ALMANAC ADVISORY BOARD Chair, Jean Crockett, F. Gerard Adams, David P. Balamuth, Robert Lucid, Michele Richman, Lorraine Tulman, for the Faculty Senate; William Epstein for the Administration; Carol Carr for the Librarians Assembly; John Hayden for the A-1 Assembly; Joseph Kane for the A-3 Assembly.