

# Year-End Reports 1986-87

## Council Committee Reports

Academic Review .....	I
Bookstore .....	I
Communications .....	I
Community Relations .....	I
Facilities .....	III
International Programs .....	III

Library .....	III
Personnel Benefits .....	IV
Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics .....	V
Research .....	V
Safety and Security .....	V
Student Affairs .....	VI
Undergrad. Admissions Financial Aid .....	VI

## Independent Committee Reports

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

## COUNCIL COMMITTEES

### Academic Review

No proposals for the establishment of new academic centers or institutes were referred to the committee during the 1986-87 academic year.

—*Adelaide Delluva, Chair*

### Bookstore

The topic of the price of books was discussed; various economic trends in the industry seem to indicate that the prices will continue to rise markedly. Profits on the sale of clothing and other items tend to counteract losses on the sale of books. The security system is working well. The problem of informing potential customers about new products was discussed. Student publications other than *The Daily Pennsylvanian* are being emphasized. If a new student union building is constructed, the committee feels that the Bookstore could well be housed in it.

A motion of approval of present Bookstore operations was passed. This committee has no specific proposals to make at the present time.

—*Andrew Baggaley, Chair*

### Communications

This report is based on meetings of the Committee during the year, responses of various administration personnel to the Chair, and demonstrations attended by all Committee members illustrating the capabilities of the Penn computer network, PennNet.

The Committee undertook a survey of all Penn-related publications, primarily as an information-gathering exercise. There had been particular concern expressed by the students involved in *Triangle*, the *Wharton Account* and *Wharton Journal*, and the SAS publications [*The Penn Collegian*] as to whether they performed a useful function for the faculty of their schools, as well as for the students. When we asked the Deans of the relevant schools about this there was a very positive response from Engineering, a positive but (because of the brief life of the publication) a less in-depth response from SAS, and no response from Wharton.

A representative of *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, which is not technically under the Communications Committee, was willing to speak to us on a number of matters, two of which motivated the Committee—(1) the extent to which the *DP* felt it had the cooperation of the faculty and (2) the degree to which the staff of the *DP* was student versus non-student. What the committee learned was that whatever difficulties there may have been in the past, the present editors of the *DP* felt they got a very good response from the administration and the faculty. Secondly, while acknowledging that the time required for the *DP* led many students to reduce their course loads in one way or another, that certainly three-quarters of the *DP* staff were full-time students, and none could really be considered non-students.

The Committee has one very strong recommendation: namely, that if progress on 3401 Walnut as an information center takes place as planned, then the Communications Committee be formed and meet very early in the fall so that it can consult with and act as a sounding board for proposals for the new information center.

A second recommendation of the Committee concerns PennNet. The Committee was very impressed by the demonstration of the capabilities of the system but felt that a major communications job was in order to distinguish between what can be done now and what is planned.

Secondly, it was felt the system was being developed independent of perceived needs and that *some consultation or surveying would be desirable* to evolve plans that would meet present needs. Thirdly, the language of our demonstration including the distributed literature, often was in computerese, and that to get the system widely used a *more common level of discourse should be used*.

The Committee received excellent cooperation from various parts of the administration with which it dealt, though the chair, for one, feels that the function of such a committee, thrice removed from budgetary considerations, can perform only a very limited function. However, it is clear that there are pressing tasks for the Committee to look into next year and that *it is very important that the Committee get an earlier start than is the custom*.

—*Alan W. Heston, Chair*

### Community Relations

#### Acknowledgements

At the outset of this report on the activities of the University Council Committee on Community Relations (CCR) in 1986-87, it is appropriate that we acknowledge the leadership provided by the University Administration and extend our thanks to all those who supported and facilitated the Committee's work this year. President Hackney, Assistant to the President, Barbara Stevens, and the Director of Community Relations, James Robinson, provided information, ideas, and assistance regarding current issues and concerns for Committee study.

CCR members called upon faculty and staff in several University offices and sought assistance from a wide range of community members. We extend special thanks and appreciation to Mr. Frank Claus and Ms. Janet Gordon in the Treasurer's office; to Dr. David Burnett, chair of the Provost's Committee on Community Outreach; to Dr. Iraj Zandi, chair of the University Seminar on the University and the City; and to Mr. Paul Levy of the University's Real Estate Office.

#### Committee Charge and Future Roles

The University Council has given the CCR two charges:

1) to work collaboratively with the office of Community Relations to assure that the University develops and maintains appropriate relationships with the community.

2) to keep the University community informed about University activities in the community as well as about developments in the community which have an impact on the University.

In assessing the CCR accomplishments this year, committee members agreed that we have fulfilled our charge to keep the University community informed about developments in the community which have an impact on the University. We have accomplished this largely by means of the Committee's Community Breakfast Program.

We have, however, experienced difficulty in responding adequately to our charge to assure that the University develops and maintains appropriate relationships with the community. More often than not, the CCR found itself in the position of reacting to projects and policies which were already being implemented rather than being asked for advice during the decision-making process. For this reason, the CCR strongly supports the recommendation in the Report of the Seminar on the University and the City (*Almanac* April 7, 1987), which calls for creation of a President's Council on the University and the City. We see the need for a University group which has both the mandate and the responsibility for recom-

mending and developing policy on University-City relations. We urge the University Council to support development of a structure that provides for faculty/staff involvement in shaping the University's community programs and policies.

#### *Committee Activities*

In planning activities for the year, the CCR used the recommendations contained in the 1985-86 CCR Report as well as drawing on the advice of University administration. This year the Committee has focused its activities in three areas: real estate and housing, community outreach, and University/City relationships. The committee met once a month from October to May and also sponsored four community breakfasts. The topics for the breakfast meetings were coordinated with the CCR's targeted areas of concern.

##### *a) Real Estate and Housing*

The CCR met with Paul Levy, coordinator of the University's study of retail development in University City. The area of study (31st to 41st streets from Market Street to the VA Medical Center) has a population of approximately 150,000 composed of University employees, students, and community residents. In reviewing the development plans Mr. Levy presented, CCR members voiced their concern that retail firms coming into this area should be selected so as to attract the patronage of faculty, staff, and community residents as well as serving student needs. At the same time the Committee reiterated its concern for the provision of on-site parking for University employees in order to accommodate employee's needs and reduce the negative impact on the space available to community residents.

November's community breakfast was used to inform the University community about new building programs in West Philadelphia; specifically, the PGH site, the University City Science Center, and two new church-affiliated projects. This breakfast provided the opportunity for faculty, staff and community residents to express their concerns directly to University and city planners regarding parking, property upkeep, retail development, etc.

##### *(1) Subcommittee on Real Estate and Housing*

The CCR continued to pursue issues related to increasing the number of faculty and staff who make their homes in West Philadelphia. The subcommittee on Real Estate and Housing, chaired by Dr. Robert Figlio, addressed the issues of the University Guaranteed Mortgage Program, the status of the University City area housing market, and faculty and staff desires and specifications in regard to residential environment and housing.

The subcommittee found that property values had increased approximately 30%/year in the 1980's. After examining the University Guaranteed Mortgage Program, the subcommittee concluded that it represents a "safe" investment for mortgage sources, at low risk to the University. They believe that the demand for this program will probably increase as housing costs continue to rise. The CCR recommends that additional lenders be made a part of this program.

The subcommittee also surveyed real estate brokers in an attempt to determine the market factors that affect the purchase of residential property in University City. Realtors identified a wide scope of factors including type of homes available, increased desirability of area for Center City employees, rental income value, crime, high turnover rates of students and faculty, and the quality of schools. Brokers indicated that in order to encourage more faculty and staff to establish homes in West Philadelphia, the University needs to assume an active role in the community by making a commitment to planned orderly change in the community.

In this regard, the CCR is particularly concerned with the so-called "gentrification" of West Philadelphia. We think that this process will tend to put the purchase of homes in West Philadelphia out of reach of most University faculty and staff. Furthermore, we believe that gentrification could result in a community which lacks the very social and economic diversity that now draws faculty and staff to establish residence in West Philadelphia.

The subcommittee contemplates one further step in this study—a survey of faculty and staff regarding their housing preferences and needs. Such a survey necessitates some financial support from the University as well as collaboration and support from several areas of the administration.

##### *b) Community Outreach*

CCR members invited Dr. David Burnett, chair of the Provost's Committee on Community Outreach to describe the Committee's survey and the resultant Penn Educational Resource Center (PERC). PERC consists of a telephone "hotline" designed to improve access to University resources for teachers in the Delaware Valley. The CCR urged that the Community Outreach Committee establish a mechanism to update the resource bank annually as well as finding a way to fund the hotline function to ensure the continuance of this service to educators in the Delaware Valley.

Three community breakfasts focused on outreach activities. The topics were Public Education in West Philadelphia, Adult Literacy Programs, and Programs for the Homeless in the Community. Presenters included representatives from community agencies, faculty, staff, and student volunteers who are serving the needs of community residents. CCR members were impressed anew with the number of students and University employees involved in a variety of community service programs. The need for logistical support to students was raised. There is clearly a need for supportive services to students, particularly in the form of transportation to and from areas that are underserved by public transportation.

##### *c) University City/Community Relationships*

Dr. Iraj Zandi, chair of the Seminar on the University and the City, shared the Committee's findings and recommendations with the CCR. The CCR sent a letter to President Hackney in strong support of the recommendations contained in the Report of the Seminar on the University and the City. This letter also indicated the CCR's interest in participating in the formation of a President's Advisory Council on the University and the City.

##### *d) Recommendations for the Academic Year 1987-88*

The current Committee recommends that the CCR address three concerns in this coming year:

###### *1. The Future Structure and Function of the CCR*

We recommend that prior to establishing a President's Council on the University and the City, appropriate representatives including members of the CCR should meet to examine the respective roles and responsibilities of the proposed Council and the CCR as it is presently constituted. We think this is an important step in order to determine the need for two groups and their respective functions and inter-relationships. If the CCR is retained, we think the membership of the Council should include the Chairman of the CCR. Further, we recommend that the CCR work with the University Administration to implement recommendations of the Report of the Seminar on the University and the City.

###### *2. Real Estate and Housing in West Philadelphia*

We recommend that the CCR focus its major activities in 1987-88 on issues in real estate and housing. To these ends we suggest that the CCR:

- a. Secure the backing of University administration to undertake a survey of University faculty and staff to determine their needs and desires regarding community living accommodations.
- b. Continue to monitor the quality of retail establishments in the new University projects.
- c. Continue to monitor plans for expanding on-site parking for faculty and staff.
- d. Continue to monitor the University's progress in increasing the number of financial institutions involved in the University's Guaranteed Mortgage Program.
- e. Devote the first breakfast meeting of the year to the proposed development of the 30th Street Station site.

###### *3. The Importance of Community Outreach*

We recommend that the CCR continue to advocate for logistical support for students volunteering in the community and continue to monitor progress on the establishment of a reception/emergency service center for the homeless in West Philadelphia.

As Chair of the CCR, I want to extend warm thanks to Committee members for the interest and commitment invested in our activities this year. Special thanks go to Bob Lorndale who took care of the Committee's operational needs and particular thanks to Jim Robinson who staffed our meetings, organized the community breakfasts, and served as a vital resource to the CCR.

—Nancy B. Ellis, Chair

## Facilities

In spring 1987 the Facilities Committee published in *Almanac* three interim reports: an April 14 call for information on any little-known conference/meeting *Facilities at Penn* (to be entered in a Physical Plant inventory); on April 28, the *Recommendations on Transportation and Parking* which were discussed at the April 29 Council meeting; and, on May 12, *Report and Resolutions on a Student Union*, with an estimate of space needs and a comparison of Penn's facilities with those of peer institutions. An overview of the year may be published at a later date by the chair, Dr. Noam Lior. —*Ed.*

## International Programs

The Committee on International Programs met seven times during academic year 1986-87, including a joint meeting with the International Programs Office's Study Abroad Advisory Committee. The major concerns of the committee were concentrated in six areas.

*First*, the International Programs Office needs to continue to work cooperatively with other administrative units of the University to develop information linkages concerning the University's far-reaching international activities. Specific centers of international information where a common data base needs to be established include Alumni Relations, the Registrar's Office, the Office of Research Administration, Schools, undergraduate and graduate group chairs, and, if possible, the University's travel office as well. The need for such information is significant, especially as the Office seeks to further integrate its international development activities with other units of the University. The present system of large decentralized, often unaccessible, record-keeping impedes University-wide efforts to achieve a greater degree of coherence in being able to fully exploit the University's extensive international resources.

*Second*, the "quality of the international environment" at Penn continues to occupy a prominent spot on the Committee's agenda. This item includes concern for the international students who study at the University each year, as well as the University's 500 Visiting Scholars and the approximately 300 Penn students who undertake formal programs of study abroad each year. The service demands on the Office in meeting the varied social, economic, legal, and educational planning needs of so many international visitors is extraordinary; in some case, increased university resources are needed in order for the Office to augment existing services with new ones (e.g., housing, day care, post-orientation followup sessions, promoting inter-departmental exchanges, developing new programs of educational and research exchange, etc.).

The Committee is particularly concerned that the Office continue to maintain its already highly successful efforts in assisting international students and Visiting Scholars prior to and upon their arrival into the University community. Pre-travel assistance, expanded orientation sessions, technical assistance with visa and other legal requirements, health insurance information, host family arrangements, day care information, housing assistance, etc. include only some of the critical support services that are offered by the Office to the University's international visitors.

The need for quality housing at affordable rates, particularly for short-term rentals, continues to be one of the most serious problems confronting the Office for which greater University-wide attention is required. Greater sensitivity is also needed on the part of sponsoring schools and departments to other non-academic needs of Visiting Scholars (e.g., for social opportunities, support groups for spouses, day care, etc.). Updated brochures and other advance informational flyers may be needed in order to better orient international visitors to the realities of life in Philadelphia's complex urban environment. Similarly, the need also has become apparent for more comprehensive surveys of the experiences of international students and Visiting Scholars while at the University. Committee assistance to the Office on each of these matters should be of high priority in the next academic year.

Beginning spring 1987 the International Programs Office expanded its efforts to formally introduce Visiting Scholars to the larger University. Hereafter, formal receptions for Visiting Scholars will be held at least annually; also, the Office's monthly newsletter, *The International Dimension*, will carry listings of Visiting Scholars by primary departmental affiliation and areas of research interest. The Office, as appropriate and possible within the limits of its resources, will also try to be

helpful to individual departments and schools in promoting more inter-school and inter-departmental exchanges of Visiting Scholars (e.g., as lecturers, curricular consultants, etc.).

Further, the Office will continue the effort to promote opportunities for a larger number of Penn students to study abroad, including for periods of less than a full academic year. The responsibility for promoting this effort will be shared by the Office and members of both this Committee and the Study Abroad Committee.

*Third*, the Office recognizes its responsibility to promote an international perspective on the Penn campus. Necessarily, the realization of the objective must be carried out primarily at the School and department levels, albeit increased Office participation and co-sponsorship of significant University-wide international events and activities may be possible. Office participation in such activities is seen as essential in order to promote a broader "world view" among University students and faculty who may not have the opportunity to study abroad or conduct research outside of the United States. In any event, given the large number of international visitors and students that contribute to the intellectual life of the University, increased University attention needs to be given to these possibilities.

*Fourth*, the Office will be continuing its efforts to identify and, as possible, contribute to the development of new resources to assist international students and Visiting Scholars (including with housing, hosting programs, holiday sponsorships, etc.). Such activities will include closer coordination of campus efforts with other entities in the Philadelphia area (e.g., International House, International Visitors Center), in the Commonwealth (e.g., Pennsylvania Council for International Education), and nationally (e.g., Institute for International Education, etc.). The Office is already active in these arenas, especially at the leadership level, but even more can and should be done within the limits of time and budgetary constraints.

*Fifth*, the Committee would like for the International Programs Office to assume a more proactive posture in helping to promote the development of areas of specialized international study at the University. Presently, the absence of formalized study abroad, institutional linkages, and research opportunities for students and faculty in Latin America appears to be among the most neglected areas of formal international activity at the University. The Committee has encouraged the Office to work collaboratively with University faculty and academic departments to identify appropriate resource persons within the University who can give leadership to these activities; where appropriate and possible, the Office will work with area study groups in pursuing external funding in support of identified international program activities.

*Sixth*, future Committee activity needs to both identify and review carefully the extent and nature of existing University linkages with other universities around the world. Presently, some twenty-six programs of formal academic and research exchange have been negotiated at the university level, but many others, often of a less formal nature, also exist. All University-based programs of international exchange need to be identified and, as appropriate, reviewed regularly by the Office; copies of official agreements and letters of understanding related to such exchanges should be filed centrally with the International Programs Office.

—*Richard J. Estes, Chair*

## Library

The Library Committee met four times during the academic year.

The first meeting was held on October 30, 1986. At this time we learned with great regret of the resignation of Mr. Richard De Gennaro, our Director of Libraries. We acknowledged his many contributions to our libraries and the progress in maintaining an outstanding facility here at the University of Pennsylvania. The agenda was otherwise concerned with receiving updated reports on the problems in security at both the main and satellite library facilities, on asbestos control of the main library, and arrangements for storage and need for increased shelf space which had been identified by the previous Chairman of the Library Committee, Dr. David B. Brownlee, and the members of his committee. Dr. Joan Gotwals reported that the security problems are being or have been addressed with the help of the University's Department of Public

Safety and in particular a security guard has been stationed to check identification of entering persons starting at 1:00 in the afternoon rather than the previous five o'clock hour, affording greater control of persons using the library in the afternoon and evening. The changes necessitated to control and remove the asbestos-engendered environmental hazards have been largely completed. Dr. De Gennaro described a new movable compact shelving which will double shelving space per area available, when compared to our present system. Dr. De Gennaro also discussed the impact of the new budget system apportioning library expenses among the various Schools of the University. We were also brought up-to-date regarding progress of the installation of appropriate computer terminals and the almost completed online cataloging of the entire Library of Congress acquisitions.

The second meeting was a special meeting called on December 17, 1986 to address the concerns of Dr. Albert L. Lloyd, professor of Germanic Languages, as to the replacement of our card catalog system by computer engendered citations. These concerns were expressed in a letter addressed to Dr. Margaret Wood (Medicine) Chair of the Advisory Committee. This letter and a responsive letter from Dr. De Gennaro were published in *Almanac* on November 25, 1986. The meeting was well attended with guests including Dr. Lloyd and other faculty members and library users concerned about the phase-out of the card catalog. Dr. Joan Gotwals summarized the position of the Library administration which had worked closely with the Library Advisory Committee, chaired by Dr. Lawrence Bernstein and with the Academic Planning and Budget Committee. A \$1.5 million grant from the Pew Memorial Trust for new technology had permitted implementation of the program.

Dr. Lloyd was introduced and emphasized that he was not opposed to a computerized catalog but rather wished to have both systems maintained. His concerns with the availability of a solely computerized catalog were those associated with unavailability during downtime, inadequate availability of terminals, the more time-consuming and increased difficulty encountered in subject searches, and with discontinuation of card catalog entries, the necessity of making two searches. Agreement was expressed by others of his faculty colleagues. In particular, Dr. Brian Spooner (Anthropology) commented on the inadequacy and slowness associated with the scanning capabilities of the computer. Dr. Peter Gaeffke (Oriental Studies) protested the discontinuance of the use of diacritics in the computerized catalog.

Drs. Brownlee and Bernstein both commented on the prohibitive cost of maintaining both a card catalog and a computerized catalog. Further expense would be reflected in the acquisition budget at a time when our rank among research libraries in this country in regard to the level of acquisitions has fallen from the 35th position to the present 45th position.

Ms. Emily Fayen, systems director, and Dr. David Stonehill, Vice Provost for Computing noted that downtime for computers was largely planned and scheduled for hours when the facility would be closed or in low usage hours. It was felt that the availability compared well with that of the card catalog which is only available during hours in which the library is open. It was also noted that software would soon be available that would facilitate search by subject and keyword. The availability of terminals has been greatly enhanced by the PennNet program which permits accession from office based and off-campus computers. In response to Dr. Gaeffke, Ms. Fayen noted that the PennLIN computers do display diacritics.

Dr. Amos Smith (Chemistry) urged that the Library of Congress card be retained for a reasonable period, e.g., 1-2 years, until persons had adjusted to the online catalog.

Dr. Margaret Wood urged the acceptance of Dr. Smith's suggestion and expressed appreciation of the opportunity afforded Library Administration and the Advisory Committee to hear and understand the concerns of the faculty. It should be expected that they would be sensitive to these concerns as they proceeded with implementation of PennLIN. The meeting was concluded with the clear understanding of Dr. Wood and the Library staff that cards would not be removed from the Card Catalog until the online catalog was operational for a reasonable period and users were familiar with its operation.

The third meeting was called on February 24, 1987. The concerns expressed at the previous meeting in regard to computerization of the catalog were reviewed and the consensus was that the exercise had been of benefit to the Library community and its users. The possibility of

increased exposure of users to the available technology was discussed. Dr. Gotwals had spent time with Dr. Lloyd and the computer program which she felt had resulted in a greater understanding and acceptance of a still undesirable change.

The meeting was predominantly directed at the solution of problems associated with the Acquisition Budget. Dr. Gotwals reported that it would be necessary to suspend acquisition of new material for the balance of the fiscal year, unless some intervention was afforded by the University. The escalation in costs has been the result of the decline in the value of the dollar against leading European currencies and the discriminatory practices of many European publishers. The latter practice has resulted in a charge to libraries in this country that is 50-100% greater than that to libraries of the originating country.

The consensus of the committee was that this was a crisis situation and that University intervention must be requested. The Chair was directed to obtain a meeting with the Provost, Thomas Ehrlich. The committee met with Provost Ehrlich the following week accompanied by Dr. Lawrence Bernstein as a most knowledgeable former chairman of the Committee. Provost Ehrlich was most responsive to the situation as outlined by Dr. Gotwals, Dr. Regan, and former chairmen, Drs. Brownlee and Bernstein. Dr. Williams stated the advisability of the Libraries to work with other University Libraries as well as through government channels to combat the discriminatory pricing activities of overseas publishers. The meeting was considered to be fruitful as after several other meetings between Dr. Gotwals and the Provost and the University Planning and Budget Committee, Dr. Gotwals was able to report to the Advisory Committee that the University would make the necessary funding to the Libraries that would sustain programs for library acquisitions, both journals and monographs, through the end of the fiscal year. Further, for the next budget year, the Libraries will receive a substantial increase on book and journal allocations. Dr. Gotwals cautioned that this was an emergency assistance, not to be repeated and that it would be necessary to monitor most carefully, costs and subscription invoices.

The final meeting was held, April 21, 1987. This was a short but informative meeting. The University intervention into our fiscal difficulties was reviewed and our improved fiscal status was noted, again with caution. The activities of our development officer and proposed grant applications were outlined. A plea was made for suggestions of companies that might be interested in awarding grants relating to serial subscriptions. The opening of the very comfortable "Class of '37 Lounge" was announced. The installation of the new Compact Movable Shelving" on the 5th floor of Van Pelt has been completed and a short tour of the facility was convincing as to its efficiency and effective use of space to accommodate the ever-increasing need for book storage.

Dr. Gotwals also reported the imminent move of the Social Work collections and the soon-to-follow move of the Fine Arts Library operations and collections into the Van Pelt Library.

The Chair expressed her appreciation of the opportunity to work with a most superior committee and staff and the meeting was adjourned.

—Margaret Wood, Chair

## Personnel Benefits

This report provides a summary of the actions of the Personnel Benefits Committee for the year 1986-87.

- The Committee approved a proposal to increase the lifetime maximum of major medical benefits for retirees from \$25,000 to \$100,000. This was implemented effective January 1, 1987.

- The subcommittee set up to investigate alternative structures to the graduate tuition benefit made its final report. The Committee accepted this report and forwarded it to the Faculty Senate for consideration by the Economic Status Committee.

- The Committee appointed a subcommittee to investigate (a) concepts of life care communities, and (b) long term health care insurance.

A preliminary report on (a) has been received and we found it extremely interesting and worth pursuing in more detail. We expect this work to continue through next year's Committee.

- Because the Tax Reform Act of 1986 places stricter limitations than existed heretofore on the amount of retirement contributions an

employee can shelter from current taxation, a subcommittee was formed to investigate a proposed restructuring of the retirement plan. Our initial findings are that under such a revised plan there is a substantial risk of a determination that the plan discriminates in favor of the most highly compensated employees. There were also significant unanticipated additional costs associated with the plan. The documents related to this plan were transmitted to the Office of General Counsel and the Economic Status Committee of Faculty Senate for further advice.

• The Committee declared that continued free access to the recreation facilities is a personnel benefit just as is use of the libraries and restrooms. Means other than the proposed users fee should be found to cover maintenance costs. Should we have pay toilets?

I want to thank the membership of the Committee for their hard work and significant accomplishments throughout the year. They have made the job of the chair a pleasure rather than a chore. Finally, the entire Committee wishes to express their appreciation to Mr. James J. Keller, manager of Benefits, and his staff for their continuous dedication, support, and cheerful cooperation under sometimes trying conditions.

—Ira M. Cohen, Chair

## Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics

The University Council Committee on Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics has cognizance of recreation and intramural and intercollegiate athletics and their relation to the academic mission of the University. The Committee consisted of eight faculty members, two administrators, one A-3 staff representative, two undergraduates, and one graduate student. The Director of Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics, the Vice Provost for University Life, the Dean of Admissions, and the chairperson of the Women's Athletic Association were ex-officio members of the Committee.

During the 1986-87 academic year, the Committee held five full meetings and met in subcommittees on a number of other occasions. Almost all of the attention of the Committee over the entire year was directed at the issue of a use fee for non-student members of the University community for the athletic facilities such as Weightman and Gimbel gyms, the track and the tennis courts. After a great deal of research and discussion, the following resolution was adopted during the fourth meeting:

WHEREAS, the Committee on Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics has agreed in principle that a fee for usage of the recreation facilities should be instituted to make possible badly needed renovations in the facilities; and

WHEREAS, renovations in Hutchinson Gymnasium estimated to cost about \$400,000 have been identified and would be carried out over the next three years using borrowed funds so that an immediate start may be undertaken; and

WHEREAS, renovations in Hutchinson Gymnasium and Gimbel Gymnasium to cost an estimated \$2,000,000 as a phase two would be undertaken following completion of phase one; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that it be recommended that, to support these intentions, a usage fee for the recreation facilities be instituted at a level of \$84 per year for faculty members (A-2) and administrative staff members (A-1) and a level of \$52 for support staff (A-3).

The rationale behind this resolution was reported in *Almanac* (February 2, 1987) and discussed in the University Council meeting of March 18.

Action on this resolution by the University administration has apparently not yet taken place. It remains to be either adopted or rejected. Hence, this issue must remain an agenda item for the Committee during the current year. It has been indicated in an informal way to members of the Committee that the sticking point on the part of the administration is the reluctance to endure the criticism which will inevitably accompany the removal of a de facto personnel benefit, the precedent set by the parking fee, for example, notwithstanding. It has also been indicated that the administration has offered, as an interim measure, to commit institutional funds, to be matched by funds to be raised by the DIAA, to attend to some of the most pressing items of deferred maintenance. This action runs counter to the advice of the Committee, which was that the facility repair and maintenance should not be paid for by a tax on the general funds of the University, but should be borne by the portion of the community which actually uses the facilities (as is the case with parking), and that fund-raising by the DIAA should be done for capital improvements, not for deferred maintenance, which is, in effect, an operating expense.

The only other item of significance addressed by the Committee in the past year was the question of the academic performance and the graduation rate of student-athletes, particularly those who are specially recruited. The reason for raising this question was to give the Committee some basis on which to analyze the appropriateness of the 1.61 rule in the Ivy group. It was finally determined that the data necessary to evaluate these issues do not at present exist in the University information system. For example, exit interviews of students who leave before graduation were not yet being conducted, and this was considered to be necessary in order to be able to understand the reasons for non-graduation. It is understood that plans exist to correct these deficiencies, and this issue is also to be recommended to this year's Committee as an agenda item.

—C. J. McMahon, Jr., Co-Chair

## Research

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

1. The guidelines concerning the *Protection of Students Involved in Sponsored Research* (*Almanac* February 18, 1986) was approved by the appropriate student bodies and was passed by the University Council and adopted as policy on October 8, 1986. This policy will now be incorporated into the Policies and Procedures Handbook issued by the Vice Provost for University Life, the Guidelines for Conducting Sponsored Research, and the Faculty Handbook.

2. The Committee has finished drafting a policy concerning the *exclusion of foreign nationals* from specific research areas, (*Almanac* October 20).

3. The Committee has reviewed the work of the *Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee* and is supportive of Dr. Detweiler in initiating an *expedited review procedure* for appropriate protocols.

4. The Committee has met with the newly appointed University-wide veterinarian Dr. Rozmariek to obtain information concerning *planned changes in animal care* at the institution and in particular learn about the new department of *University Laboratory Animal Resources*.

5. The Committee has formulated a subcommittee to look at the issue of *indirect costs*. Specific emphasis has been placed on understanding the calculation of the rate, cost recovery and distribution of the overhead once recovered. A report will be forthcoming.

The chair would like to thank the members of the Committee for their hard work during the last year.

—Trevor Penning, Chair

## Safety and Security

This Committee continued the tradition of monitoring security systems in general, while responding to specific needs as they arose. Early on we reviewed the University's process for responding to incidents (including medical emergencies). We also looked into the accuracy and clarity of crime statistics collected by the Department of Public Safety. The Department responded that more information, such as the gender of victims, can and will be provided, and also furnished to the Committee definitions of categories used on the Crime Blotter now published in *The Daily Pennsylvanian* and *Almanac*.

In two areas the Committee responded to events and concerns among the constituencies on campus:

### *Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety*

Early in the fall, we received reports of injuries to pedestrians by bicycles on Locust Walk. The Committee reviewed the situation and recommended to the Council that bicycles be banned from Locust and Hamilton Walks proper, and that bike paths be built. This was then referred for consideration by the Administration. After its review, the Administration decided that barring bicycles from the above locations would create additional problems that would in themselves create new safety problems. However, there was agreement that the feasibility of developing a network of bike paths would be investigated.

### *Safety in Residence Halls*

A good deal of the Committee's deliberation was on the adequacy of

safety measures in the residences while school is in session and during holiday break periods. Because of the Thanksgiving 1985 murder of a graduate student in Graduate Towers, the Committee in fall 1986 reviewed changes in residential security including special arrangements for low-occupancy periods. Yet, despite added security measures in 1986, an intruder gained entry to the Quad and attacked two students—again on a Thanksgiving weekend.

A Quad Women's Group presented to our Committee its concerns regarding the Escort Service including a need for off-campus escort, for walking escort, and for building guards in academic office buildings for those working at night. Following a sit-in on safety at College Hall (*Almanac* December 9), this Committee was involved in the fulfillment of two promised actions—the conduct of a safety walk, and the creation of an ad hoc committee to hire a Safety Consultant (initially for overall review, but later focused to residential security). Working with the University Administration, a Consultant was selected and a prospectus for the Consultant team's site visit was developed.

(The team visited the campus towards the close of the spring semester. A summary of their report appeared in *Almanac* September 15, and many of the suggested changes have already been implemented, as summarized in an article October 27.)

#### *Unfinished Business*

Remaining to be carried out are the development of a plan for bike paths, and a comprehensive assessment of the adequacy of the safety measures now in situ on the campus grounds as well as in non-residence buildings of the University.

—Sheldon Jacobson, Chair

## Student Affairs

The Student Affairs Committee devoted the year to its charge to study and respond to the Undergraduate Assembly's recommendations in a paper entitled *Year 1990 Outlook on Student Life*. A year-end report was distributed to the membership of Council in April, and at the April 29 Council meeting the co-chairs of the Committee highlighted certain groups of needs, some which they expected to see met by the proposed student union. The full report, which was published in *Almanac* on May 12, pp. 5-9, contains 35 recommendations, grouped under the headings of *Social Activity and Promoting Class Unity; Cultural Life; Off-Campus Living; Residential Living; Greek Life; Student Health Service & University Counseling Service; Public Safety; Dining Services; Career Planning & Placement Service*; and, in the *Conclusions* Section, the proposal for a new Student Union.

Council voted to receive the report, which is available at the Office of the Secretary or from the office of the Chair.

—Vivian Seltzer, Chair

## Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid

The Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid met five times during the 1986-1987 academic year. Two subcommittees, Financial Aid and Special Admissions, met frequently and conducted a number of interviews with administrative officers and others. The Committee continued its review, initiated last academic year, of certain aspects of University admissions policy, including criteria for admission into academic, diversity, and special categories, and follow-up studies to examine the validity of the admissions procedures.

The Office of Admissions operates in a highly efficient manner. During each of the past three years the number of applications has been approximately 13,000, a substantial increase over the period prior to 1985 and a 67 percent increase over the count for 1978. A policy of greater geographical diversity has been successfully implemented, and the overall academic quality of the admit and matriculant groups is strong.

The McGill Report on Admissions, written in 1966, continues to provide much of the official policy on University admissions. The report calls for 10 percent of the class to be special admits, and an additional 5 percent to be persons exhibiting outstanding nonacademic talents such as leadership, motivation, and creativity. In recent years Admissions Office officials have used a target of 15 percent for special admits. In effect, the 5 percent category has been used for special admits. Admissions Office officials have cited the 1972 report of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee, chaired by Professor T. H. Wood, which pro-

posed increasing the special admit category to at most 15 percent. The University Council voted not to accept this recommendation. However, the McGill Report does note that some of its committee members expressed doubt that the 10 percent figure would accommodate future needs. During the period 1981-1986 the percentage of matriculating students in special admit categories exceeded 15 percent each year. The percentage exceeded 20 in CAS in 1985 and in Wharton in 1982, 1984, and 1985. The University-wide figure for the class entering in fall, 1986, was slightly above 16 percent. Careful monitoring of these figures is needed. Tables showing admission and matriculation counts for 1981-1986 by undergraduate college and by category, with percentages attached for special categories, are appended to this report. To facilitate further study of admissions figures, the Committee urges the Admissions Office to produce finer disaggregations in its statistical reports, particularly in those which provide counts in various categories for each predictive index value.

The McGill Report calls for the admission of every student whose objective criteria (SAT and achievement test scores and class rank) would place that student in the top 25 percent of the matriculating class. This is not being followed exactly. (Approximately 10 percent of such applicants are being rejected.) In addition, the boundary between diversity and special admits is not clearly delineated in practice.

The McGill Report calls for continuing studies to examine the validity of current admissions policy. The report of this committee last year noted that such studies have been conducted only occasionally during the past twenty years. There has been no solid administrative commitment to such studies. Recently some administrative officials have begun to pay more serious attention to this need. In particular, studies should be conducted to determine whether failure rate can be predicted from entrance credentials. The McGill Report suggested that applicants with probability of receiving a degree less than .75 not be admitted.

The work of the Committee was hindered by lack of adequate faculty participation. Faculty attendance at committee and subcommittee meetings was poor. More generally, the Committee believes that the faculty should play a greater role in the admissions procedure and in the formulation of admissions and financial aid policies. No specific proposals have been made to foster greater faculty participation. Furthermore, the Committee believes that there should be consultation with it prior to the implementation of new admissions and financial aid policies.

Members of the Admissions and Financial Aid offices were always most helpful to the Committee in providing information and offering their time.

—Howard Brody and Paul Shaman, Co-Chairs

## Report of Subcommittee on Financial Aid

The Subcommittee on Financial Aid met several times during the 1986-1987 academic year. Topics discussed were the impact of the new tax laws on financial aid, financial aid to post-baccalaureate students, and the entire administrative and decision process for undergraduate financial aid.

A task force on the impact of the new tax law published a report in *Almanac*. The problems with financial aid to post-baccalaureate students were referred to this subcommittee by the Steering Committee after a complaint by GAPSA. The subcommittee determined that the difficulties were probably a one-time occurrence due to an unanticipated leave and an illness in the Student Financial Aid office. The "Catch 22" situation with aid versus registration did not appear to be an unreasonable set of rules, since students were given an entire year to attempt to pay a bill (if a bill due in September is not paid by September a year later, the student cannot register). The education the subcommittee received on the operation of the financial aid system was turned into an internal committee report and is appended to this report.

The University of Pennsylvania is still committed to a "need blind" admissions policy for the admission of U. S. citizens and permanent residents to its undergraduate schools. Some other schools are moving away from this policy as funds become tighter and costs rise. Among the sources of financial aid to students (direct grants, loans, and work) it is the direct grants that are tightest, and in the case of the University these come predominantly out of unrestricted funds, whereas many other schools can cover much of these costs by use of endowment funds.

—Howard Brody, Subcommittee Chair

# INDEPENDENT COMMITTEES

---

## Faculty Grants and Awards

This year the committee received 21 applications and made 14 awards. Eight applicants received both Fellowships and Grants-in-Aid, four received Fellowships, and 2 Grants-in-Aid. A list of the grantees is below.

The committee also approved the following motion (all voting in favor; one member's vote has not been received).

*MOTION:* That the Faculty Grants and Awards be merged into the Research Foundation as a Type C grant [to be distinguished from their Type A and Type B grants.] This type C grant should maintain the principal features of the existing Faculty Grants and Awards:

1. Limited to Assistant Professors.
2. Provide summer salary support of about \$3,000 and support research expenses of up to \$1,500.
3. Give preference to subjects and fields that are not well supported by alternate sources.

—Janet R. Pack, Chair

## List of Awardees and Titles of Proposals

Ivy A. Corfis, Romance Languages—*An Edition of Ms. 17631 of the Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid: Celestina Comentada.*

Margreta de Grazia, English—*The Late Eighteenth-Century Devising of Shakespeare's Chronology.*

Alan Fiske, Psychology—*Dimensions of Social Relationships.*

Samuel Freeman, Philosophy—*The Role of the Judiciary in a Constitutional Democracy: Judicial Review and Constitutional Interpretation.*

Aryeh Friedman, Legal Studies—*Law and Innovation: A Comparative Study of American and Japanese Law.*

Inchi Hu, Statistics—*Efficient Time-Order Sequential Design.*

Eugene Kroch, Economics—*Intergenerational Transfers and Intangible Capital Formation.*

Mario Rui Pascoa, Economics—*Equilibria in Chamberlinian Non-atomic Games.*

Stephen Phipps, Geology—*Nature and Origin of Accreted Oceanic Rocks, Northern California Coast Ranges.*

Hilton Root, History—*A Transaction-Cost Approach to Historical Political Economy.*

Nancy Steinhardt, History of Art—*Dynastic Art of the Liao (947-1125).*

Peter Swenson, Political Science—*Employer Power and the Shaping of the Left in Germany and Sweden: The Breakdown of Centralized Trade Unionism in Comparative and Historical Perspective.*

Stephen Thom, Medicine—*Possible Carbon Monoxide Induced Brain Lipid Peroxidation and its Antagonism by Hyperbaric Oxygen.*

Lorraine Tulman, Nursing—*Functional Ability After Childbirth.*

## Honorary Degrees

The Committee received 37 nominations for honorary degrees to be awarded at the May 1987 Convocation. In addition the Committee approved four candidates for honorary degrees to commemorate the special convocation held on April 27, 1987 by the University Museum in celebration of the Museum's Centennial year.

Those receiving honorary degrees at the Museum Centennial Year Convocation were: Kent Flannery, Floyd Lounsbury, Erica Reiner, and Machteld Mellink.

Of the eight names originally submitted by the Committee to the Trustees for conference of honorary degrees at the May convocation, five were approved. Of these five, two were unable to accept; those who accepted were: Riccardo Muti, Robert Austrian, Edgar Kaufman, Jr., and Margaret Kuhn.

A special luncheon meeting with President Hackney and Committee members was held March 2, 1987. At that time the Committee submitted an additional three names to the Trustees Honorary Degrees Committee for their consideration. The Committee felt strongly that a woman should be among those to be honored at the May convocation. Of the three names recommended by the Committee, all of whom were women, two were approved, one was able to accept.

Because the Chairman of the Trustees Honorary Degrees Committee was on sabbatical leave, it was not possible to have the usual January meeting between the Trustees Committee and the University Committee. The University Committee regretted very much this lapse in direct communication. Further, in the future we hope for improved communication between the Secretary's Office and the Committee, since the Committee considers this to be a vital liaison with the Trustees.

In addition to the four persons proposed by the Committee and approved by the Trustees to receive honorary degrees, the Trustees nominated: Thomas Ehrlich, Bernard Lewis, and Robert Stevens.

—Marilyn E. Hess, Chair

## Disability Board

*University of Pennsylvania*

As of June 30, 1987, 107 Long Term Total Disability applicants were in benefit status. During the 1986-87 fiscal year, 17 new applications were approved, three were disapproved, and 13 people were removed from the rolls. Of these 13, four died while receiving benefits and nine retired.

Four thousand nine hundred sixty one members of the University faculty and staff are eligible for Long Term Total Disability benefits, representing a total base payroll of \$157,820,173. Benefit payments during 1986-1987 aggregated \$614,016 representing .39% of eligible payroll.

The Long Term Disability Board met once 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, various medical specialists and rehabilitation specialists in evaluating applications.

### *Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania*

As of June 30, 1987, 48 Long Term Total Disability applicants were in benefit status. During the 1986-87 year, 12 new applications for Long Term Total Disability Benefits were filed. Of these, seven applicants were approved, one withdrew her application before action was taken, one died before action was taken on his application, two withdrew their applications following initial disapproval and one applicant is in the appeal process.

During this same period, ten recipients were removed from benefit status; seven of these died while receiving benefits and three were retired with a pension.

Two thousand eight hundred and ninety one employees and staff of the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania were eligible for Long Term Disability benefits, representing a total base payroll of \$66,857,348. Benefit payments during 1986-87 aggregated \$254,846. The Long Term Disability costs for this fiscal year represented .38% of eligible payroll.

As a result of the cooperative efforts of the HUP Personnel Department and International Rehabilitation Associates, Inc., nine Long Term Disability recipients were assisted in obtaining Social Security Disability or Retirement benefits. The offset of these benefits coupled with the offset of one recipient who received Sickness and Accident Benefits, resulted in undiscounted savings to HUP of \$400,976.

—*Dan M. McGill, Chair*

## **Open Expression**

The Committee on Open Expression (COE) met 23 times during the period of October 3, 1986 and May 4, 1987. The Committee took the following actions:

1. At the request of the University Administration the COE conducted a fact finding investigation to determine whether the Open Expression Guidelines were violated in the April 9, 1986 incident in the President's Office. The Committee characterized the incident as a demonstration and determined that no violation occurred under section III.D.1.a, governing demonstrations in the areas where records and collections are kept, and under section III.D.2.a, prohibiting demonstrations in private offices. The Committee, however, determined that the failure to obey the instructions of the Vice Provost for University Life (VPUL) was a technical violation of section IV.C of the Guidelines (Appendix I).

The Committee received a request by the President and the Provost for clarification of these findings. The Committee responded (Appendix II) that its findings were formulated on the basis of the case under investigation and without intending to resolve the issues raised in the President and Provost's letter. The COE, however, agreed to take up these questions in the next academic year. A request for an advisory opinion on the same issues was also received from Mr. Wayne Glasker, chair of GAPSA.

The Committee, then, received a dissenting report (Appendix III) from one of its members and issued a response to this document (Appendix IV).

2. In 1985-86, the COE, at the request of Professor Gary Francione, a member of the University community, agreed to investigate two incidents of alleged photographic surveillance by the members of the Department of Public Safety (DPS). The first incident occurred on October 2, 1984 at an off-campus screening of a videotape which consisted largely of excerpts from research videotapes stolen from a University Medical School laboratory. The showing was sponsored by People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals and was held at a rally sponsored by Professor Francione and held on College Green to protest head injury experiments on animals.

The Committee, in the first incident, declined to find a violation of the Open Expression Guidelines, but stressed its concern that the approach taken on that occasion could easily be used to harass members of the University who are associated with unpopular causes.

In the second incident, the Committee concluded that the photographic surveillance by the DPS violated Sections III.A and IV.D of the Guidelines. The former is a prohibition against infringement of the rights of individuals and groups to assemble peacefully and to demonstrate. The latter section is a prohibition against collection and maintenance of information about members of the University community, except in connection with alleged crimes, violations of University relations, or as specifically authorized in writing by the President (Appendix V).

3. The Committee, at the request of the Lesbians and Gays at Penn (LGAP), initiated an investigation into a series of incidents in April 1986, during the LGAP Awareness Week. The Committee found (Appendix VI) that the defacement of the Bookstore wall sign and the removal and destruction of the the LGAP banners were infringements of that group's rights of open expression. The Committee was unable to reach a conclusion that the refusal of students accused of posting anti-gay flyers to show their University identification to an Open Expression Monitor was a violation of Section IV.C.1 of the Guidelines. The Committee concluded that the distribution of derogatory flyers was not a violation of Guidelines and was protected under Section III.B's prohibition against restriction of the expression of views based on their substance. Based on this evidence, the Committee was unable to decide whether the Open Expression Guidelines were violated by shouted obscenities and verbal threats. A concurring report was also received from one of the members of the Committee (Appendix VII).

4. The Committee asked and received a detailed report from the University Administration on the events leading to the removal, in January of 1987, of shanties erected at 40th and Locust as a prelude to National Action Day for the Homeless. The Committee volunteered its services in providing advice on Open Expression questions in similar future incidents.

5. The COE Chair participated in a meeting with Dr. James Bishop, the VPUL, and Mr. Wayne Glasker, the chair of the Graduate and Professional Students Assembly (GAPSA), to provide advice in the drafting of policies to regulate vendors and the impact of these policies on student organizations which engage in leafletting, tabling, and canvassing on campus. All questions were satisfactorily resolved.

6. The COE at the request of the Administration agreed to investigate the demonstration by the members of the Penn Human Rights Coalition on December 4, 1986 in the President's Office. This investigation is nearly completed and will be concluded in the next academic year.

7. The Committee received a request by the Black Student League (BSL) to investigate the actions by the University Administration in the case of the cancelled appearance by Minister Louis Farrakhan on November 1, 1986. Since no response was received from the complainants to a request by the COE to appear for a scheduled fact-finding meeting, this case has been postponed to the beginning of the next academic year. The complainants have been informed that the case will be dropped if no communication requesting otherwise is received by September 10, 1987.

8. The Committee agreed, as part of its next year's agenda, to discuss and develop guidelines for dissenting and concurring reports by the members of the Committee.

—*Sohrab Rabii, Chair*

## **Student Fulbright Awards**

I am writing to report to you the outcome of the University's Fulbright award nominations for the 1987-88 academic year. As often happens, two awards are still uncertain as to outcome, being in alternate status. In toto, out of 27 applications evaluated by the committee, we had 13 finalists. Six eventually received Fulbright awards, and two more, who applied for West Germany, received Deutsche Akademische Austauschdienst fellowships, which are awarded by the German government in cooperation with the Fulbright program. Two other finalists received alternate awards. Three of the finalists were eventually unsuccessful. The recipients were:

Teresa Burke—DAAD to Federal Republic of Germany

Thomas DuBois—Finland

Cynthia Goldfine—France

Virginia Jewiss—Italy

Ellen Leung—Switzerland

Darielle Mason—India

Joseph Schwarzer—Turkey

Peter I. Tokofsky—DAAD to Federal Republic of Germany

Seth Brody—Alternate to Israel

D. Fairchild Ruggles—Alternate to Spain

Considering the shrinking number of awards in the last few years due to federal budget reductions for the program, I think we can be quite happy with this level of success, and certainly, quite proud of the quality of the proposals from all the finalists.

—*Margaret A. Mills, Chair*