

"Welcome to this first-ever Penn Town Meeting..."

... said Interim President Claire Fagin, introducing herself, her co-host and Interim Provost Marvin Lazerson, and members and staff of the Commission on Strengthening Penn's Community Gloria Chisum (chair), Rebecca Bushnell, Peter Vaughan, and Allen Green.

The scene was the Annenberg School, at 1 p.m. on October 4, and the occasion an hour-long closed-circuit Q & A with students, punctuated by interviews that UTV had taped earlier with still other students on Locust Walk.

This transcription gives the Q & A only, and has been lightly edited to fit in four pages—mainly by removing false starts and repetitions. The complete videotape is available from Town Meeting Coordinator Leah Binder, who can be reached at Ext. 8-8893.

Dr. Fagin continued:

Our purpose in having this Town Meeting today is to use the television medium as a way of shrinking our psychological community, and see if it works—see if television brings an immediacy and intimacy to our community and helps us communicate with many more people than we could do [in] a large meeting of the sort that I think you're much more accustomed to.

We want to hear the problems that people are having, but we also want to hear solutions. The hallmark of this year is to put our community together so that all of you in this room and all of you out on our campus are not only engaged in talking about the problems of our community, but are engaged in building the bridges to put our community together. This is one of the greatest communities in the United States; it's a microcosm of the United States. What we have is a highly-educated, elite population...who ought to be able to solve these problems. Let's go to our first comment....

Allen Orsi, immediate past-chair of the Graduate and Professional Students Assembly: I would like to talk about the feeling of isolation that, for the past two years, the Graduate and Professional group has been trying to grapple with. We've successfully instituted e-mail for all graduate and professional students in hopes communicating through that network. We've also had our third year of the *Graduate Perspective*, which reaches all graduate and professional students. But we feel

we're lacking the social interaction that would be part of not only a social aspect, but an intellectual aspect. My comment is: Basically, there's always a need to segregate graduate, professional, and undergraduate students, as opposed to making it one group of students at the campus.

One of our interim solutions has been monthly happy hours that we've been very successful in instituting, and getting a large portion of the graduate and professional group [to attend.] We were hoping that we would be able to get a space. Right now, we have no space in terms of a pub or a coffee house. We've worked with the VPUL's office over the last two years, but haven't really moved any further. We've petitioned for 37th and Locust Walk...We're willing to share the space with other groups as well; not just making it exclusively graduate and professional students. We were wondering how close we are to getting a space and obviously we would be willing to partake in the development of it and we would like to model it after Yale's graduate coffee house.

CF: Before I give Provost Lazerson a chance to answer that, Allen, I want to comment on one little phrase that you had in there and you said, "There seems to be a need to separate undergraduate, graduate and professional." ...I'd be curious about why there is a need to separate anybody....?

Marvin Lazerson: Allen, you're probably closer today than you were yesterday at getting [an answer]. I don't have a clear answer. What you're asking for seems to me to be eminently responsible and wise. And, it touches this larger issue, which is, how do you take graduate and professional schools separated in one way by twelve different locations, twelve different schools, and get them to think of themselves as part of a larger whole? I don't know where the place will be. I can say we will work on it a little faster than the last two years and try to provide something. It's important, though, and that's the most obvious thing I can say.

CF: And we are looking at that specific space you talked about. But you know there may be other solutions, like having certain schools contribute space for a period of time; centrally-located schools that have been referred to earlier on in the comments from people on the street.

Lynn Edwards, president of the Black Graduate and Professional Students Assembly: Cur-

rently I find that our students and our police are kind of in a double bind: when a student is a victim, they expect the campus police to act like Rambo, but when [the student is] innocent we expect a counselor, someone who's going to lend a fair ear to what we have to say. One of the terms that's come up recently is the idea of "community policing"; but no one really seems to know what it means. My suggestion is that, like the cops on television from the old days, where they kind of knew their beat and they knew the people that lived in that area and they were more familiar with the residents—the police then worked with the community a little more so perhaps we could incorporate a sort of get-to-know-your-police-officer strategy in which they're more familiar with the campus buildings, who's there after hours, the RAs, the RDs, and maybe avoid some of the unfortunate incidents that occur.

CF: We both think it's a great idea. We don't know if that's what community policing means, but that's what community policing ought to mean and we will take that to where it belongs, which is probably the committee that is working on their final report on police procedures. Terrific idea.

Allison Marinoff, president of the Panhellenic Council: The Panhellenic system represents over 1300 women. Although we're a proud part of the greater Greek community, we are a distinct women's organization with differing views and objectives.... We're the largest women's organization on campus and we are comprised of over one third of the female undergraduate population. Based on this, and regarding the issue of diversifying the Walk, what's the status of placing a sorority on Locust Walk?

CF: That's a very hard question to answer; it's an issue that we put on the board, as well as some of the other issues you've already brought up, when Provost Lazerson and I assumed the positions we're in; and we are committed to having some solution for diversifying Locust Walk before we are finished with these interim periods. To tell you that it's going to be a sorority necessarily—no, I cannot tell you that now. To tell you that we will probably have something in place to diversify the Walk, I can say that, I think; can I say that?

ML: Yes. You can say anything you want; you're the president.

CF: ...I can't swear to you that it's going to be putting a sorority on the Walk...[but] I'm sure we're going

to hear more recommendations from the Commission about diversifying the Walk, so that, hopefully, by next spring, we will have some very public plan in place that will be able to be actualized fairly rapidly.

Ms. Marinoff: Can I get a commitment to at least looking at a sorority as you would look at any other campus organization, placing them on the Walk?

CF: It probably is on the list of things being considered. Yes?

Rhonda Frederick, representing the Graduate English Association: What I'm concerned about is the discussions of racism, sexism, and homophobia on campus, and how the discussions are limited to the University of Pennsylvania. I think the problem is that we're not looking at it in a broader scale or on a broader perspective, as a national problem and ...I think the solution would be to embed our discussions of these problems in a national sphere and, with the hope that we could start to deal with it a systemic problem, instead of a problem at the University of Pennsylvania.

CF: How would you go about doing that?

Ms. Frederick: I think it's important to talk about these problems as coming into the campus, not like they take root here and flourish here. I think it's important to recognize that there are connections between what happens at the University and what happens outside the University, not only in Philadelphia, but in the nation as a whole. We need to discuss it that way, and not just say this a Penn's problem and...involve people who are...discussing these issues outside the University and bring them on [campus] so that we could talk more. I think we could work out solutions better if we looked at it in a more national perspective.

Also, one of the student leaders was concerned about crime on campus, and I think that kind of phases in with what Lynn Edwards said earlier about community policing. It's important to recognize that there are reasons why people commit crimes, and it's not just that I'm a student at Penn and people are seeking me out to rob me. It's important to see that, you know, people do things for reasons and, also, as far as the University Police are concerned, I was an undergrad at Penn during the black student protests and one of the things that started that off was that the Police treated African-American students on campus as if we didn't belong here; they asked for our IDs

and things like that. So, I think when you start talking about community policing and that kind of thing you need to be conscious of what that could mean to students who are not in the majority here at Penn.

CF: *I think it's one of the reasons that the solutions have been so hard to come by, because we're focusing so much on new rules and new procedures for the police. That, in a sense, delays us from coming up with some of the things many people would like....I think both of your points are very well taken.*

You did something in the first point that I think is worth mentioning, and I would hope it's a habit that Penn students get into. What you did—it's interesting that you come from the English department, because I see it from the prejudice of being a nurse and a psychiatric nurse; and I'm sure that Peter Vaughan would see it from a certain standpoint, those of us who come out of a social science background: What you just did was you reframed a problem, which is what family therapists do, because many families think they're having problems in their own family and that these are unique problems. What therapists often do is they take the problem and reframe it in a larger context and that's what you just did. And you're absolutely right.

We have become so inwardly focused here at Penn that we think these problems are "Penn problems" and then we try to solve them with "Penn solutions," which is fine—but I [like] your re-framing it into a much broader context and recognizing that we are grappling with problems that are affecting our entire society. And you are saying pull people in from the society to help us solve them, which I would agree with, but I would also say—what I started out by saying—is that we are a highly-educated community and I expect a higher level of performance here, not only in behavior, but also in the way we solve our problems....

M.J. Warrender, representing GAPSA: I feel a lot of the problem in the Penn community is more of a direction of reaffirmation to social systems and policy-making and that kind of thing, instead of a reaffirmation of the self. I feel that each person needs to look more in terms of how they view other groups, different from themselves. A lot of times people look at differences and use that as a means to separate, instead of celebrating the differences that [could] make this community and society much more rich.

CF: *How would you do that?*

Ms. Warrender: I would establish an open forum and speak openly about these issues, and also have different cultural days where all the members of the community can come and look at how different groups celebrate their own culture and take part in that.

CF: *We'll keep that in mind....*

Ms. Frederick: I just have to respond to M.J., because it seems to me that it's easy to get involved in other people's cultures...we share foods all the time, we share culture, but I don't think that by appreciating somebody's culture you appreciate them as a distinct and viable people. And what's important to me, it just reminds me of something that happened in Maya Angelou's *I Know Why the Caged Bird Sings* where she was in a play that kind of trashed white folks and this white lady came up to her afterwards and talked about how much she loved the play and Maya Angelou asked her, "Well, what about what we were talking about in the play?" The problems that we raise are real problems, and though it's easy to get involved in people's culture it's harder to talk about how it's part of a larger piece of who people are.

CF: *Keep going for a few seconds....*

Ms. Warrender: Excuse me, Rhonda. Not just to celebrate different cultures, but to take an active part in open dialogue; to really break down the barriers of communication and segregation by talking openly about different issues. A lot of times I feel very strongly that the community is silent; a lot of people have opinions and they talk amongst themselves, but they don't necessarily talk across those barriers. The more we can talk openly and really figure out what it is underlying all these differences, then we can more or less emerge into understanding between groups.

CF [to viewers, announcing a break]: *We'd like to hear from you, your comments about whether you think this is a successful or not successful medium; whether you'd like to see it expanded; whether you'd like to see it larger; whether you'd like to see phone-ins; anything that you'd like to tell us. Please send comments to*

Strengthen the Community
100 College Hall
or e-mail to
mcQuiston@a1@quaker.

CF: *Welcome back....*

Liz Rudnick, a committee chairperson for the Performance Arts Council: It seems that recently, Penn only receives negative national media attention, from D.P. confiscations to our fallen rankings in *US News [and World Reports]*. What action is being taken for the University to more effectively promote the positive qualities of the Penn community, through greater student involvement in the public relations office, or more active p.r. campaigns in general?

CF: *A lot. We could take the rest of the time to tell you everything that's going on, but I think you just came up with something that would*

be a tremendous asset and that is the very, very heavy involvement of students in some of these activities. We have things going on on every level...right now, starting with visits to every editorial board of newspapers that have been dealing with us, shall we say, over a period of time. We have an entirely new public relations campaign in relation to the Medical Center. I don't know if any of you have seen those ads; they're fabulous; absolutely, startlingly wonderful.

And I think we are starting to see a real turnaround, because part of the thing that happens when you start going out and talking to a lot of people is you don't talk to them about the past only, you talk to them about the future, you talk to them about your students, you talk to them about programs.... I do not think that we are maximizing the use of students the way we ought to be. It's a terrific suggestion....

Kaplan Mobray, president of the Black Student League: I first want to respond to your comment about students. Student input is important and it doesn't happen by just putting one or two token students on a commission, [or] because people who are far removed from the campus situation come down and interview students to find out their opinion, their views. It comes by working together with students, because students know the campus situation; we know it first hand. Students should be the ones mainly comprising that Commission.

I also have a concern about the Racial Harassment Policy. There's been much talk about it being suspended—specifically Article 2. I want to first state that racial harassment is defined in Article 2 as any "verbal or symbolic behavior." So, it is not a speech code. And I'd like to again applaud the editors of the D.P., *Daily Pennsylvanian*, for spreading this false notion that it is a speech code. Again, it is any verbal or symbolic behavior.

What I want from you is an assurance that no further direct action concerning suspending the policy will take place unless there is more information disseminated, further discussion, and a provision which will convey the same sentiment of protection for students here at Penn.

CF: *Well, that's not a hard commitment to give you, actually, because, first of all, the piece that we're looking at is strictly that one little piece in Article 2. You called it the whole Racial Harassment Policy. I don't think it is the whole Racial Harassment Policy. And I will do everything that you have just said, actually, which is tremendous input. We will have a racial harassment policy. There is no absence of commitment to that. So, let's wait and see what happens over the next month; this month is going to be very crucial. We're getting a lot of comments back*

and let's see what happens and what we get. Can I comment on your other point? Or, I would like, actually, to ask Dr. Chisum to comment on your first point....

Gloria Twine Chisum: I would like respond to the issue of students on the Commission.

A number of students have raised a question about the failure to include students initially in the naming of the Commission. Students were not named to the Commission initially, because the Commission was named in June. Students were not on campus in June. I've said this in a letter to the student organizations, and I've said it to the D.P.: I think that there would have been a tremendous uproar and, justifiably, from the students, had they been named in June.

We met with the student leaders early, I guess in August before school started, and asked that the student leaders go through their procedures so that we could have representation from students just as soon as possible after the school year began. Now the student groups, GAPSA and the Undergraduate Assembly, have gone through their procedures. We have the GAPSA representatives already. We're hoping in the next few days to have the undergraduate student representatives.

The other thing I would like to comment on is with regard to hearing from students, broadly, in the University. We're meeting with every group who will talk to us. We are going around day, evenings, weekends, whenever anyone will talk to the members of the Commission. We are now in the process of fact-finding, which means that we're trying to find out as much as we can about life in general; much of it, student life, but we're also looking at faculty, student, staff interactions, how we communicate with one another.

We're looking at the various procedures, the judicial procedures and policies. And, we expect, eventually, to make some recommendations regarding all of these issues. We are making recommendations as our fact-finding goes along, but I think that it is impossible for us to really make any meaningful recommendations for any actions that we could request from the administration until we've done a thorough fact-finding job and that is going on now. We are meeting all of the month of October and probably into November with all of the various groups on campus.

It's important for everyone to keep in mind that members of this commission represent the University of Pennsylvania; they do not represent any particular constituency; they are there as members of the University of Pennsylvania to try to apply the best thought, the best insights, the best knowledge, the best wisdom that we can get from the whole campus in arriving at solutions to these problems.

And, I would also like to say that we are not ignoring the outside community, the impact that the outside community has on this campus. I think that in the first statement I made after the Commission was named. I said that we're really a microcosm of the world at large and the problems that we're wrestling with here on the University of Pennsylvania campus are problems of the nation at large and, we hope, that some of the solutions that we come up with here will be useful at other universities, because we do have a unique kind of community, and we would like to think, to hope, through all of this fact-finding that we're doing, that we are promoting discussion of the problems from within the community. I think we're having some success at doing that, because lots of people are beginning to talk about the issues. And we're finding that when people come to talk with us they're talking very frankly and we're learning some things that we just did not know about the Penn campus.

This is a very long answer to your comment—but I would just like to encourage everybody to be just as candid and as open and don't worry about hurting our feelings; tell us exactly what you see and what you think. That's the only way that we'll be able to come up with any meaningful solutions for Penn.

CF: Thank you, Dr. Chisum. Yes?

Miae Oh, representative of the Undergraduate Assembly: I would just like to respond to [Dr. Chisum]. From what I gather, we've been told that we had to fight for our representatives on the Commission and I was wondering, why did we have to fight for them? From what I got, there were only 17 people, even though it was only in June, that you had to name to this Commission. Why did we have to fight to have even... three or four... graduate and undergraduate students?

Dr. Chisum: I can assure that that is a total misconception. The articles that appeared in the D.P. claimed [there was] fighting for membership of the Commission, but that is absolutely not true. We expected to have members, student members, on the Commission and just as quickly as we were able to get some student input into naming those members, we went about doing that. But the fight was an illusion; it was not a fact.

CF: We hadn't actually made the announcement yet as to how this was going to be done and I think it was a question of timing—getting the comments before...the plan was actually developed, in the sense of trying to put people together. It became a controversy; it just sort of happened in the air, actually, because, as you probably know by now, in a sense, there are five undergrads and five graduate students in different ways.

Jonathan Pitt of SCUE, the Stu-

dent Committee on Undergraduate Education: I'd like to bring up what I perceive to be a problem, and then suggest two different solutions. The problem, I think is, overall, the lack of intellectual and social community at Penn. I don't want to say a "lack" but our community needs a lot of work and as we look into ways of building community...there are two things I'd like to suggest.

The first is: re-examine Kim Morrisson's residence report. Her report, in which she suggests the ultimate implementation of residential colleges, is the most important document that's come down from the administration in the past five years and I'd certainly hate for that project to get lost. It's a very, very important project and I think it's essential for building community at Penn.

My second solution is a bit more controversial, but I'm going to say it anyway: I believe that all first-year housing should be 100% randomized—that as students come into Penn, they should *not* have choice in where to live. This not an end-all, be-all solution...but I think Penn actively promotes separatism and if you want to look at reasons why there is *de facto* separatism on our campus: it happens as students first come in and [are] able to choose...

Mr. Mobray: I'd like to disagree with what John has said. I think that, for kids coming out of high school, coming to college, to have choices is part of growing up. Where to live, with whom to live, as a first-year—that's important. Having the option to live in Du Bois College House, to live in Hill House, to live in Van Pelt, is important to this University; it's not separatist.... You don't promote, you don't strengthen the community by just having people live on floors that are integrated floors that have Indian, Blacks, Jews; it doesn't work that way. What we are promoting at Penn is education and choice...I think that should stay important to this University.

Mr. Pitt: If I could respond in part to that. I certainly agree that eliminating choice in the first-year housing process will make a lot of students feel uncomfortable...I'm not convinced that comfortable is, in all senses, the best thing when you first come in to college. I think that we should strive to put people in new situations, meeting new kinds of people who they wouldn't have met, and the fact that maybe uncomfortable, while very unfortunate, is something that we need to overcome.

M.L. Let me just respond to the residential-learning part of that. I think that on this campus there is probably a good deal of enthusiasm, and at least on my part an enormous enthusiasm, for the development of better living and learning environments. So, I think the initial phases of a plan which would have us do more and more living-

learning environments, residential colleges—we will press on that over the next decade. That, clearly, is an opportunity to shrink the psychological distance of the campus, to tie social life and academic programs more closely together, to bring faculty onto the campus in greater numbers, and to provide something that Allen asked about—an environment in which graduate and undergraduate students could work more closely together, not just in social hours, but in environments that really inform and improve our capacity to learn from one another.

Floyd Houston, Jr., president of the Bi-Cultural Inter-Greek Council: [On encouraging interaction between students], one solution can be for the University itself to offer financial incentives for groups to work together. Various organizations do a lot of the same projects with the same goals in mind, but it's harder, with lesser numbers, to do something if you don't have the financial backing. So to encourage groups to interact, bring speakers to campus or have blood drives or things of that nature—groups would more likely work together. If you encourage us financially to work with other organizations. ...

CF: As long as you're not asking for millions of dollars of financial incentives. Actually, I have been thinking about using some of the funding that is discretionary for the President's Office for exactly this purpose, because the strengthening of the community at Penn is my primary purpose this year, and therefore I can justify using small amounts of money, not large, for advancing that purpose. If we come up with a cohesive plan, there is absolutely no reason why we couldn't devote some of that money, in small quantities, to exactly the agenda you're talking about, because you're absolutely right—many of the things you want to do require a little bit more money than you're going to be able to get from a normal student activities fund. So, it's a terrific idea, what we have to do is get the programs together, get working together, and we'll find a way to do it. Okay?

[In a second break, Dr. Fagin again asks feedback on town meetings and the issues raised; see mail and e-mail addresses, page II.]

CF: ...We're hearing problems and solutions, and it seems to me actually that we've heard more solutions than problems, or we've heard problems with solutions. So, let's get to the next comment.

Leonard Reuter, representing GAPSA. I'm also in the Asian/Middle Eastern Studies department and I'm an A-3 staff member as well. I think one of the problems that the University has is a general problem in higher education throughout the

country, in that we have difficulty deciding whether the goal of the University is academic excellence and education, or whether the goal is socialization into some kind of broader environment.

I don't think that you *can't* do both, but if you are going to do both, you have to use creative solutions; you can't have one sphere of academics and one sphere of socialization, which means lots of different things to different people.

The most significant thing about what's happening today is the technology that's being used to do it, and, although it sort of maybe has the aura of a gimmick attached to it now, it's unfortunate that most people at this University have, seem to be watching the multi-media revolution, which is the most significant technological revolution in at least a thousand years, since the invention of moveable type.

And, the University is not taking advantage of the new media technologies, the ability to broadcast courses into individuals' rooms. ResNet is very small; it's only five dorms, it reaches barely 2,000 students, I think. The University could be broadcasting courses off campus. The students can take courses whenever they want, they can interact with their professors, people's time will be freed up, the collections can be increased by buying CD-ROMs instead of books, and I'd like to know where the University is going with this and if we're just content to sit by and watch MIT blow our doors off.

CF: Believe it or not, we have an answer. Provost Lazerson?

ML: We're not waiting. We have been cautious. Rightly so: institutions that jumped in have spent a lot of money, not satisfied students, not satisfied faculty, and not satisfied themselves. We're moving. We're moving on the electronic publishing front. We are talking about redoing some of the other curriculums, in addition to math and economics, in the sciences, actually.

But let me get to your first point, which, I think, is a much more critical one. And that is the separation on university campuses between what we think of as the academic side of the street and the social side. That has been a higher-education disaster. And, it's put us into this terrible situation where we often feel at odds with students in terms of their social life; students feel at odds with faculty in terms of academic life. A critical goal over the next decade is going to be: how do you integrate, how do you bring together the educational concerns with social concerns? Living-learning environments on this campus appear to do it quite well. We need more of those kinds of environments. We need more faculty involved with students in the sororities, in the fraternities, in the community house. That's where we're going to have to push and I

think all of higher education is going to have to move in that direction....

Mr. Reuter: I think that that's true. My point is that technologies are basically to fill a social need and the new multi-media technologies were precisely invented to fill this need between people, between the globalization of the world economy and people's need to learn about other cultures and interact with them at the same time. It touches on a lot of the comments made earlier about what the point about learning, that learning about another culture in and of itself does not help you to understand or accept them; that's what the new media technologies are addressing.

CF: Well, to some extent, this is a small step in the direction, isn't it?

Unidentified speaker believed to be Herman Grant of GAPSA: I want to follow up to the point that was previously brought up and, that is, I think that the town meeting is a very, very good idea, along with electronic mail and other new technologies, but what type of steps are being put in place so that these solutions can be put into action and what do students do if there's another crisis in the future, a racial crisis, something like the D.P., so that they can feel that not only are things being heard, but things are being done? Also, briefly, what do you plan to do about the religious studies department to make sure that there are scholars trained in religion at Penn?

CF: You have actually three questions. So, I will turn to...

ML: Let me do the religious studies one first and put that in the context of other recommended departmental closings. I think what you asked for was how do you make sure that religious studies, religious thought, study of religion or religions, plays a vital role on the campus. And that's what we have to aim for; it isn't so much a department, whether it's American Civilization or the Religious Thought Department; it's how do you make it vibrant and vital? On this campus, we're lucky; we have examples of tremendous undergraduate and graduate programs that are outside of the department. The biological basis of human behavior undergraduate major; international relations undergraduate major—those are not departments. So, what we need to do as we make decisions is to make sure that religious ideas, religious thought, American studies really infuse large parts of the campus, so that those of us who want to study it, can do that. We don't necessarily need a department to do that and, indeed, in some cases, a department might hinder the truly interdisciplinary work we want to accomplish on a campus.

That's what makes Penn great, by the way. It's the capacity to engage in truly interdisciplinary work.

The second one is harder. What do we do if we have other incidents?

Well, clearly, one of the things President Fagin and I are doing by this town meeting is to say we want to have on this campus much more effective mechanisms for having voices heard. One of the sad things about any large institution, large university, is something happens and nobody knows where to go; nobody knows who to talk to; nobody knows what's happening; nobody has access to information. There are no central locations.

What new technology allows us to do is actually do what we're doing today. That is to say, throughout the campus, this is what we know; this is what we think happened; these are the ideas we want from you. We haven't got all of those pieces in place, but, clearly, what we're trying to do today is to say, "We need to do that effectively, productively, and rapidly, in a way that we have never done that before."

CF: We do have a third answer, too, though. We have given a go-ahead on the whole idea of electronic publishing and various other things to a senior dean in the University to move ahead with just the kinds of things that [the last two speakers] refer to. We do expect to be moving much more rapidly into the next stage.

Morris Massel, president of the Interfraternity Council: As probably most of the community is aware, we recently activated the new alcohol policy on the campus. I don't want to discuss that here, but I want to talk about one of the results—that the undergraduate social life has lost a huge element and a large, large void has opened up even wider. There isn't a lot of funding for undergraduate social activities, for a campus hangout. We have attempts such as bi-weekly movies; there's the Underground in High Rise North—neither of which have the funding or the manpower to cater to the full undergraduate social needs. We've heard about Revlon on its way in '95 or '96; I don't know where it is any longer. I know there's the commitment...but how strong is it, and when is Revlon coming?

CF: Can I ask a sidebar question?

Mr. Massel: Please.

CF: To what extent is Houston Hall used? Does that not function at all in the ways you're talking about?

MM: It works in the capacity. People go there for bagels. It's really great that way, but it's far off; it's at the corner of 34th and Spruce and most of the upperclassmen live [beyond] 40th Street and that's over six blocks away. It's also far from the dorms. It doesn't have much to offer—a couple of video games and some food and that's it. So, it's not used. It could be used, I guess.

CF: You know, I pass it all the time, and I never see people sitting in that central space or, rarely. To me, it's an underutilized building....

It just strikes me as such a tragedy that we are crying so for space to get together, and yet, there is space there that, somehow, nobody wants to use.

Mr. Massel: I think what we need right now is a group and a commitment, financially...to get that building up and going; it's old, and it's got some great tradition to it, but it needs to be modernized [for] undergraduate and graduate groups to make it the social center that it could be.

Ms. Oh: I'd like to address two issues. The first one has to do with the underrepresentation of the undergraduate and the graduate students on the administrative boards or committees that the administration has formed. And the fact that we are the community, basically—we make up such a big part of the community, and we have so much to say. We should have a say in how the community runs and what have you, but I feel that the message that we're getting from the administration is "you seem somewhat inept" is what I'm getting.

CF: Where are you getting this?

Ms. Oh: ...I feel that we need more people. If not that, then maybe even a different committee that works alongside with whatever administration or administrative committee that you have.

My other issue: I'm working on my project for the UA for the year—to write up a Bill of Rights with Rashad Ibrahim for the JIO in protecting the plaintiffs' and the defendants' rights. We're also working with Kirsten Bartok and other committees in the University to set up, possibly, to reform the JIO and even have it as student-run JIO. What are your opinions about that?

ML: It's marvelous. I mean, not to drag this out, but you start out talking about non-student involvement and, yet, you really tell us that you're involved in really the most important issues, in exactly the way it should be done. So, we're tremendously supportive of it.

Ms. Oh: The thing is, it's been so hard to try to even bring up the issue of a student-run JIO.

CF: That's what we're not clear on: why it should be hard to bring up the issue. Is it because somehow or other you're not integrated into the right committees? There isn't anybody right now studying this, you know. The committee that Provost Lazerson is going to develop has not been formed, because we're waiting for the Commission to come out with some recommendations. We don't want things to be redundant—that they're working on something and the Commission is working on something and we've wasted a lot of people's time. So, that committee, which I'm sure will have a heavy representation of students, has not been formed.

That's part of, I think, what Dr.

Chisum was referring to earlier about the fact that there was a lot of miscommunication. There were committees mentioned, but not formed. I think that this is an area that we're going to want to talk a lot more about, because we do have a lot of ideas, such as having concurrent groups or mixed groups or whatever. It is crucial for students to be involved in just the issues you're talking about. But, I'm getting all kinds of signals that we have something like 30 seconds left and we're going right over.

Jodi Bromberg, co-chair of the Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Alliance: For the past three years different organizations on campus, including the Faculty Senate and the University Council, have come to the conclusion that ROTC is in direct conflict with the University's non-discrimination policy, which includes, among other things, sexual orientation. Yet your only action, thus far, has been to call for the formation of a ROTC-evaluation committee, which is sort of like reinventing the wheel.

Why have you repeatedly refused to make this a priority in your administration, and said so, when ROTC is so directly in opposition with the non-discrimination policy? Here is an opportunity for you to show the country that Penn will not tolerate discrimination. You've instead let the matter slide. You've spoken today of strengthening the community, yet systemically ignored the lesbian, gay and bisexual community.

CF: Well...I don't think I've ignored it; I think you just got up too late and I seem to have run out of time for comments here. And, I never said that this was not a priority; what I said is—and I will repeat publicly what I said to a small group: I said I am not taking this up as my first issue and I think, to many people in this room, that what I said ought to resonate. I was not going to take it up as my first issue. This is not just a repeat committee. This committee, if you look at it, has a different mandate. It is looking at a lot of things, including options, and that has never been looked at before here. We are not going to let this lie; we are going to take care of it in some way and I really have to end now. I'm sorry.

For me, this has been a terrific opportunity, partly, I think, because, you're all so terrific and I hope that students outside have heard this, have listened to it, have decided whether or not they think it's a good idea; will respond to us, will give us some information about whether or not this technology we've talked about has worked.

I want to thank various of our community that have really helped in this. First of all, the Annenberg School for Communication and Dean Jamieson have been absolutely wonderful, but we have had help from many many others.