

Almanac

Tuesday, May 10, 1988

Published by the University of Pennsylvania

Volume 34, Number 33

Memorial Service: Dr. Chambers

The campus memorial service for the late Vice President for Engineering, Dr. Carl Chambers, will be held May 25, from 4 to 5 p.m. in Room 100 Towne Building. All members of the University are invited.

United Way: Dean Andrews

Chairing the coming year's United Way/Donor Option campaign on campus will be Dean Edward Andrews of the School of Veterinary Medicine. Affirmative Action's Joann Mitchell will continue as staff coordinator.

"Dean Andrews' knowledge of the United Way organization and leadership will be invaluable," said Dr. Sheldon Hackney, referring to the Dean's years as head of the Montgomery County campaigns while he was an executive with Johnson and Johnson.

To follow up on what President Sheldon Hackney called a "banner year" in campus giving (\$238,000 was the final total in the campaign jointly chaired by Dean Claire Fagin and Senate Chair F. Gerard Adams), Penn is surveying faculty and staff on their ways of giving, including their use of the Donor Option provision.

Hospital: April Setback, but No Projected Layoffs

A drop in patient admissions for the month of April is affecting FY 1988 income projections and FY 1989 budget planning for the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania, Executive Director C. Edward Schwartz told the Trustees Committee on Budget and Finance last week.

Trustees as well as Mr. Schwartz said a major concern was not being able to forecast a balanced budget for FY 1989, without knowing whether April's drop was anomalous, or signals a trend.

The FY 1989 budget is being reexamined, but the Hospital's management will not look to layoffs for a solution, Mr. Schwartz said. Although attrition may be a factor, he added, "The Hospital is committed to maintaining a stable workforce, and has no plans for any other across-the-board workforce reductions unless confronted by extraordinary circumstances not foreseen at this time."

HUP has rehired 30 of the 110 laid off February 1, when 130 vacancies were also frozen as part of a revised "cost-containment" budget adopted in January after fall figures led to the projection of an \$11.2 million deficit (against the original FY 1988 budget, which contained a planned deficit of \$3 million). The revised budget whittled the projected deficit to \$6.1 million through a combination of staff reductions and reduced purchasing of materials.

In the cost-containment budget, HUP also revised its projected admissions (which drive revenue) from 25,500 for the year to 24,635, and initiated plans to increase marketing. In January, February and March admissions ran slightly ahead of projections; but April figures just received show a shortfall of 249 patients, which translates to \$1.75 million in revenue.

Emphasizing that the drop has not yet been fully analyzed, Mr. Schwartz presented a table on admissions service-by-service, and noted that in some cases a single provider appears to make the difference from year to year. In one service where patient-days were down, he said 7.5 person-weeks were lost to April's heavy concentration of scientific meetings; but "there may be other factors."

The impact of competition with other hospitals will become clearer in a few weeks as standard data reports come from the Delaware Valley Hospital Association, Mr. Schwartz added. However, he said, Penn's competition is not always local; it includes other teaching hospitals across the country that provide highly specialized treatment.

As to the effects of a recent *Inquirer* series which analyzed local teaching hospitals as troubled, Mr. Schwartz said that far from hurting HUP, the first story produced a flood of referrals through the Hospital's new Physician Referral Hotline—calls shot up from the usual seven or eight a day to as many as 48 a day in the period just after publication.

HUP's February layoffs carried a one-time cost of roughly \$450,000 (for salary in lieu of notice and for severance pay scaled to length of service). In addition to staff reduction, HUP tightened purchasing, and suspended the incentive bonus system temporarily. He said in talking with staff there was strong reaction to the suspension of bonuses, though most staff understood that layoffs would have cut deeper if bonuses had not been eliminated. "We believe strongly in the need for incentive bonuses," he said, "and will propose bringing them back as soon as possible, though that will not be this year or next."

Advisory Opinion of the Committee on Open Expression (On Applicability to Union-Affiliated Staff) April 28, 1988

On January 14, 1988, Mr. John Hanlon, a Faculty Club employee and union member, was told by a club official to cease distributing leaflets in the Faculty Club courtyard. These leaflets dealt with negotiations between the University and the Club employees and their union. As a consequence of the above, first Professor Clyde Summers of the University of Pennsylvania Law School and later Mr. John Hanlon requested the Committee on Open Expression to determine whether there had been a violation of Mr. Hanlon's rights of free expression under the University's Guidelines on Open Expression. Professor Summers also contended that his (i.e., Prof. Summers') right to know had been infringed. The following advisory opinion is issued in response to these requests and in accordance with paragraph IV.B.3. of the Guidelines.

All employees of the University are covered by the Guidelines on Open Expression regardless of union affiliation. This is consistent with the historical record (see attached* excerpts from the *Almanac* May 20, 1971, page 5—"Open Letter from the President" and "The Council").

—Ervin Miller, Chair,
Committee on Open Expression

* Available from *Almanac* on request. The Council action taken May 12, 1971, reads, "RESOLVED, That in all future negotiations and actions involving disputes between the University and labor unions, a prominent part of the instructions to negotiating administrators should include the Guidelines on Open Expression." The Open Letter from then-President Martin Meyerson, dated May 17, 1971, addressed faculty, staff and students who blocked facilities during a demonstration connected with a labor dispute, calling their acts illegal both externally and "internally . . . where they violated the Guidelines on Open Expression adopted by the Board of Trustees and applying to faculty, students, administrators and other University personnel . . ." —Ed.

INSIDE

- On Trustee Professorships, p. 2
- Speaking Out: Reporting Salaries, p. 2
- Senate: Chair's Report and President's Report to April 20 Meeting, pp. 3-6
- Faculty Club: Dues Drop, Summer Close, p. 6
- Grants for Humanities Faculty Seminars, p. 6
- Of Record: Decision/Findings in the Phi Delta Theta & Phi Gamma Delta Cases, pp. 6-7
- CrimeStats, Update, A-1 Assembly, p. 8

Pullout: CRC's Penn Printout

From the President and Provost

A new category of enhanced professorships has been discussed briefly by the President and Provost in recent meetings of Senate and Council. Below, they spell out the new program in detail.

On Trustee Professorships

The primary planning principle that has defined our priorities for Penn is the recognition that "the University's quality is the strength of its faculty." They are key to achieving distinction in research and teaching. As delineated in the document *Investing in Academic Excellence (Almanac Supplement March 3, 1987)*, if Penn is to excel it must:

- recruit and promote younger faculty of great promise;
- reward and retain its most distinguished and productive faculty; and
- attract established faculty who can provide important leadership to research and instructional programs.

In the decades ahead, most American universities will witness the retirement of a large proportion of their most established professors. Between now and 1995, more than 200 members of the standing faculty at Penn will reach the normal retirement age. Their departure will be followed by an even more dramatic wave of retirements lasting into the next century. If Penn is to enter the next century as an institution of distinction, we must begin now to recruit men and women noted for their excellence in teaching and scholarship, while at the same time providing for the continued support of current faculty.

The focus of the major development campaign ahead will be a sustained investment in academic excellence. The campaign's first priority will be the strengthening of the University's already excellent faculty. Our goal is to raise money to endow at least two hundred chairs. Fifty of these will be used for the Trustee Professorships.

Because we must begin now to identify and recruit those faculty who can augment and extend Penn's scholarly excellence, the University has established the Trustee Professorship program. This is designed to help schools and departments recruit persons from outside the University before endowed funds are actually in hand. Schools will use their own funds and faculty vacancies occurring over the next five years to create positions (thus the professorships will not increase the size of the faculty); University funds will be used to enhance compensation and other resources, including research support, facilities, and graduate students. Through the use of Trustee Professorships, we hope schools will be able to proceed with the appointment of distinguished scholars and teachers in advance of raising the funds for these professorships in the development campaign.

Faculty appointed to Trustee Professorships are to be scholars of outstanding promise and accomplishment in a subfield or discipline; persons who bridge two or more disciplines or Schools are particularly attractive candidates. Affirmative action efforts will be made to ensure that new Black, Hispanic, and women scholars are recruited.

In addition to a record of outstanding scholarly accomplishment and the promise of sustained intellectual activity, Trustee Professors in schools with undergraduate programs, and schools that offer a significant number of undergraduate courses, will be expected to teach both undergraduate and graduate students. A record of service to academe, the profession, and/or the larger community is also expected. Although Trustee Professors must be tenured, no age restriction applies. The gifted younger scholar who promises to be the most outstanding person in his or her subfield, as well as the more mature established scholar, may be appointed.

Because these appointments will be jointly funded by the schools and the University at large, candidates will be identified, recruited, and appointed through a cooperative process involving the Provost, the deans, and relevant school and departmental committees. It is expected that the positions requested will conform to the school's five-year plan and that those nominated will enhance Penn's academic stature. They will be expected, for example, to sustain current strengths, to elevate a department or program into a position of leadership, or to encourage collaboration among departments and schools.

Thus far, ten searches for Trustees Professors have been approved, with three resulting in appointments effective for the next academic year. The three—in Latin American Literature, French, and Nursing and Health Policy—will be announced shortly. The seven other searches underway are in American Literature, Astrophysics, Behavioral Neuroscience, Computer Science, Economics, Finance, and Materials Synthesis. Those being appointed—and sought—are major scholars in the prime of their careers who can be expected to exert research leadership in their disciplines and educational leadership in the faculties they join.

The aim of the Trustee Professorship program is to attract the very best. Yet it is the collective reputation of Penn's faculty and the strength of its scholarship that will make it possible for the University to compete successfully for the teachers and researchers who will help shape the scholarly world of tomorrow. To preserve and strengthen Penn's standing as a major research University, broad and sustained support for all the faculty is required. The Trustee Professorship program is but one way of providing such support, and helping to foster a University community that is rewarding to gifted scholars and teachers, both those currently a part of Penn and those who will join us.

—Michael Aiken, Provost

—Sheldon Hackney, President

Speaking Out

Ways of Reporting Salaries

It has come to our attention that the manner of reporting average salary figures from the University to the national AAUP office has contributed to discontent among the faculty concerning salary levels here. It has been suggested that the failure to report average salaries separately for the separate schools makes these figures seriously misleading—that they both overstate salary levels at this University relative to other universities, and that they lead faculty members here to misunderstand their positions relative to colleagues in the same school. This causes particularly serious morale problems in the liberal arts, where many faculty members are under the mistaken impression that they are not as valued as their colleagues.

After consultation with the local chapter's Board, we believe that the possibility that aggregated salary figures distort the situation at this University is a serious problem, which can only be cured by greater openness. Moreover, we are concerned that it may be inappropriate for the AAUP to remain a party to the dissemination of information that has these unfortunate effects. We urge that information regarding average salaries, broken down separately for the separate schools, should be made publicly available.

—Elsa Ramsden, (physical therapy)
President, University of Pennsylvania
Chapter, AAUP

—Peter Freyd (mathematics and computer
science) Vice President, University of
Pennsylvania Chapter, AAUP

—Gerald Neuman (law), secretary-treasurer,
University of Pennsylvania Chapter, AAUP

Response

The AAUP salary survey requests average salary for the University, excluding the School of Medicine, by rank and by gender. It does not ask for such data by School. We will continue to provide the data requested as we have done in the past.

—Michael Aiken, Provost

Two Issues Left: *Almanac* expects to publish May 17 and May 24, then skip to July to begin Volume 35. The May 24 poster-calendar *Summer at Penn* will include all summer announcements received in our offices by May 11. Happy Commencement!
—K.C.G., M.F.M. & M.A.C.

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 April M. Alfano,
Catherine E. Clark, Mary A. Downes, Michelle Y. Holloway,
Lisa A. Richardson

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.

SENATE

From the Chair

1987-88: Year-End Report

Dr. Adams' Expanded Remarks at Senate April 20, 1988.

This has been a good year for the faculty. Many issues have come up during the year that affect the faculty and, in broader terms, the University. We have been able to handle them—working closely with the administration without antagonism or divisiveness. The Consultation Committee has met with the President and the Provost twice each month. There have, in addition, been numerous informal contacts. The Faculty Senate chairs have also worked through the University Council and its Steering Committee, which is directed by the Senate Chair. The Senate Executive Committee meetings and the Senate committees have considered many questions and have spent many hours in discussion and in drafting new proposals. The faculty has participated actively in University decision making. The processes of faculty governance have worked smoothly.

In this, my final report to you as Chair of the Faculty Senate, I would like to bring you up to date on the issues which we have considered this year and on our accomplishments.

Safety and Security

As you know, questions of safety and security on campus have been an important concern, as much of the faculty as of the students and staff. We have been extensively involved in discussion of these issues. We met with the University's consultants on safety and are being kept in touch on the implementation of their proposals. In April, the Committee on Open Expression stood by at the time of the Farrakhan speech. But there were no disturbances and the University community should be complimented that the visit went smoothly.

Reorganization of the Office of the VPUL

The University has been searching for a new VPUL. We appointed two faculty members to the search committee and we participated extensively in the discussion of the consultant's report on the reorganization of the University life and student services functions. Senate leaders were also consulted with regard to sanctions imposed on fraternities in connection with last fall's rush activities.

Faculty Salaries and Benefits

Faculty salaries and benefits are always potentially a contentious issue. The Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty met a number of times with the Provost on salary and benefit questions. The administration has been open with us with respect to last year's figures and with respect to plans for this year. Last year's salary increases appear to be well in line with what the committee had been promised. They yielded an increase in the typical faculty member's salary (after allowing for inflation) and a small improvement in the standing of the University of Pennsylvania as compared to other comparable institutions. This year's increase, just announced, will be a little smaller than last year's due to a smaller tuition increase. But it is expected that on average, salary increases will exceed the increase in the cost of living. The Senate chairs and the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty will continue their oversight of salaries and benefits. I am satisfied that the University is making its best efforts to increase faculty salaries, and I hope that in the future information on salary increases will be more openly communicated than it has been in the past.

Undergraduate Admissions

In response to widespread feeling that the faculty should be more involved in the formulation of admissions policy, SEC accepted the recommendation of the Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy to do an annual review of the admissions plan and to invite the chairs of the admissions committees of the four undergraduate schools involved to participate in this process.

Changes in the Academic Calendar for 1990

In response to the University's plans for celebrating its 250th anniversary

in 1990, SEC agreed to a change in the University calendar which would move the spring semester of 1990 ahead by one week. This will make it possible to put on a gala 250th celebration for alumni and friends of the University with academic as well as entertainment events.

Clinician Educators at the School of Nursing

After consultations with Claire Fagin, Dean of the School of Nursing, SEC accepted the recommendation of the Committee on the Faculty to increase the number of clinician educators in the model clinical program of the School of Nursing to 40% of the school's faculty. This increases the limit on clinical professorships in Nursing to the same limit as in the School of Medicine.

Goodness of Fit

The Committee on the Faculty brought for consideration by SEC a proposal concerning the use of "goodness of fit" in appointment and promotion of nontenured faculty. This proposal, which was intended primarily to protect nontenured faculty, raised serious concerns on the part of some members of SEC about the possible misuse of goodness of fit criteria and was rejected. It is disappointing that the committee's hard and thoughtful work on this matter did not reach a positive conclusion.

Faculty Grievance Procedure

Following on recommendations of the Senate Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Faculty Grievance Commission last year, negotiations between SEC representatives Marten Estey and Robert Davies and members of the University administration have reached fruition in the form of a revised grievance procedure. These rules, which codify procedures and resolve a number of previously uncertain questions, were approved by SEC and will play an important role in protecting the interests of the faculty. I would like to thank Professors Estey and Davies for their great efforts.

Student Code of Academic Integrity

A detailed revision of the Code of Academic Integrity has been carried out under the direction of David Brownlee and his Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy. This has been a major effort involving consultation with numerous faculty and undergraduate school representatives. The revised code has been discussed by SEC which has recommended its enactment to the Provost.

University Administration and Finances

Numerous administrative aspects of the University have come to the attention of the Senate Committee on Administration. These have included discussions of the administrative management of the University with the Provost and, informally, by the Senate Chairs with Helen O'Bannon, the Senior Vice President. The administration has been informative with respect to the activities and financial results of the non-academic parts of the University.

The Committee on Administration, headed by Martin Pring, has considered many matters including the Bookstore, WXPN, communications and computing, etc.

SEC has been informed on the Campus Master Plan and has suggested that it be a rolling document that is regularly reviewed by the faculty.

As you know, the Faculty Club poses severe financial problems. As last year, the Senate chairs have played an important role in the discussions of how to manage the financial problems of the club. We have been assured that the Faculty Club is considered by the University administration to be a valuable institution and that it will continue, after air-conditioning repairs this summer, in the tradition which has been established for many years.

(continued next page)

(continued from page 3)

Regarding the problem of parking, the new garage at 34th and Chestnut will allay some of the pressure for spaces, but we must recognize that costs are rising and that there will be an increase in parking rates. Many faculty have sought University subsidization of parking. While a strong argument can be made that the University should provide parking for its faculty, we must be aware of the differences between the interests of those faculty members who use parking and those who rely on public transportation.

Committee on Conduct

Last, but in my opinion, most important is the enactment of the proposed Senate Committee on Conduct, part of the University's procedures on racial and sexual harassment. The proposal by the Committee on the Faculty seeks to meet a need for a body to deal fairly with charges of harassment brought by students or staff members against faculty. The committee has prepared a carefully thought-through report suggesting the Committee on Conduct to deal with these cases in a judicial manner. The committee will mean that faculty are judged by their peers. It will

maintain existing informal procedures. It will continue to protect the faculty's rights to appeal before the Faculty Grievance Commission and the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

You are being asked by the Faculty Senate to vote on this issue by a mail ballot that will be sent to you shortly. I believe a mail ballot is important to assure that the entire faculty has an opportunity to express its opinion on an important subject like this one. The Senate Committee on the Faculty has made a valuable proposal. I urge you to approve it.

Finally, in my letter to you at the beginning of the academic year, I expressed my objectives for this year as follows: "Through dialogue comes consensus and support. I would like to see Faculty Senate institutions develop as a channel for communicating our thinking to the administration." From that perspective, we have had a very good year indeed.

I would like to thank the members of the administration and the faculty, especially the hardworking Senate leaders and committee members, for a job well done.

—F. Gerard Adams, *Outgoing Chair*

From the President

Bumps, Bruises and a Good Year

Dr. Hackney's Address to Senate April 20, 1988

Though it has not been without some bumps and bruises, the year that we are now bringing to a close has been an extraordinarily good one for the University in various ways.

The most exciting way one can measure this is in the strength of the faculty. There again, there are always pluses and minuses. Some people we lose, some people we gain. But I think our gains have outweighed our losses, in particular our new Trustee Professorship program that up to now has authorized 10 searches. This program uses monies from various sources, money that can be sequestered by the central administration from the rest of the budget. Those monies are used to supplement the funds for existing vacant positions in the faculty to enable departments and schools to be a bit more ambitious in their hiring. At least three new Trustee Professors will be here by September. Other searches will be authorized in the future.

This is also the season in which the deans and the department chairs face a vast array of raiders who are trying to lure our faculty away. By my last count there were some 20 such raids being attempted. I hope that we will be able to resist all of those or at least the vast majority of them.

That reminds me of a point I made in the annual report last fall. The 1990s, which are really beginning now, are going to be a very tough time for higher education, for three reasons.

The number of high school graduates will continue to decrease, so we have to continue making a big effort to attract the sort of students we want if we are going to hold our position or continue to strengthen our undergraduate student body.

More importantly, there will be a great number of retirements of faculty members beginning in the mid-90s, if not a little bit before. We do not have in the pipeline younger scholars and scientists to fill those positions.

The numbers of students going into Ph.D. programs began to decline

in 1975 and has been declining ever since. So, we really don't have a vast pool from which to recruit. Every school is going to be in this position, and therefore the competition for the very best faculty is going to be intense.

Now, that is good news if you are among the very best scholars and scientists. We were among the first universities to notice this, and we were out in the market a bit earlier. I believe we'll fare very well, but we'll have to run hard and get the resources with which to compete.

The other thing that is going to happen in the 90s is already happening. The price of everything we do is going up—everything from research equipment and scientific labs to our libraries. All are going to be more expensive—and not just more expensive by the rate of inflation, but quantitatively more expensive.

If we are going to have the sort of facilities that attract scientists and humanists and social scientists here, we must provide the resources to pay for those facilities. As the *Almanac* has revealed, we have good news on the budgetary front. Faculty salaries should not only continue to make gains against inflation next year—the eighth straight year in a row that we have been able to do that—but I believe the salary increases will allow us to make some gains relative to our major competitors.

I'm pleased that we were able to do this while also limiting the rate of growth of tuition to lower than it was last year and the year before. At the same time, our admissions picture for undergraduate programs is very strong. You may have seen the article in the *New York Times* stating that selective universities all over the country are having a similar experience. Of course, we want to be among the more selective universities so that better students will flock here and we'll end up with the very strong student body to which we have become very accustomed.

I believe we are not only participating in that general trend but creating
continued past insert

(continued from page 4)

a trend of our own. We are becoming much more attractive to high school seniors. We're well established as a popular university now, and we intend to do whatever we can to continue in that direction.

On the fundraising front, we are headed toward another record breaking year in fundraising. We expect to hit \$100 million, which was our goal. We raised \$92 million last year.

The new total is very encouraging because we are now about mid-way in our planning for a major capital campaign. This is the worst kept secret in captivity, and that's alright because it is the sort of thing everybody needs to know about, especially the prospective donors among our alumni and friends, foundations and corporations on the outside.

We have been spending a lot of time telling our story to small groups across the country to make sure that they understand the University and our plans, going back seven years to the first big planning document called *Choosing Penn's Future*. That appeared in 1983, and we have successive plans in place. Those were the plans that set forth what are now four major priorities of the University: undergraduate education, financial aid for graduate and undergraduate students, research, and faculty development.

We have programs up and running in all of these areas, and we now seek, in the next six or seven years, to find major new resources so that we can strengthen the university in these four thematic areas. The campaign planning has been going very well and we are still on track to go public with that effort in the fall of 1989.

Three years ago we began a process that has led to the creation and implementation of two new policies—one a sexual harassment policy, the other a racial harassment policy. Faculty-student committees worked very hard on those policies for two years. Last year, the 1986-87 academic year, University Council debated those two policies over a long period of time. The proposed policies appeared in *Almanac*, resulting in exchanges of correspondence and a good deal of discussion.

After all of that process, I promulgated the two policies about a year ago, and those were published in their full version at the beginning of the current academic year. The mechanisms to enforce those policies are also in place, with one exception. The two committees that worked on developing those policies had in mind a new university-wide mechanism to hear complaints of sexual harassment and racial harassment against faculty members. That was a very controversial matter when it was discussed in University Council, and it was discussed quite thoroughly.

University Council itself endorsed the notion of a new university-wide mechanism to hear all complaints about racial harassment and sexual harassment against faculty members and all other members of the University community. After a good bit more consultation and thinking myself, and talking in particular to the Senate leaders, I decided that a new university-wide judicial body was not a good idea. I determined that it would be better—more efficient, if you will, and less confusing—if we could use existing disciplinary mechanisms. We already had in place a judicial process for students that hears all kinds of complaints about student misbehavior; it seemed to make a great deal of sense and to be very easy to give that judicial process jurisdiction over complaints of harassment. So that was done as part of the new policies.

The same is true on the staff side. There are mechanisms to enforce racial harassment complaints and sexual harassment complaints. That is not true for the faculty, however, so we needed some mechanism for people in the student body or on the staff who want to register a formal complaint against a faculty member for racial harassment or sexual harassment.

I thought initially that it would be good if we could find a university-wide standing committee to take jurisdiction over this, and our first thought was the Academic Freedom and Responsibility Committee. Unfortunately, it did not make sense to the members of that committee. After a good bit of discussion they advised SEC and me that they thought it would be a mistake. They saw their role as being to protect academic freedom in the first instance, and they did not want to get that role confused with other sorts of faculty disciplinary processes. The members of the committee advised us strongly not to give them jurisdiction.

That seemed in this instance good advice. We also considered and rejected the possibility of using the faculty grievance procedures. We regrouped at that point and thought we should use another committee. The notion that developed was that some new faculty committee should be created in order to take jurisdiction over this class of complaint. It would provide for symmetry among all the constituencies of the University, and I think in fundamental fairness there ought to be some way for members of the student body and for the staff to have a way to bring a formal complaint against a faculty member when they believe they have been victimized and have not been able to resolve their complaint in any other way. Therefore, I support the notion of having a new Committee on Conduct composed of faculty to hear complaints and to adjudicate them. There are some imperfections in this, but the policies themselves are as clear as they can be. There will always be some gray area in the definition of what sexual harassment is or what racial harassment is, but I think that gray area has been minimized in the definitions.

It seems to me to make a great deal more sense to have that gray area defined by a faculty group that will have the correct sensitivities in order to make sure that academic freedom is not infringed upon in pursuing complaints of racial or sexual harassment.

That definition is more likely to be sharpened over the long term through case law, building up real decisions in real circumstances rather than trying to imagine all the possible implications of different hypothetical situations, so I very strongly support the notion that the faculty ought to create a new committee on conduct that would have jurisdiction over the violations of these two policies and I would recommend that to you.

The other area that I might mention is the appearance on our campus of Louis Farrakhan. You undoubtedly know the circumstances leading to that appearance. He was invited by a coalition of student groups. Once invited, the University's principles are quite clear that the University should permit Louis Farrakhan or anyone else who has been properly invited by a student group or a faculty group to speak, and should permit him or her to be heard by those who want to hear. For those who disagree and want to express their disagreement, we have an obligation to make that possible as well, as long as that expression of disagreement doesn't interfere with the rights of those who want to hear or the invited speaker's right to speak.

I was very concerned about this. Louis Farrakhan is someone who stirs up emotions, in my personal opinion quite justifiably. I don't think that his values represent those that the University is striving toward at all, but there are groups who want to hear him and so I think we did the right thing in this instance in providing the security and allowing him to come to speak. I think we should all be pleased that the appearance came off as well as it did. There were absolutely no incidents at the event itself. The counter demonstration was held. It was impressive; it was demonstrative; yet, it did not interfere with anyone's right to go into Irvine Auditorium. The people participating did have their right to express their opinions as well.

I think we should be proud of the way the University community comported itself on that occasion, and it was of course the occasion for a good bit of comment in the media both on television and in print about how well this event went. There are also people who will remain angry at the University for providing a forum for Louis Farrakhan, and I am hearing from them in great numbers. I will try to explain as clearly and firmly as I can what the University's principles are. I hope that those who are angry will understand our position and that we will not lose any great number of friends and supporters because of this event. In general, I think the University came out as well as it could, given all the circumstances.

Lastly, let me say how much I have enjoyed working with Jerry Adams and his colleagues. It has been a productive year, and I think we have a very good working relationship now between the Administration and the Senate leaders and the Senate itself. I know that this will continue next year when David Balamuth steps up into the hot seat, and I look forward to many more years of productive cooperation with the Senate. Thank you.

—Sheldon Hackney, President

Faculty Club: Summer Closing, \$20 Dues Plan

At the stated Annual Meeting Wednesday, Faculty Club members learned that the Club will close at the end of service June 3 and reopen on or about September 7, while its air conditioning system is overhauled and asbestos removed during the summer.

Manager Tom Walters said later the University will continue its contributions to employee benefits for the Club staff throughout the period, and each will receive a letter shortly indicating the intent to recall them to service when the Club reopens in September.

Board of Governors President Edward M. Shils also announced that regular individual membership dues will be reduced from present rates (\$55 to \$135, on a sliding scale pegged to salary) to a flat \$20 but with present charge privileges changed so that members use their own commercial credit cards or a declining-balance arrangement under discussion. Broadening the Club's membership is viewed as a philosophical change—to "a more democratic Club" affordable by all levels of faculty and staff in all age groups—as well as "gambling that we can turn around by volume."

The Club has some 1900 regular members and another 1600 alumni or other special-category members whose dues will remain at \$25 for pay-as-you-go use, or \$55 with monthly billing privileges. Departmental Accounts will remain at \$200.

Dues have been applied annually to loans for renovations which created The Hourglass on the first floor, and refurbished the main lounge and third-floor private dining rooms. Operating expenses are expected to be covered annually by membership sales and private catering. Partly through a loss of catered events to the Wharton Executive Education Center and Penn Tower Hotel, the Club's deficit is expected

to be about \$400,000 this year, Dr. Shils said.

Dr. Shils credited the Faculty Senate and several officers of the Administration for help in reaching new understandings on long-term support for the Club.

Dr. Shils also announced plans to share the Club's space in the evenings and on Saturday mornings with an academic program, and the designation of the Club as a focal point for activities planned for the 250th anniversary of the University's founding.

Graduate Studies: The academic program is Dynamics of Leadership, an advanced continuing education program which enrolls young executives, primarily at their firms' expense, who choose a master's degree in liberal studies as an alternative to the M.B.A. Dr. Anthony Tomazinis heads the program, originally led by Dr. Nancy Bauer. Four seminars of 20 students each will meet in Club space, and a snack bar will be open for them.

Program Chair Shirley Winters listed several evening and weekend programs that are expected to continue—among them special dinners such as the Foods of the Forest and Seafood Buffets; the "Evenings in the Manner of . . . (Sherlock Holmes, Charles Dickens, etc.)," Saturday football luncheons and the popular art-show openings held Tuesdays in the main lounge where the work of University-related artists is exhibited.

Dr. Shils said the Board of Governors has added representation of the Senate and the vice presidencies for finance and facilities. At the request of Edward F. Lane the Board is considering the addition of an alumni representative as well.

At Wednesday's meeting, named to two-year terms were E.J. Browne, Robert MacDonald, Jacqueline Matthews, Dr. Leonard Rico and

Dr. Shils. Rita Doyle and Kay Gadsby were added to the House Committee. The Board will meet shortly to elect a new president.

Members gave an ovation to Mrs. Gladys Kolodner of the Club's front office staff, who is retiring in June after 21 years of service.

Faculty Seminar Proposals

Each year the Humanities Coordinating Committee of the School of Arts and Sciences dispenses funds to make possible Faculty Seminars in the Humanities. Funding requests for 1988-89 are now invited. Preference will be given to new seminars and to groups that do not have access to other sources of funding.

In order to qualify, each application should include:

- 1) a description of the seminar's purpose and how it is both interdisciplinary and humanistic;
- 2) a list of faculty participants;
- 3) an outline of the proposed program for 1988-89;
- 4) a statement about any other funding sources (and amounts) available to the seminar.

Please note that a detailed budget proposal is not required. Rather, the available funds will be divided evenly among those seminars that are approved. Judging from past years, allocations are anticipated to fall in the range of \$500 to 700 per seminar. Funds are normally for payment of honoraria and travel expenses for outside speakers, refreshment following lectures, and related publicity costs.

Proposals should be received in 16 College Hall/6378 (Graduate Division of Arts and Sciences) by *Friday, September 9, 1988*. Questions should be referred to Maggie Morris, Ext. 8-4940.

OF RECORD

Decision and Findings in the Phi Delta Theta and Phi Gamma Delta Cases

To the University Community:

As an extension of the investigation of the September 30, 1987 incident at Zeta Beta Tau Fraternity, the University Judicial Inquiry Officer also investigated similar incidents at Phi Delta Theta and Phi Gamma Delta Fraternities occurring on October 1, 1987. These two complaints were heard by the Fraternity/Sorority Advisory Board on April 18, and April 21, 1988, respectively. For each case, I have now reviewed the written decision of the Advisory Board, the Chapter status report, the statement of charges against the fraternity, and the report submitted by each fraternity regarding its activities and contributions to the University community.

In each case, the Advisory Board has identified nine findings of fact upon which it has based its recommendations to me. These findings are attached to this statement. The Board has found by a preponderance of the evidence that each fraternity is collectively responsible for the activities described in the findings of fact.

Specifically, in each case, the Board has found the following identical violations of University policy:

1. [The fraternity] has an obligation under the Recognition Policy to accept collective responsibility for the activities of individual members of the undergraduate chapter as they relate to conduct of members and

conduct of guests of members which is knowingly tolerated by members of the fraternity and is in violation of the University's Code of Conduct. Specifically, the activities described in paragraphs 1 through 8 [of the findings] show a failure of [the fraternity] members to act in a mature and responsible manner.

2. The activities described in paragraphs 1 through 8 violate [the fraternity's] obligation under the Recognition Policy to contribute positively to the University community and to the development of the individual members. Specifically, the activities described in paragraphs 1 through 8 promote sexist attitudes among [fraternity] members and rushes and contribute to the creation of an offensive and possibly intimidating environment for women in the University community.

Based on these findings, I have accepted, in full, the recommendations of the Board. The following sanctions apply to both Phi Delta Theta and Phi Gamma Delta fraternities:

1. [Each fraternity] shall be immediately placed on probation which shall continue until the end of the Spring 1989 semester, at which time [each fraternity] will be returned to full recognition status provided the fraternity is in compliance with the conditions listed below and is in compliance with the Recognition Policy.

(continued on page 7)

(continued from page 6)

2. [Each fraternity] shall immediately issue a public apology to the University community directed to those offended by the activities described above and including a statement that [the fraternity] will not hire strippers in the future.

3. [Each fraternity] shall submit plans for its rush and pledge education programs to the OFSA for approval. Plans for the Fall 1988 semester shall be submitted by September 15, 1988, and plans for the Spring 1989 semester shall be submitted by January 15, 1989.

4. [Each fraternity] shall plan and implement a program dealing with sexism and diversity in the University community, the contents of which are to be approved by the OFSA. The program is to be attended by members and pledges and shall be conducted annually for at least four academic years.

5. [Each fraternity's] alumni shall be represented at Interfraternity Alumni Council meetings for the length of the chapter's probation and thereafter.

In accordance with Section II.B of the Fraternity/Sorority Advisory Board Judicial Charter, it will be the responsibility of the Director of the Office of Fraternity and Sorority Affairs to ensure that these sanctions are enforced.

In reviewing the materials submitted by the Fraternity/Sorority Advisory Board, I have taken note of the fact that each of these fraternities was last disciplined in Fall 1986, that each has been an active participant in most IFC and OFSA-sponsored activities, and that in each case, fraternity members have been actively and productively involved in University and community activities. Phi Gamma Delta has also been recognized by the Interfraternity Alumni Council for its community service contributions.

These contributions notwithstanding, the Fraternity/Sorority Advisory Board's recommendations in these two cases have clearly demonstrated that it finds the performance of strippers in fraternities to be a violation of the Recognition Policy and an activity which does *not* contribute positively to the University community or to the Greek system.

I hope that in the period of this probation, members of each of these fraternities and their alumni corporations will actively commit themselves to supporting the positive aspects of their fraternities so that each can appropriately meet the goals of its national, the standards of the fraternity system at Penn as described in the Recognition Policy, and the expectations of the University community.

—Kim M. Morrisson, Acting Vice Provost

Findings of Fact* Submitted by the Fraternity/Sorority Advisory Board

Phi Delta Theta

The following facts were found by a preponderance of the evidence presented at the hearing:

1. Phi Delta Theta Fraternity ("Phi Delta Theta") sponsored at rush event at the Phi Delta Theta house, 3700 Locust Walk, on October 1, 1987 which was attended by Phi Delta Theta members and officers and by students specifically invited as rushes as part of Phi Delta Theta's rush activities. Phi Delta Theta sent written invitations which invited rushes to attend "a smoker with a surprise".

2. Phi Delta Theta, through its [officials], arranged through a business named "Strip-O-Gram" to have a woman perform at the rush event certain activities described below.

3. Phi Delta Theta paid \$125 to have the woman perform at the rush event.

4. An audience of between approximately 75 and 100 men, consisting of Phi Delta Theta officers, members and rushes attended the rush event.

5. The woman was accompanied to the event by a man who received the cash payment for her performance. Before performing, the woman requested that a chair be placed in front of the audience and that a person from the audience sit in the chair during her performance. A chair was then placed in front of the audience.

6. The woman danced to music in a small area in the middle of the living room floor in front of the crowd of men and removed all of her clothing. While the woman was dancing, members of the audience shouted at one individual in the audience to encourage him to sit in the chair in front of the crowd.

7. As the woman removed all of her clothes, two men, both of whom were members of Phi Delta Theta, sat, in turn, in the chair in front of the audience. While each man sat in the chair, the woman disrobed in stages as she danced around him. While the second man was sitting in the chair, the woman shook her naked breasts directly in front of his face.

8. At least one member found the activities described above inappropriate, another found them to be a mistake in judgment, and a number of those in attendance found these activities not to their liking. The activities described above took place before an audience of Phi Delta Theta officers, . . . , members and rushes.

9. Phi Delta Theta has maintained a cooperative relationship with the Office of Fraternity and Sorority Affairs ("OFSA"), has participated in most OFSA activities and has demonstrated service to the community.

Phi Gamma Delta

The following facts were found by a preponderance of the evidence presented at the hearing:

1. Phi Gamma Delta Fraternity ("Phi Gamma Delta") sponsored a rush event at the Phi Gamma Delta house, 3619 Locust Walk, on October 1, 1987 which was attended by Phi Gamma Delta members and officers and by students specifically invited as rushes as part of Phi Gamma Delta's rush activities. Phi Gamma Delta sent written invitations which invited rushes to attend a "Live Adult Entertainment Night."

2. Phi Gamma Delta, through its [officials], arranged through a business named "Fantasy Entertainment" to have a woman perform at the rush event certain activities described below.

3. Phi Gamma Delta paid \$120 to have the woman perform at the rush event.

4. An audience of approximately 100 men, consisting of Phi Gamma Delta officers, members and rushes attended the rush event.

5. The woman was accompanied to the event by a man who received the cash payment for her performance. Before the woman performed, a chair be placed on top of two large tables and the members of the audience sat on the floor facing the tables.

6. The woman danced to music on top of the tables in front of the crowd of men and removed all of her clothing. While the woman was dancing, members of the audience shouted.

7. As the woman removed all of her clothes, one man, who was a member of Phi Gamma Delta, sat in the chair on top of the table. As the woman disrobed, she danced around him and tossed at least one article of her clothing on him.

8. Some of those in attendance were made uncomfortable by the activities described above, all of which took place before an audience of Phi Gamma Delta officers, . . . , members and rushes.

9. Phi Gamma Delta has maintained a cooperative relationship with the Office of Fraternity and Sorority Affairs ("OFSA"), has demonstrated significant community leadership and service, and was the recipient of the 1988 IFC award for community leadership and service.

* Identification of individuals has been deleted.

Pay for Performance

What are the *advantages* and *disadvantages* of "Pay for Performance"? How is it working here at Penn? These and other questions will be addressed by a panel at an open forum sponsored by the A-1 Assembly on May 12 in Room 110 of the Annenberg School from noon to 2 p.m.

The panelists will include Dr. Ross A. Webber, professor of management at the Wharton School; Dr. Barbara S. Butterfield, vice president of human resources and Ms. Adrienne S. Riley, director of human resources for employment/compensation/information management; Mr. Saul L. Katzman, director of administrative affairs for the School of Arts and Sciences and Mr. Thomas Angeloff, associate director of administrative services at the Wharton School. The panelists will discuss the theoretical issues, practical considerations, and implementation of pay for performance.

Update

MAY AT PENN

Correction: A seminar, listed in the May pullout calendar, sponsored by the department of physiology for *May 10* has been changed. The new talk is *Calcium Transport Function of Placental Membranes*; Rocky Tuan, department of biology; 1-2 p.m., Physiology Library, Richards Building.

CONFERENCES

12 Beyond Electronic Mail: People and Organizations at Work in a Global Economy; conference on computer conferencing includes speakers from Penn, Philadelphia and around the world. Fee: \$300 for full conference, \$100 per day. Open house Friday, May 14, 4-7 p.m. Fee: \$15, International House. For information call Nan Hanahue, 821-7777. *Through May 15.*

13 Health and Illness Across the Life Cycle: Medical Issues for Social Workers; open to professionals in health and human service organizations; 8:30 a.m.-5:30 p.m., Penn Tower Hotel. Fee: \$35, includes luncheon. Registration: Ext. 8-5511.

SPECIAL EVENTS

10 Spring Plant Sale features a unique selection of plants, trees, and shrubs, with members of the Arboretum's professional staff on hand to answer questions and help gardeners make selections; 10 a.m.-4 p.m., Morris Arboretum. Fee: \$2 adults, \$1 children, under 6 free. Information: 247-5777. *Through May 13.*

TALKS

17 A Review of Unilab Projects; Wei-Kang Yuan, director, Unilab Research Center of Chemical Reaction Engineering, East China University of Chemical Technology, Shanghai, China; 11 a.m., Room 337, Towne Building (Department of Chemical Engineering).

The Iran-Contra Affair: A Threat to Constitutional Government; Archibald Cox, professor of law, Boston University, national chairman, Common Cause; 7:30 p.m., Harrison Auditorium, University Museum. Reception following in Lower Egyptian Gallery. Tickets: \$6, address only; \$25, address and reception (\$8 and \$30 at door). Information: Ext. 8-3719 (Fels Center of Government and Common Cause/PA).

Deadlines

The deadline for the weekly calendar update entries is Tuesday, a week before the date of publication. The deadline for the Summer pullout is *Wednesday, May 11*. Send to *Almanac*, 3601 Locust Walk/6224 (second floor of the Christian Association).

The Morris Arboretum sponsors a Kite Festival on Saturday May 14 from 10 a.m.-4 p.m. (rain date: May 21). Scheduled events include kite contest with prizes, children's crafts, live family entertainment with folk musicians The Youngs, and a special exhibit Colorful Kite Tales, which explores the history and joy of kites. Prizes will be awarded at 2 p.m. in both adult and children's divisions for 1) most colorful and 2) most unusual and in the children's division only for 3) longest tail and 4) highest after a sprint.



Admission to the Arboretum, located on Hillcrest Avenue in Chestnut Hill, is free with a kite. All children under six will receive a free plant. Morris Arboretum kites will be on sale.

Second Annual Summer Fair: June 8

The 1988 Penn Summer Fair, sponsored by the Office of the Senior Vice President, is scheduled for June 8 on Locust Walk from 11:30 a.m. to 2 p.m. Reminiscent of an old-time country fair, Locust Walk will be lined with booths featuring special presentations and services from over 50 schools and offices.

Everything from hands-on computer assistance to resume critiques for internal career pathing will be available at the Fair along with plenty of entertainment. Once again, Hospitality Services will serve lunch at a discount to anyone with a Penncard.

The theme of this year's fair is "Perks To Work At Penn." Fair-goers will be asked to cite some of the lesser-known benefits to working at Penn. Those who participate will get a raffle ticket for a drawing to be held at the end of the Fair. Grand prizes include a Getaway Weekend at the Penn

Tower, a gift certificate from the Bookstore, and Phillies Tickets from Rosenbluth Travel.

"We are looking for examples of some of the perks that set the University apart from other employers," said Anne Cranmer, Business Services, chairperson of the Fair. "Noontime exercise classes, the Book Club at Van Pelt Library, and on-site day care are a few of the unadvertised benefits that come to mind." According to the Senior Vice President Helen O'Bannon, the best examples will be used in efforts to recruit top faculty and staff to Penn.

At the request of many people on campus, the Fair is being held a month earlier this year. "One of the few complaints we heard about last year's Fair, was that the weather was too hot," said Ms. Cranmer. "Hopefully cooler temperatures will prevail this year and more people will be on campus to enjoy a good time and a tasty lunch."

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 crimes in the five busiest sectors on campus where two or more incidents were reported between **May 2 and May 8, 1988**.

Total Crime: Crimes Against Persons—0, Burglaries—2, Thefts—15, Thefts of Auto—4, Attempted Thefts of Auto—0

Date	Time Reported	Location	Incident
36th St. to 38th St., Hamilton Walk to Spruce St.			
05-02-88	6:53 PM	Hopkinson Hall	Money taken from wallet from unlocked room.
05-03-88	4:13 PM	Stouffer Triangle	Secured bike taken from bike rack.
05-08-88	1:32 PM	Thomas Penn Dorm	Answering machine taken from hallway.
37th St. to 38th St., Spruce St. to Locust Walk			
05-02-88	9:50 PM	McNeil Bldg.	Secured bike taken from rack.
05-04-88	10:33 AM	McNeil Bldg.	Umbrella taken from office over weekend.
32nd St. to 33rd St., South St. to Walnut St.			
05-06-88	3:53 PM	Franklin Field	Unattended wallet taken from weight room.
05-07-88	11:14 PM	Lot #5	Vehicle stolen from lot.
Expressway to 32nd St., University Ave. to Walnut St.			
05-02-88	5:40 PM	Lot #45	Radio taken from car.
05-07-88	8:05 PM	Lot #45	Vehicle stolen from lot.
40th St. to 42nd St., Baltimore Ave. to Walnut St.			
05-02-88	9:38 AM	Evans Bldg.	Scale taken from locked office.
05-07-88	1:43 PM	Sigma Phi Epsilon	Clothes taken from vehicle. Window broken.

Safety Tip: Bicycle riders must obey the same traffic rules as drivers of automobiles. Be a defensive driver.

18th Police District

Schuylkill River to 49th St., Market St. to Schuylkill/Woodland Ave.

Reported crimes against persons from 12:01 a.m. 4-25-88 to 11:59 p.m. 5-1-88

Total: Crimes Against Persons—10, Homicide/knife—1, Aggravated Assault/gun—1, Aggravated Assault/auto—1, Aggravated Assault/list—1, Purse snatch—1, Robbery/gun—2, Robbery/knife—1, Robbery/strongarm—2, Arrests—4

Date	Location/Time Reported	Offense/weapon	Arrest
4-25-88	3734 Walnut St., 12:14 PM	Robbery/strongarm	Yes
4-26-88	43rd and Locust Sts., 10:10 PM	Purse snatch	No
4-28-88	34th and Civic Center, 2:45 AM	Aggravated Assault/gun	No
4-28-88	46th and Market Sts., 10:30 AM	Robbery/strongarm	No
4-29-88	4500 Regent St., 1:40 PM	Homicide/knife	Yes
4-30-88	1-76 and South St., 12:00 AM	Aggravated Assault/auto	Yes
4-30-88	4817 Walnut St., 11:24 PM	Aggravated Assault/list	Yes
5-1-88	47th and Paschall Ave., 7:17 AM	Robbery/gun	No
5-1-88	39th and Ludlow Sts., 12:15 PM	Robbery/knife	No
5-1-88	40th and Market St., 10:20 PM	Robbery/gun	No