

# Almanac

INSIDE

- Senate Chair on Electronic Privacy, p. 2
- Joint Statement on Du Bois House, p. 2
- Council 10/13: Racial Harassment, pp. 2-5
- Speaking Out: SAS Closings, p. 5-7
- For Comment: Report on Domestic Partner Benefits, pp. 8-9 • Attachment, p. 10
- Fair for Working Families, p. 10
- Summary Annual Report on Benefits, p. 11
- Research Foundation & Awards, pp. 12-14
- Bulletins, p. 14 • Crimes, Update, p. 15
- Benchmarks (Claire Fagin), p. 16

Tuesday, October 19, 1993

Published by the University of Pennsylvania

Volume 40 Number 8

## Death of Eliot Stellar, Provost of 'One University'

Dr. Eliot Stellar, former Provost of the University and co-developer of the 1973 *One University* theme that transformed Penn's academic planning and established new distinction based on the cross-disciplinary nature of the University, died on October 12 at the age of 73.

World famous for his research in psychology and anatomy, including discoveries of new ways to study the brain and appetite, Dr. Stellar was equally well known as an academic statesman at home and abroad (see the Trustees' tribute below on this page). On campus he was esteemed by faculty and staff alike as one who nurtured the careers of others, both during his provostship and afterward when he returned to research and teaching in the School of Medicine.

Named professor emeritus in 1990—which colleagues, alumni and students celebrated with a symposium and the establishment of a lectureship in his honor—Dr. Stellar never really retired. At the time of his death following what had appeared to be a successful battle with cancer, he was in charge of two all-University programs (the Research Foundation and University Scholars) while also chairing the Department of Cell and Experimental Biology. Dr. Jay Lash, named interim chair of Cell and Developmental Biology, said "Through the sadness of Eliot's death, the department continues the programs and activities he nurtured so carefully."

In addition to holding numerous posts at Penn,

Dr. Stellar also headed the American Philosophical Society for six years, presiding when the APS celebrated its 250th anniversary in 1993. "He shared with earlier presidents Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson a gracious charm, a keen intelligence and an ability to shape the future in positive ways," a Society spokesman said.

President Martin Meyerson, who as president named Dr. Stellar as co-chair of the University Development Commission and then as provost, recalls the "sterling values—collegiality, scholarship, vision and loyalty—all of which made him a superb provost. The University has lost one of its great saints and I a beloved friend."

A Harvard alumnus who took his Ph.D. at Brown, Dr. Stellar spent four years in military service and seven on the faculty of the Johns Hopkins University before joining Penn in 1954.

Often wooed but never won by other institutions throughout their careers, both he and his co-chair of the University Development Commission, Dr. Robert Dyson, frequently and openly expressed their intense commitment to Penn. Their essay introducing the Commission's report, *Pennsylvania: One University*, helped Penn trustees, alumni and friends—as well as the faculty, staff and students—redefine the institution and prepare for change in the coming decades.

Dr. Stellar is survived by his wife, Betty; their son, James R.; their daughter, Elizabeth S. Fallon; two brothers, two sisters and five grandchildren.



**Memorial Service:** Details are to be announced for a campus memorial service, probably on December 6. Contributions may be made to the Eliot Stellar Visiting Lectureship Fund at Penn, created by colleagues and alumni in his honor, or to the National Academy of Sciences' Committee on Human Rights, which Dr. Stellar helped to establish.—K.C.G.

### Bike Policy Effective November 1

Starting November 1, the University will require that bikes be walked on Locust, Hamilton, and Smith walkways between 8:30 a.m. and 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Bicyclists violating the new policy will be stopped and asked to walk their bicycles. People refusing to comply, or those riding recklessly, may be issued a ticket, said Commissioner of Public Safety John Kuprevich. Public Safety will also "strictly enforce the walking of bicycles on the 38th Street bridge of Locust Walk, a policy that is already in effect," he said.

The new policy was proposed last year by the Safety and Security Committee of the University Council, which recommended a policy in three phases. The first two phases—installation of more bike racks and a campaign to register bikes—have been completed. New racks near residences and at main entrances to Locust, Hamilton, and Smith Walks have brought the total from about 1,000 to 3,000 slots. Registration has more than doubled in recent months. (This service is also open to those not members of the Penn community; call 898-4482.)

A formal policy document is expected shortly for publication in *Almanac*.

### Memorial Resolution of the Trustees

#### Eliot Stellar, November 1, 1919 - October 12, 1993

Eliot Stellar, Provost Emeritus and Joseph Leidy University Professor Emeritus of Neurological Sciences, contributed greatly to the culture and quality of the University of Pennsylvania, and his loss will truly be deeply felt. A brilliant scholar and a pioneer in the field of behavioral physiology, he came to Penn from Johns Hopkins University in 1954 and helped to establish the interdisciplinary Institute of Neurological Sciences, which became a model for many other institutions. His gifts as a teacher are legendary. He always had time for his students and colleagues, nurturing students' creativity and taking warm interest in younger colleagues' work. He engendered such affection and respect that at a week-long colloquium at the Institute of Neurological Sciences held in 1990, a full day was devoted to celebrating Dr. Stellar's influence on his former students and colleagues, who read papers on research that he had inspired. Earlier this year he was awarded the Gold Medal for Life Achievement in Psychological Science by the American Psychological Foundation.

Dr. Stellar performed yeoman service as co-chair of the Development Commission early in Martin Meyerson's presidency so admirably that he was appointed provost of the University, in which role he served from 1973 to 1978. Seeing knowledge as a global heritage, he brought to that role an international orientation, a "One University" point of view and great skills as a consensus builder.

Upon completion of his term as provost, he undertook the rigorous process of reestablishing himself in his field, assisted by colleagues eager to have him back. As further testimony to both his willingness to serve and his colleagues' high regard for him, he accepted his colleagues' invitation to chair the Department of Cell and Developmental Biology even after assuming emeritus status. A leader outside the University as well, he chaired the Human Rights Committee of the National Academy of Sciences, to which he was elected in 1968, and served as president of the American Philosophical Society, presiding over that organization's 250th anniversary celebration last year.

*Resolved*, that the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania, on behalf of themselves, the overseers, administration, faculty, students and alumni of the University, express their deep sorrow over the loss of their friend Eliot Stellar, who defined the term "University citizen," and in recording this official minute in memory of Dr. Stellar, they ask the Secretary of the University to convey to Dr. Stellar's family their affection for Dr. Stellar, their enduring gratitude and their profound sense of loss over his death.

## Privacy of Electronic Information

During the last two decades there has been a significant change in our "private space." Twenty years ago faculty offices and laboratories were specified physical space. Within that space each individual was able to provide security for private information by locking desks and file cabinets. To be sure, the University Audit Policy enables administrators, under extraordinary circumstances and with appropriate procedures, to search offices and laboratories.

Today, one's physical office is only one part of one's virtual office. Our virtual office includes electronic information that we own but which may be located on computers that are not in our physical office. This information includes research data stored on computers used for analysis, electronic mail stored on mail machines and voice mail messages. Throughout the University the hundreds of such computers are managed by a variety of employees most of whom are aware of the privacy of this information. Nevertheless I am sure that over the past few years there have been questionable searches and monitoring of electronic information.

The University has the ability to keep records of which electronic news groups we access from our computers and, in the case of buildings that require "swipe cards" our comings and goings. In addition many records formerly kept in secure files are now kept electronically. These include personnel records, records of health problems (insurance payments), grades, library records and phone logs.

Who has access to this information and under what circumstances? Last year the University established a policy for ethical behavior by the users of electronic services. It is now appropriate to establish a policy for the managers of electronic data that ensures the privacy of that data. The University Council Committee on Communications has taken on this task and will be working on it during the coming year. The chair of that committee is Ira Winston (ira@cis.upenn.edu). Please communicate your thoughts on this issue to him.

*A reader has asked that Almanac identify the Senate Chair whose signature is traditionally reproduced with the column From the Chair. The current chair is Dr. Gerald J. Porter, professor of mathematics.*



### Du Bois House: Investigation Continues

*As University and City Police continue to investigate last week's anonymous phone calls to the W.E.B. Du Bois College House, the leadership of the University issued the following letter on October 13.*

#### To the Penn Community:

#### On Threats and Harassment

The reports of bomb threats and harassing phone calls to residents of Du Bois College House and other campus residences fill us with anger and sadness. Anger that any member of our community has to endure such senseless and demented behavior. Sadness that there are people within or outside our community who have so little self-respect that they can engage in such behavior.

The University's stand and our own on such behavior is clear: Such acts violate the spirit of academic community, the University's Code of Conduct, and the law. When the culprits are identified they will be prosecuted to the fullest extent possible.

We are pleased that other leaders of the University community, particularly students, have already begun to express their condemnation of this behavior and their support of the residents of Du Bois and other campus residences who are being affected. We applaud their leadership. The University is doing its part by taking steps to secure the physical security of residents and to provide appropriate victim support services. University Police are aggressively investigating these incidents.

We ask all members of the University community to join us in condemning this behavior so that no one on or off our campus will have any doubt about where we stand.

*Claire M. Fagin*  
Interim President

*Janet Hale*  
Executive Vice President

*Marvin Lazerson*  
Interim Provost

*William N. Kelley, M.D.*  
Executive Vice President  
CEO, University of Pennsylvania  
Medical Center and Health System  
Dean, School of Medicine

## Getting Started: Racial Harassment

At the University Council's first meeting of 1993-94, the chief topic of discussion was the proposal to suspend a portion of the University's Racial Harassment Policy. In the wake of nationwide controversy over what has been labeled a "speech code," Interim President Dr. Claire Fagin made the proposal (*Almanac* September 21) to suspend Part II. She called for full debate at the October 13 meeting, asking Dr. David Hildebrand to provide a history of the policy's development here, and inviting two speakers, Dr. Morris Mendelson and Dr. Anne Norton, to give prepared statements for and against suspension of the code. Their remarks are reproduced in this issue (starting next page) along with an advisory of a pending EEOC action that Dr. Fagin said might affect the University's latitude in revision of policy. On pages 4 and 5 of this issue are two additional statements made from the floor.

**A-1/A-3 Reports Added.** Before taking up the policy, and an agenda item on planning for the year, Council received the standing reports of the President, Provost, Senate/Steering Chair, and chairs of the UA and GAPSA—and, for the first time, reports by the chairs of the A-1 and A-3 Assemblies. Both of the staff organization chairs reported on new measures in furthering their communication missions. For the A-1 Assembly, Dr. Carol Kontos-Cohen announced that Executive Board meetings will now be open to all A-1 observers. The A-3 Assembly's Rochelle Fuller announced the establishment of a newsletter for A-3s campus-wide, and the start of a new Outreach Project that will move from one campus site to another to offer programs for A-3 staff. The first site will be 3401 Walnut Street.

**Correction:** In last week's *Almanac Supplement* on the Penn Town Meeting, M.J. Warrender's first comment on page II should have read, "I feel a lot of the problem in the Penn community is to move in the direction of reformation of social systems and policy-making...." not "more in the direction of reaffirmation of....". We apologize for the inaccurate transcription.—Ed.

### Flexibility on October 28

On October 28, all members of the faculty and staff are invited to an information fair at the Faculty Club, at which we are *Celebrating Working Families at Penn*.

The Family Resource Center and Division of Human Resources have worked together to find out what information today's families need most, and to provide it in an informal way so that you can drop in and talk to experts over the lunch period between 11 a.m. and 2 p.m. The topics to be offered, and some information about prize drawings, can be found on page 10 of this issue.

One more thing is needed to make this fair work for *all* members of the staff, and that is to make sure that *everyone* who needs this information gets an opportunity to visit the Faculty Club between 11 a.m. and 2 p.m. Supervisors and fellow staff members are urged to be as flexible as possible in making lunch-time arrangements on October 28.

See you at the Fair!

— R. William Holland,  
Vice President, Human Resources

## October 13 Discussion of the Proposal to Suspend the Racial Harassment Policy

### A Chronology of the Policy

[Dr. Hildebrand noted that he spoke not as a former chair of the Faculty Senate but as a former moderator of Council, in office during the period when the present policy was formulated].

The movement toward a policy on racial harassment goes back at least as far as the campus demonstration in 1981 in the wake of bomb threats and racial phone calls received at Du Bois College House. In '84-'85, there was a task force on conduct and misconduct whose survey led to a committee to draft a policy in '85, reported in October '86. . . There was a very extensive debate at that time—the president, then Hackney, undertook to formulate a single policy combining issues of sexual and racial harassment. That was promulgated finally in June of '87. That combined policy replaced a separate policy on sexual harassment which had been in place at least since 1980, probably before.

In 1988, there was another ad hoc committee—on violence, harassment and discrimination—that recommended separating the two harassment policies. They were then issued separately in December '88. In 1989, a U.S. District Court Judge in Michigan held unconstitutional a somewhat similar harassment policy at the University of Michigan, because of breadth and vagueness and possible violation of rights of free speech and due process, in a public institution. The decision there cited the Supreme Court's "fighting words" doctrine defining the limits of free speech and the First Amendment.

The most recent discussion at Penn began in the spring of 1990, with concern over the implications of that Michigan decision. There was a perception of conflict possibly between the Open Expression Guidelines and the Racial Harassment Policy that were concerns about chilling of free speech. Then-Faculty Senate Chair Bob Davies added a statement in *Almanac* on the fighting-words doctrine. All of this led to a discussion, beginning in 1990; and during the spring semester, Council called for re-evaluation.

During the fall, there was a long series of proposals...in a continuing, exhaustive and exhausting discussion of the policy. Finally, the current policy was promulgated in September of 1991. In addition, there have been, during the debate over the racial harassment policy, calls for protection from harassment of other minorities, included in general University and federal policies on non-discrimination, on such bases as religion, age, gender, sexual orientation, disability or status as disabled or Vietnam era veteran. That came to Council in the fall of '91. Council recommended against the adoption of a comprehensive harassment policy...the feeling was that these other groups were not so clearly in need of a protection against harassment and ... the majority opinion was that in those cases, members of Council felt that the concerns over open expression seemed to take precedence.

The 1991 racial harassment policy still remains in effect, and of course in light of the now celebrated water buffalo case last spring, Interim President Fagin has asked the advice and commentary of members of the community as to whether the enforcement of Part II of the current policy...should be suspended, pending recommendations of Gloria Chisum's Committee on Strengthening the Community.

—David Hildebrand, Professor of Statistics

### Briefing on a Proposed Rule by EEOC

The debate that's going on in this campus balancing free speech rights and interests, and the rights of all members of this community to be treated in a civil manner, is a microcosm of the debate that's going on in society generally. In the United States, there was a Murphy Brown television episode last week discussing it, and just on October 1, two weeks ago, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission put out a Proposed Rule—actually a policy that's similar to the omnibus or comprehensive policy that professor Hildebrand discussed—prohibiting harassment on the basis of race, color, religion, gender, national origin, age or disability.

What EEOC has issued is a *notice of proposed rulemaking*. It is not a rule; it is up for discussion in the United States community—the balance between free speech in the workplace and the need of a workplace to be free of discrimination. So there is a comment period, for all members of United States to comment as this Council will be commenting today. And as the discussion will go forward in the University community, that same discussion will be occurring on a nationwide basis, with these proposed Equal Employment Opportunity regulations. So if, in fact, the national debate resolves itself by regulations like these being passed, as our President stated, we may have to pass our own comprehensive harassment policy mandated by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for the employment situation, as we are an employer of 20,000 employees roughly here, we have to comply with all employment regulations passed by the EEOC and other governmental agencies that govern employment situations, so that's the recent development that has just occurred, the comment period nationally closes November 30.

—Neil Hamberg, Associate General Counsel

### Two Invited Position Statements

• **Dr. Morris Mendelson, Professor of Finance:** The University is a community devoted to learning. It can sustain such a claim only if it provides the maximum latitude for the expression, examination and criticism of ideas. Indeed the free and open exchange of *ideas* is the paramount value of the University community. It is paramount because absent free speech other values cannot always be protected.

The harassment code under which we currently operate violates that concept of a university and not only constitutes a violation of free speech but may establish a precedent for ever more serious infringements in the future. The consistency with which the courts have rejected such codes on First Amendment grounds confirms my belief that they threaten more harm than the good they promise. It is disgraceful to hide behind the shield of the fact that we are a private institution and therefore not subject to the First Amendment.

However, the University must also try to preserve the ability of all members of the community to participate to the fullest extent possible in its life. Words intended to inflict pain and suffering should not be condoned by any member of the University community. Hate speech should not be condoned, but it must be tolerated. Causing harm by speech is often relevantly different from causing harm by conduct. Thus, all conduct, other than speech, which cause direct injury to an identifiable individual on the basis of race, ethnicity, national origin, or sexual orientation should be prohibited and should be the basis for the disciplinary action.

Clearly the principle of free speech is most severely tested when it is exercised to defame. However, as the AAUP has noted, "An institution of higher learning fails to fulfill its mission if it asserts the power to proscribe ideas....a university sets a perilous course if it seeks to differentiate between high-value and low-value speech." It is notoriously difficult to define the speech to be prohibited without impinging on the speech that should be free. Such prohibition invites overzealous members of the community to seek to silence those whose views they dislike. This can have a chilling effect.

The faculty and administration of the University have an obligation to refute speech that creates or even threatens to create a hostile atmosphere. Neither threats of violence nor utterances that clearly may induce violence are protected by free speech. However, the "fire in the crowded theater" argument also lends itself to abuse. It is tempting to promulgate prohibitions under that umbrella, but reliance on that umbrella can easily lead to the erosion of speech protection the umbrella was never intended to cover. When Hitler robbed the Germans of their freedom and the Jews of their lives, he did not do it in one swoop. He robbed by degrees so that no single step looked untoward in the light of the place from which the step was taken.

• **Dr. Anne Norton, Professor of Political Science:** This is not a perfect policy, securing the structures of a perfect world. This is a principled policy that confronts our imperfections with our aspirations.

The policy is guided by the principles of equal protection and neutrality. The policy does not favor African Americans or any other group at the expense of whites. Anyone, of whatever race, may be brought up on charges of racial harassment. No one, of whatever race, is exempt from it. The text will bear no other interpretation.

This is a neutral policy. Ours is a colorstruck context. In our time, racial minorities, and African Americans in particular, still occupy a subordinate position in the American nation. Reactions to the policy reflect this. Although the racial harassment policy is racially neutral, few appear to expect that whites will bring charges of racial harassment. Racial minorities are expected to behave with more grace and civility—or perhaps more circumspection—than their colleagues in the majority. They are also constrained by history. When racial epithets, or other instances of exclusionary language, are directed at racial minorities they carry the weight of history with them. Few of the terms that might be directed against whites have such historical resonance. This asymmetry has practical consequences for people of principle. In our time, African and Asian Americans will suffer more than the white majority from racial harassment. Pressure to repeal the policy has come disproportionately from whites. In this context, repeal is an act that favors whites.

(continued next page)



**Dr. Norton:** Keeping the policy affirms the principles of equal protection and neutrality: in practice as well as in principle. Repeal may preserve these in theory, but it will diminish them in practice.

The policy is guided by the principle of free speech. Those who wish to oppose affirmative action, the credentials, or even the presence of African Americans, Asian Americans, or any racial, ethnic or national group in the University, are not silenced by the policy. The policy does not censor offensive speech. On the contrary, the text recognizes explicitly that such speech is a part of intellectual life and secures the right to free speech more firmly.

What the policy does do is oblige those who wish to make statements of this sort to put them, if not in reasoned arguments, at least in the speech of common civility. I mean civility in the political sense. The policy is not a prescription for good manners. Rather it requires us to address one another as members of a community. It rejects only that speech which forecloses all future speech, which denies the another the right to speak in turn. The opponents of the Racial Harassment Policy are, it appears, not content with the right to the free expression of ideas. They are not asking for free speech, but for special privileges within the community, a license to incivility.

Remember that repealing the Racial Harassment Policy would leave other restrictions on conduct in place. Is racial harassment somehow more acceptable than sexual harassment? Or are we to see these policies repealed as well? Conduct in the classroom, in administrative offices, toward faculty, students, and staff, is regulated by norms and rules of civility. Should speaking about racial difference come with an exemption from these norms, a special license to incivility? I think not.

The opponents of the racial harassment policy are offended that they may be asked to account for their words. That is a curious thing to take offense at in a University, but let it stand.

Two types of offense contend for attention here. If it repeals the Racial Harassment Policy, the University will be asserting that it is deeply sympathetic to the people who are offended because they might be asked to account for their words, but indifferent to those who are offended by racist speech.

Last year, an appeal to the University's Racial Harassment Policy produced a national controversy, with debate over free speech and community. The University learned what many have already come to recognize. In one sense, there is no free speech. Speech is costly.

I regret the content of the national debate, but I cannot regret the debate itself. We are scholars. This is a university. Here, the statements of the ignorant and the misled, are to be preferred over the complacent silence of the unquestioning.

If it repeals the racial harassment policy in this context, the University will be asserting that it regards such controversy as something which is dangerous, and to be avoided. This is not a position that becomes us. If, in this context, the University repeals the policy, it will throw over a policy that was the product of an extended process of reflection, discussion and debate, in response to the passions of the moment. Keeping the policy in place acknowledges the role of reason and deliberation in its formulation. Repeal suggests an unseemly—and unscholarly—responsiveness to the ephemeral opinions of the press and the power of the trustees.

Keeping the policy in place affirms the values of equal protection, freedom of speech and civility. Repeal may not involve rejecting those principles—in principle. In practice, repeal will do exactly that. Repeal is, in context, an endorsement of a license to incivility in racial matters, an act of favoritism to the white majority, and a retreat from the first principles of intellectual life.

## Two Statements from the Floor

• **Dr. Peter Freyd, Professor of Mathematics:** A policy intended to reduce racial harassment ought not, it is generally agreed, be itself racist. This means that it ought not prohibit harassing some races more than others and if a policy were to do so it would be defeating the very goals it was constructed to serve: it would be declaring some races more needy of protection than others and in so doing it would be certifying the very racial pecking order it is trying to undo. It would be institutionalizing a scale of "racial strength" and by institutionalizing it, it would be enforcing it.

Such is the general wisdom. I am not prepared to challenge its basic assumptions. What I am prepared to challenge is the possibility of implementing any racial harassment policy in a non-racist way. I am suggesting that the noble goals of the best written policy in principle are doomed to defeat in practice.

There is a humorous side to this discussion. And that's the problem. Humor when done properly targets those in power. You could try to prohibit "demeaning jokes" targeted at whites in this society, but I can not imagine the prohibition actually working. Worse, I can not imagine wanting to live in a society in which it could work. The saving grace of this society is its periodic deflation of the high and mighty.

Of course no one ever expected that a harassment policy would stop the regular demeaning of the powerful for the simple reason that no one ever expected the powerful to invoke the policy.

To invoke a harassment policy in this culture is to declare oneself as less than powerful. On the other hand, to appear magnanimous in the face even of a direct insult establishes one as a member of the elite. When a white basketball player smiles at the phrase "white man's disease" he is certifying the dominant role of his race. When a white male faculty member doesn't respond to the word "whitemale" he is telling the world that "whitemale" can't be an insult. This very immunity to insults serves as a badge of strength. And a need for protection is seen as a sign of weakness.

There is a very non-humorous side to this discussion. There is a serious problem that we can't just walk away from. If an anti-harassment policy is not the answer, we must continue to seek the answer. It's easy for those of us who don't feel powerless to go around chanting about sticks and stones hurting bones but "words can never hurt me." There's a sense in which we've never really known how hurtful words can be. It's easy to criticize others for being "hypersensitive" and for interpreting every insult as a racial insult. But the very process that allows those in power to turn every intended insult into a harmless jest, that very process can turn every remark heard by those out of power into a grievous insult.

Snickering if you will at "water buffalo" being heard as a racial insult. And after snickering a while think of all the innocent-sounding descriptions that are, in fact, intended as racial insults. And then come up with a system that can tell you which way you're supposed to respond.

The word "boy" is surely, by itself, one of the most innocent of words and when used on most of us, even in a contemptuous tone, it doesn't get much of a response. But the same word can totally stun. When intended to establish a racially-based gulf in status there is no way sanctioned by law to respond. It presents the dilemma of either no response or an illegal response. And if a grown man chooses to stay within the law he must stand soundless and motionless. He must, in other words, be stunned.

One can be silenced by speech. It is this paradoxical power of speech—this power of pure speech to bring about silence—that stands as the central dilemma of the subject. We need free speech for the free exchange of ideas. And free speech can be used to stop that exchange of ideas.

It will not do to prohibit insulting or obnoxious speech; the freedom of "polite" or "civil" speech is an empty freedom. The cliché that granting freedom to the press obliges it to be a "responsible press" is a contradiction: no press needs the freedom to be responsible in the eyes of those with the power to censor it. And so it is with speech. Speech that insults our most cherished attributes is the very speech that most needs the protection of the First Amendment.

But there is one unacceptable form of speech: speech ought not be tolerated if by its very nature it stops the free exchange of ideas. This principle is usually so well understood that it goes unremarked. The notion of free "speech" has rightfully been extended to all sorts of behavior but no one claims that it includes the right to blast out the competition. At the very time that the University Council was evolving its anti-harassment policy it was adopting a noise-control measure and no one thought to claim that the First Amendment entitles one freely to amplify one's speech to the point where others are drowned out.

We understand that a person can demand to be heard but we do not allow his demand to exclude others from being heard. We understand this when the method of exclusion is noise, or the refusal to print responses, or physical force. We can further understand it when the method of exclusion is speech itself. We already have the rules for this. We have, in fact, always had the rules. Indeed, no university can hope to be a place for exploring ideas without having such rules. At this particular university we call them the "open expression guidelines." What we don't seem to have had is the will to enforce them. Within the last few years we have seen planned disruptions of class rooms, planned disruptions of judicial proceedings, planned disruptions of newspaper distribution, all without sanctions. The most egregious case was, of course, when *The Daily Pennsylvanian* was trashed by a dean.

Rather than enforce the rules we already had, we deflected the issue—and I must count myself as part of this process—by adopting yet another set of rules. This time it was a set of rules destined to humiliate those it claimed to serve. By failing to enforce our rules the campus has become less than congenial to the free exchange of ideas. Truly open expression takes place only at a university when none of its members are silenced, whether by noise, or disruptions, or by being made to feel so unwelcomed that silence becomes the only acceptable response. Such is a goal that we can—indeed, must—strive for even if it takes generations to reach. That goal will ultimately be defeated by anti-harassment policies; it will be achieved by a commitment on the part of all of us to truly open expression.

(second statement next page)

• **Dr. Jean Crockett, Professor of Finance:** There are four points I wish to make.

First, the legal requirements: The University is legally responsible for protecting women employees from sexual harassment in the work site, including a pattern of verbal abuse; and a similar legal responsibility is likely to be imposed with respect to employees who are members of specified minority groups. What is left up to us to decide is whether or not to extend the same protection legally required for employees in the work place to students in classrooms and residences.

Second, the speech code is one piece of a broader problem: divisiveness, incivility, and in-tolerance on campus. It was introduced in an attempt to address the problem. It has led us to some absurd outcomes, although I am not sure how much the fault lies with the code itself and how much with its implementation. In any case some changes have to be made. But I do not think that we should fix this one piece without at the same time making a coordinated effort to correct the many other things that are wrong with our approach to the underlying problem.

What would it say if we suspend the speech code, while ignoring other failures of our policy? It would seem to say either

- 1) that abuse is OK so long as it is merely verbal, or
- 2) that verbal abuse is regrettable, but not really our concern, or
- 3) that we do feel some responsibility, but haven't a clue as to what to do about it except for mouthing pious platitudes.

I do not think we should be sending any of these messages.

Third, a private university really is different from a government and that difference is relevant for the way we prioritize competing values. The protection of free speech from governmental interference has primacy because it is essential for the survival of democracy. A government can maintain itself in power indefinitely, while maintaining democratic forms, if it can silence its opponents. Public universities, as agencies of government, are bound by the same rules. A private university has much less power than a government and has a different function. Within the law, it can and should set the priorities that it believes will best serve its own particular function.

Finally, we come to the question of what priorities this private university should set. It will be argued at once that we owe a special duty to free inquiry and the free interchange of ideas. I could not agree more. But I would draw a distinction between substantive arguments and *argumentum ad hominem*. Name calling is *argumentum ad hominem* and I do not accord it the same sanctity that I give to substantive argument.

I would further argue that, as a university, we owe a special duty to tolerance, civility and the willingness to listen. It does not do much for the free interchange of ideas if everyone expresses himself freely, but on one listens. I believe that the freedom to express substantive arguments is in very good shape at this University and has been for a long time. But I believe that tolerance and civility and the willingness to listen are in desperate straits. So I hope we will view the speech code in the context of the problem it was meant to address and make a coordinated effort to deal with all of the failures of that policy.

**Ed. Note:** Comments of Council Member Michael Nadel are scheduled for publication next week, and views of others are invited.—K.C.G.

## Speaking Out

### Against Departmental Closings

The recommendations of Dean Stevens to close five departments in the School of Arts and Sciences leads us in a direction we ought not go. These recommendations stem from a view of our school and its purposes which sees our undergraduates as consumers in a corporate culture that is centralized to administrative initiatives, a view soundly rejected by the Lindback Society's invited lecturer on higher education assessment, Willard F. Enteman, in the issue of *Almanac* announcing the Dean's proposed closings (9/28/93). The consumer model for measuring, restructuring and reengineering what faculty and students do is a noncollegial view of our tasks and diminishes learning by both teacher and student. In Enteman's words, "instead of going back to first principles, the [corporate] assessment pushers have tried to mandate their version" of education. This corporate centralization ought to give every faculty person pause because the nature of our mission is at stake.

Centralization has occurred by increasing school resources (in the form of dollars, programs, personnel) that are subject to central administrative sanctions. The central administration then controls the flow of those resources—turning them off as well as on. Virtually every financial crisis in this school and university over the last eight years has served as a pretext to increase this centralization.

Such central control itself presumes that administrators can adequately monitor the world at large and forecast its direction in order to respond with new initiatives while discontinuing old ones. Those monitoring tasks—of describing, analyzing, and seeking to anticipate the world's workings—are the central purposes of disciplines and departments in a university's organization. Certainly, no single canon of disciplines and departments exists; they have grown up in response to the increasing complexity of the world's workings, and as a function of research and teaching within and between fields. We ought to reject administrative prescriptions that claim better knowledge of the purposes of disciplines and departments than their own practitioners, or that would manipulate them in the interests of efficiency as opposed to substance.

The current proposals would result in a reduction of the number of separate departments with which the central administration must consult and a concurrent increase in inter-departmental institutes, programs, and centers. No financial savings is achieved, but the personnel, programs and budgets are newly sanctioned by the central administration. We have been told that the proposed "program" budgets would be situated in the office of the Associate Dean for the College. That is centralized administrative control, and leads directly to control of programs and personnel.

Members of my department were told

repeatedly that there were no plans to close the department. Then, control of the graduate group was taken out of the department and lodged in an inter-departmental committee, against the Department's wishes. This is the same process that is proposed for the undergraduate program, with the proposed closing of the Department. The Dean now writes, "The recommendations for these five departments are the only recommendations for closure or merger of departments following from the strategic planning process." That may be true for the current round of planning, but based on our experience, I do not believe that promise holds any long-term merit. None of you had better count on it if you relinquish planning to the central administration, and fail to protest the lack of collegial consultation and substantive justification.

The particular claims made as justification for proposing to close the American Civilization Department cannot be sustained. One claim is that the department has "relatively few majors (19 graduates in May 1993)." Indeed, the Department is a small one, having numbered nine faculty members in the mid-1980's, and now three. And the number of graduates has varied over time. But in the past three years, even as our faculty was reduced to three tenured members, the pool of undergraduate majors has been steadily increasing, not decreasing. It currently numbers more than 60 majors, not counting those who graduated this past spring. These totals of current majors and graduates are not large absolute numbers, but the ratio to the number of faculty, and the ratio to the total number of students taught by the American Civilization Department makes the department one of the most efficient by the central administration's own measures. Further, the number of graduates this past year was comparable to any of the other small departments and was greater than the number for a larger department like sociology. Thus, contrary to the justification offered by the administration, the facts would suggest that the program of the department is important to students who want to understand their own society and was accomplishing objectives that are part of the administration's own measures. In addition, I might note, nearly half of this past year's graduates earned forms of academic honors.

A second justification is that the number of faculty in the department "is not numerous enough to provide the combination of coverage and intellectual focus that one would expect of a first-rate American studies program." This claim is simultaneously false and misleading, if not downright unconscionable. It is false in suggesting that the program is less than first-rate. The Gorman Report, which ranked American Studies undergraduate programs across the United States, placed Penn's second only to Yale's, followed by Michigan and Brown. That was in 1987, and involved the core structure and

*Speaking Out welcomes reader contributions. Short timely letters on University issues can be accepted Thursday noon for the following Tuesday's issue, subject to right-of-reply guidelines. Advance notice of intention to submit is appreciated.—Ed.*



integrative concentration in the major that is still in place. It is misleading in the claim the faculty is not sufficiently numerous—to quote again—“though attempting valiantly to stretch itself across a wide range of fields.” First, the reason the faculty is not numerous is because the central administration has refused to provide new appointments for vacant positions. In announcing their decision to our faculty, the words used by the Deans were that they were quite aware they had “starved” us of resources. I hope you all understand the brutality of that metaphor, and that its very real implementation and consequences were then used against us in the justification of the Dean’s recommendation. Second, we are not valiantly trying to stretch ourselves across a wide range of fields. We have concentrated our efforts on our core integrative courses and a few supporting electives. And where we had instituted very attractive electives taught by adjunct faculty, the administration has moved to eliminate those courses.

The issue here is not that our undergraduate students do not take appropriate courses across the range of SAS departments, because they do. In consultation with their faculty advisors, every student creates a topic or theme which they pursue in depth by constructing their own selection of five courses whose content will allow them to explore in depth the topic or theme they have chosen. Virtually 80% of these courses come from outside of the American Civilization Department. Our majors and minors all take courses in other departments according to their particular interests—in Art History, Sociology, English, History, Anthropology, Political Science, Communication, Regional Science, History and Sociology of Science, Psychology and even the Biological Basis of Behavior to name those most frequently chosen. Our core courses, taught by senior faculty, seek to exemplify how we describe, analyze and integrate our understandings of our own society using regional applications—to the American North, South and West. The students’ concentration, then, becomes their effort to make this integration with regard to the topic of their own choosing. And the Senior Seminar provides a capstone course where they bring their prior learning to bear on the contemporary United States and its future. This program structure was cited in the *College Guide* as an exemplary one for other departments to emulate.

It is, in fact, not the Department’s faculty size or program that are truly at issue here. What is at issue is what is proposed. The Dean’s recommendations suggest “that a revised, inter-departmental undergraduate major could...bring together more effectively than the current departmental structure, the wealth of intellectual talent in SAS in the field of American Studies. A faculty committee will be constituted to make appropriate recommendations.” This part of the recommendation comes closest to the aims and purposes of the administration and runs directly counter to the long-term disciplinary efforts of the American Civilization department to construct an anthropology-like approach to the study of our own society. The administration’s proposal represents a direct effort to centralize and control with administrative sanctions the American Civilization faculty

and programs along lines they choose.

It is no secret that the administration sought and accomplished a political take-over of the Graduate Group in American Civilization during the past two years. This was first proposed more than five years ago through an internal review (authored by Richard Beeman, then Chair of the History Department). An external review committee dissented from the internal report, recommending that “the Department of American Civilization be maintained as a distinct department.” At that time the administration wrote, “We accept this recommendation.” But, of course, that is not what the administration did. The moves that followed involved a cynical policy of starvation on the one hand, and the political take-over and re-organization of the graduate group on the other. But that still left a Department that not only failed to die, but which continued to flourish, and whose initiatives in Asian-American studies and Native American studies, continuing core courses, and the study of material culture and political communication were tapping sources of increased student interest. Having established new courses in several of these areas, we were then told that we could not participate in faculty searches in them, and the diminished faculty size is now held against us. That these moves were done without full prior disclosure and open discussion certainly serves to undermine any sense of collegiality and trust. I urge that the Dean’s recommendations be set aside and that the future direction of this school be re-examined with full and open discussion.

—Melvyn Hammarberg  
Associate Professor of American  
Civilization and Undergraduate Chair

### What Are the Real Reasons?

The SAS Faculty meeting of October 12 makes it very clear that this Faculty faces a choice between a corporate type of governance in which executives decree and faculty obey and a collegial type of governance in which the Faculty governs itself. The conduct of the deans was incredible. They did not deny that they had failed to consult with any of the faculty of the departments targeted by the Dean before she issued her recommendations to the Trustees. Their rationale for this conduct was that had they done so, the opposition of those faculty to her recommendations would have generated a general opposition among the faculty as a whole which might have hindered her plans. She further claimed that no consultation with the Faculty was necessary beyond the October 12th meeting, and made it very clear that regardless of what the Faculty says or does, she intends to “implement” her recommendations anyway. Clearly, the timing of her action was designed to secure Trustee approval of her recommendations before the Faculty realized what she was doing or had an opportunity to make its views known.

As this nightmare has unfolded, I have vacillated between thinking that there is behind the Dean’s actions some deep plan which I cannot fathom, and thinking that her administration has lost its collective mind. What I find particularly troubling is that her recommendations make no sense. If as she claims she wants to see better programs established in American Civilization,

Regional Science, and Religious Studies, and if as she says she has a high estimate of the academic attainments of the faculty in those departments, what is the point of destroying the departments we already have? Surely the logical thing to do would be to build on what is already in place. It may be that in the current financial situation, new appointments cannot be made in these departments (although the fact that she has authorized 41 new searches makes one wonder), but if she hopes to obtain the cooperation of scholars from a range of other departments to foster these programs, why not use the existing departments as agents to bring together and coordinate their efforts? Certainly we in American Civilization would welcome the cooperation of other Americanists in enriching our program, and I know that the other departments feel the same way. Moreover, it makes far more sense to build an expanded program around an already existing center than to first destroy the center and then try to reconstitute the program—far more sense, that is, unless the hidden agenda is that the Dean does not like the curriculum we presently offer or disapproves of the approach now taken by these departments. If that is the case, the agenda should not be hidden. Let it be spelled out, and let us—for once—have a genuine intellectual debate about these matters.

But I fear the agenda is more devious than that. I fear that the real agenda is to eliminate these fields of study from the Penn curriculum. It is difficult to eliminate departments, as the Dean is discovering; it is all too easy to eliminate programs—no Trustee vote is required for that. And why else would the Dean pursue this course? She of course denies that this is her intention, but the day is past when I can believe what she says. Having been assured repeatedly by her that the department would not be closed, and having seen how little these statements actually meant, I have learned to believe what she does, not what she says. And what she is doing is trying to destroy the smaller departments while pouring resources into the larger ones. Yet one of Penn’s great strengths historically has been the range of smaller departments which it has and which have permitted an extremely rich range of undergraduate offerings. Is it rational policy to destroy departments which have been and are among those which yield the greatest benefit to this university at the least cost?

If the Dean were to say that owing to the financial situation, the University must consolidate units, and if a convincing case could be made that such a consolidation would save significant amounts of money, then while we might disagree with her at least we would understand the reasons for this action. But she says the reasons are not financial. Indeed, it is very hard to see how any significant savings are to be made by this action; and staff salaries which, she has publicly stated, will remain unchanged. So what are the reasons? Religious Studies is criticized for having only ten majors; American Civilization has 60 majors, so the number of majors is obviously not the reason. These departments are criticized for being too small; whose fault is that? Certainly it is not the fault of the departments which would be happy to grow. And despite being small, these departments produce excellent programs and scholarship. By the Dean’s own figures, the American

Civilization Department is the most cost efficient department in SAS (which only means that we do more for less—not a distinction I covet, but one which shows the nonsense of her argument). So what are the *real* reasons? Why is the administration so shy? If there are complaints to be made against us, make them, and let us face our problems. But these star chamber proceedings, these closed-door cabals, are unworthy of this institution and the antithesis of the collegial governance which has characterized this Faculty in the past and which this Faculty should demand continue in the future.

—Murray Murphey, Chair  
Department of American Civilization

## On SAS Departments

I am acutely aware of the pain caused to my distinguished colleagues Professors Murphey and Hammarberg, because of proposed changes to departmental organization in SAS, including the closing of the department (but not the graduate group nor the undergraduate program) of American Civilization. Change is hard. Their letters raise some issues that affect all the proposed changes to departmental structure in SAS, but they also include some inaccuracies, perhaps misperceptions is the better word, and raise questions about the process of consultation, which I hope to clarify here for all concerned.

The first and most important element in the proposals for restructuring is that research universities in the 1990s must make hard choices. We do not have the resources in the 1990s to develop in any one direction without shifting resources from elsewhere in the School or university. Those universities which are able to use their resources wisely and flexibly will overtake competitors that cannot make structural change, or can only do so after the fabric of their institutions has seriously deteriorated. (This theme is, in a nutshell, the main theme of the latest issue of *Daedalus*, *The American Research University*, fall 1993). Academic planning in the 1990s involves conscious choices. In SAS we have a vigorous, inventive, and forward-looking school.

Second, the proposals have a long history. They did not spring up suddenly from a corporate or Frankensteinian brain but are, rather, the result of (1) years of a deliberate, if quiet, policy of attrition in selected departments over the tenure of several deans, and (2) a year and a half of intensive planning and priority-setting in SAS, drawing on the expertise of faculty throughout the School. With respect to the former point, the department of American Civilization has seen its standing faculty fall from nine to three in a period of six years. Religious Studies faculty has dropped from nine to six, Regional Science from sixteen to six, and Astronomy from seven to two. These trends alone have sent a clear message about priorities to these departments.

The proposals for departmental restructuring now being made follow a comprehensive planning process for SAS, involving at least 100 of the School's 475 faculty. These include members of the School's Planning and Priorities Committee, five faculty task forces, and three faculty panels to review the departments' five-year plans for each of the

main divisions of the School—humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. All SAS departments were asked to respond to specific questions relating to the discipline concerned, its strength and character at Penn, and future prospects for the field. The departmental plans were reviewed by the appropriate divisional panel, each of which was asked, in turn, to assess strengths and weaknesses, department by department, and to identify cross-cutting (School-wide) strengths, themes, and needs. The panel reports were discussed further by the Planning and Priorities Committee in terms of priority-setting for the future. The proposals I am making for restructuring stem out of this entire, interlocking set of activities. This year's Planning and Priorities Committee has further discussed the restructuring, and supports the proposals I am making.

The announcement of the proposed recommendations as a package underlines the important message to faculty and students that the announced changes are the result of judgements made by many people over a period of years, and that they are part of a comprehensive strategy for the whole School. Other recommendations for closure or merger are not foreseen.

Third, there has as yet been no formal recommendation to the Provost for departmental restructuring in SAS, and thus there has as yet been no recommendation for restructuring to the Board of Trustees, which is responsible for making the final decision. The period between the initial announcement of the proposed changes (on September 22 to the affected departments and on September 23 to all faculty in SAS) and a formal recommendation to Provost Lazerson represents an important period of consultation. In the words of Provost Aiken's directive, setting out the procedure for departmental closings, we are now in the period of "prior consultations" with each of the departments concerned. Thus the announcement of the proposed restructuring was followed immediately by meetings with each of the departments concerned, and by meetings with individual faculty in those departments. Views are being both sought and heard from faculty in these departments and across the School. Restructuring was discussed at the faculty meeting held on October 12, and will be discussed again at the continuation of this meeting on October 21. I also presented the proposals to the Academic Policy Committee of the Board of Trustees, for information, on October 14, and I have consulted with the Interim President and Interim Provost, and with the chair of the Faculty Senate. I remain willing to listen to all points of view, as are the Associate Deans of SAS and members of the School's Planning and Priorities Committee. So far, I must say, there has been little of substance to convince me that the original proposals should be substantially modified. However, important additions and changes are being suggested, and will most likely be made, with respect to proposals for implementation. The goal is to achieve a transition (on July 1, 1994) that is seamless to students in the programs concerned, and that causes the least disruption to our faculty colleagues.

Penn has a superb School of Arts and Sciences. One of the things we do best is to create and run outstanding interdisciplinary

programs, for both undergraduate and graduate students, that transcend the structure of departments. Many of the educational and research activities relating to the restructuring will be supported in this way. We will have strong undergraduate and graduate offerings in American Civilization in SAS supported as cross-departmental programs. Slavics will be rebuilt, Astronomy programs will be preserved within a merged department. We want and will have strong undergraduate and graduate cross-departmental programs in Religious Studies, and are pushing for a University-wide look at the best way to support programs in urban and regional development and applied social science at Penn. Out of change comes innovation. The result of these changes, taken together, will be very positive for the School. As a member of the SAS faculty since 1979, I am honored to serve as dean. I am also deeply aware of the responsibilities that go with faculty leadership.

—Rosemary Stevens, Dean,  
School of Arts and Sciences

## An Open Letter to Dorothy King

On behalf of the Officers and the Board of Governors of the University of Pennsylvania Faculty Club, we wish to congratulate you on your contemplated retirement.

You have made major contributions to the Club and its membership ever since you were first appointed to our staff in May of 1965. I can recall your first assignment as a waitress during the first year of your employment because I became President of the Club at about that time, serving from 1966-1969.

Your warm personality, your intelligence and your devotion to member interests, have been discussed many times by those of us who served on the Board of Directors and who communicated regularly with membership. I can recall your promotion to Cashier, and how loyal and industrious you were in working under difficult conditions in the crowded second floor cafeteria. In the later years of your work at the Faculty Club, you became our Principal Receptionist and Key Greeter. With a warm smile and a gentle manner, you were always able to direct concerned and often impatient visitors to their proper events and destinations.

As you know, I also returned to the Presidency in 1988 serving through 1991 and I could always count on your support to help make the Club run smoothly.

I hope that you will continue to be frequent visitor and guest at Faculty Club Affairs. We are not a group to forget your contributions over a 28-year period. Our best wishes to you and your new endeavors and hopefully new hobbies.

—Edward B. Shils  
Past President, Faculty Club  
(For the Board of Directors)

## Ed. Notes

Friends of Dorothy King are invited to drop in and wish her well during the lunch period, 11 a.m. to 1 p.m., on Wednesday, October 27, in the main lounge of the Club.

A letter concerning bicycles on Locust Walk has been held for next week to allow time for right-of-reply. —K.C.G.

*Last Spring (Almanac April 13, 1993), President Sheldon Hackney created a task force to review the issue of providing employee benefits to domestic partners. That task force has now submitted a preliminary report, which is published below for comment by members of the Penn community, as originally promised by President Hackney. Stanford University, the University of Chicago, Columbia University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the Universities of California at Berkeley and at Santa Cruz, the University of Iowa, and the University of Vermont have already extended benefits to same-sex domestic partners. Harvard and Yale may follow suit. Comments should be directed in writing to the Office of the President, 121 College Hall, or e-mailed to [partners@AI.Quaker](mailto:partners@AI.Quaker) no later than November 19, 1993.*

— Claire Fagin, Interim President

## Preliminary Report of the Task Force on Benefits for Domestic Partners

The Task Force was created in March 1993 and asked “to consider the proposition that the University should provide to domestic partners of Penn employees the same benefits provided to spouses of employees.” The Task Force held seven meetings, at which we reviewed current University policies and practices, the policies and practices at other institutions, and a variety of materials relevant to the issues raised by the proposition put to us. In this brief report, we convey our unanimous recommendation that the University should provide benefits to domestic partners of the same sex and the reasons for that recommendation. Specifically, we recommend the following statement of policy:

The University of Pennsylvania recognizes that lesbian and gay faculty and staff members who are, or who may wish to become, involved in long-term committed relationships are not permitted to marry and therefore cannot qualify for benefits available to the spouses of employees and their children. Believing that the inequity thereby created is not consistent with the stated affirmative action goal of eliminating inappropriate patterns of unequal treatment in benefits, the University shall henceforth accord benefits and privileges to the same-sex domestic partners of employees and their children that are comparable to the benefits accorded to spouses and their children.

### Discussion

Benefits strategies and policies change, particularly in response to costs and market forces. According to current University literature, Penn “provides benefits to faculty and staff members for two reasons. The primary reason is to protect the financial security of our faculty and staff . . . The second reason . . . is to keep Penn competitive in attracting qualified people to the University and in retaining the outstanding faculty and staff members we have.”

The University’s affirmative action/equal opportunity policy has not changed in more than a decade. It forbids discrimination on the basis of sexual or affectional preference, applies that policy of non-discrimination specifically to benefits, and exhorts the community to move beyond simple non-discrimination to the elimination of inappropriate patterns of unequal treatment.

In recent years, notwithstanding rising health care costs and other pressures on employee benefit plans, a growing number of private and municipal employers have extended benefits to the domestic partners of their employees. This trend includes universities such as Chicago, Harvard, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Stanford. Some employers have extended benefits to all domestic partners who meet the requirements, but colleges and universities have tended to restrict the benefit to domestic partners of the same sex. Although cost considerations have undoubtedly affected that choice, equally if not more important has been the view that the moral force of the argument for according domestic partner benefits is much stronger with respect to those who are legally prohibited from marrying (and thus qualifying for spousal benefits) than it is for those who for personal reasons choose not to marry.

In our view, both current University benefits policy and stated affirmative action/equal opportunity policy support (if they do not require) according benefits to domestic partners of the same sex. Surely, the University wishes to protect the financial security of its lesbian and gay faculty and staff as

much as the security of other employees, and surely Penn wishes to remain competitive in attracting and retaining highly qualified individuals, regardless of their sexual orientation. Moreover, even if the failure to provide domestic partner benefits to lesbian and gay employees is not contrary to the University’s non-discrimination policy, it hardly bespeaks an effort to eliminate an inappropriate pattern of unequal treatment in benefits.

We share the view of some other colleges and universities that the moral force of the argument for according domestic partner benefits to partners of the opposite sex is not nearly so strong. The University should also be concerned about their partners’ financial security and about attracting them to, and retaining them in, the work force. Yet, the inability of opposite sex partners to secure spousal benefits is the result of personal choice, not of legal prohibitions that the University is powerless to change. Moreover, in Pennsylvania it is possible to enter into a common law marriage (although not to divorce) without state intervention, and adjoining states recognize common law marriages that are valid where made.

The movement nationally and at Penn to provide domestic partner benefits does not arise from a grass roots campaign to recognize non-traditional relationships in general. It is responsive to the particular situation of gays and lesbians, who may be involved in or wish to enter long-term committed relationships but who are legally disabled from entering the one status that would permit them to qualify for spousal benefits.

Thus, we believe that arguments from equity push very strongly in favor of a change in University policy with respect to domestic partners of the same sex. Equity cannot always be a trump card, however, particularly in the increasingly cost-conscious world of employee benefits. Still, we do not regard the perceived need to reduce or otherwise reconfigure existing benefits as an adequate justification for continued inequity. Equal opportunity in a world of constrained benefits dollars requires that sacrifices be shared.

In any event, our research and the independent inquiries of the Office of Human Resources (a statement from which is attached to this report [*see page 10*]) provide no basis for a prediction that according benefits to same-sex domestic partners would consequentially affect the cost of benefits at Penn. To be sure, experience to date is limited, and we are not aware of any truly sophisticated analysis. One certain cost would be a simple factor of additional enrollees, but experience elsewhere leads us to estimate a small number here, at least for health benefits. Existing data do not support fears that according same-sex domestic partner benefits would overwhelm the system with medical costs as a result of AIDS. Indeed, the insurance carriers for a number of employers that have extended domestic partner benefits have lowered their premiums when it became clear that experience did not support estimates reflecting such fears. We expect AIDS-related costs to occur, but we note that they may not be as high as the costs of other catastrophic illnesses and that the same-sex partner population includes lesbians, who have a lower than average incidence of AIDS.

Cost is, however, an additional reason not to extend domestic partner benefits to unmarried partners of the opposite sex. Experience suggests that opposite-sex enrollees would outnumber same-sex partners, adding at least the costs of additional enrollments. We would not regard this consideration as important if we thought opposite-sex domestic partners had a strong moral claim to coverage. We perceive no such claim on the part of those who have it within their power, including through common law marriage, to qualify for the benefits they seek.

(continued next page)



Finally in this aspect, we do not believe that the University would invidiously discriminate by extending benefits to same-sex, but not to opposite-sex, domestic partners. Again, the goal is not to repudiate marriage, nor to establish non-traditional relationships in general, as legitimate benefits criteria. The University is not responsible for the state's refusal to permit lesbians and gays to marry, but it is bound by its own policies to eliminate inappropriate patterns of unequal treatment in benefits. It is one thing to exclude those who are legally incapacitated and quite another to refuse to include those whose disadvantage springs from personal choice. There is a rational basis for distinguishing between the two groups, and it involves marital capacity rather than sexual preference.

No matter what the scope of their domestic partner benefits policies, the employers who have extended such benefits, including colleges and universities, have evinced concern about fraud. Desiring to attract, retain and protect employees who have relationships akin to marriage, they have worried that the lure of benefits will cause those employees to mistake a roommate or a casual friend for, or to misrepresent that person as, a domestic partner. Yet, as we have learned during the course of our deliberations, fraud is not unknown in the traditional world of spousal and dependent benefits.

Marriage and dependency are relatively easy to establish. In light of the value of the benefits at stake and recent demonstrations of employees' creativity in seeking to obtain them, we believe the University should establish a uniform policy requiring documentation of relationships that entail eligibility for University benefits. In our view, such a requirement should be made applicable to all new employees; the University has the legal right to impose it on existing employees as well but should do so only when there is a reason to believe that eligibility does not exist.

In an ideal world, the University would impose on employees seeking domestic partner benefits exactly the same criteria and requirements, including documentation requirements, as are imposed with respect to eligibility for spousal and dependent benefits. We favor making the criteria and requirements as close as possible and thus, for instance, treating a child of a domestic partner identically to a stepchild. A same-sex domestic partnership is not, however, and cannot be a marriage, and it is not amenable to similar ease of documentation.

Moreover, marriage (including common law marriage) entails legal responsibilities that may make it an unattractive vehicle for a free benefits ride. Since fraud is not the exclusive province of heterosexuals, we believe that the University should require evidence that a same-sex domestic partnership involves mutual obligations akin to those of marriage. Accordingly, we would require those seeking domestic partner benefits to certify that:

- (1) they have a committed relationship of indefinite duration;
- (2) they reside together and intend to do so for an indefinite period of time;
- (3) each is the sole domestic partner of the other;
- (4) neither partner is married;
- (5) both partners are at least 18 years of age;
- (6) partners are not related by blood to a degree that would bar marriage in their state of residence;
- (7) partners are financially responsible for each other, to be demonstrated by producing any three of the following documents:
  - a. domestic partnership agreement;
  - b. joint mortgage or lease;
  - c. designation of domestic partner as beneficiary in a life insurance policy or retirement contract;
  - d. designation of domestic partner as primary beneficiary in a will;
  - e. durable property and health care powers of attorney;
  - f. joint title to an automobile, or joint bank account or credit account.

If these criteria and requirements are imposed, the Task Force believes that there should not be any special waiting periods for eligibility (i.e., different from those applicable to spousal/ dependent benefits). Moreover, we note the importance of interpreting our suggested criteria so as not to disadvantage domestic partners vis-à-vis spouses, as for instance by failing to recognize that those who "reside together" may for a time not be able actually to live together. We would, however, require notice of termination of the partnership

and impose a twelve-month waiting period before an employee would be eligible to register a new domestic partner. Anticipating that the proposed documentation requirement of joint financial responsibility may prove a hardship for some employees because of their financial circumstances, we also recommend that a special appeal procedure be available.

The Task Force's recommendation that the University accord domestic partner benefits to employees who satisfy the criteria and requirements discussed above is intended to include all benefits and privileges that are available to spouses and dependents of employees. We recognize, of course, that those benefits may change. Again, the guiding principle of benefits administration should be to define criteria and requirements so as to achieve the closest possible comparability between same-sex domestic partnerships and marriage. Thus, as we have noted, children of a domestic partner should be treated as if they were stepchildren of the employee. A few additional matters regarding the Task Force's recommendation deserve comment.

With respect to retirement benefits, it is our view that the recommended change in University policy should apply only to employees who retire after it becomes effective (i.e., not to those already retired). We note that, in addition to changes in medical benefits, the recommended policy would require revision of the University's defined benefit pension plan (for full-time regular A3 staff), under which survival benefits are currently provided to married employees only.

The University offers a number of benefits and privileges that are not funded by the employee benefits budget. These include bereavement leave, sick leave, recreation facility privileges, library privileges, and Penn Guest cards. Current policies and practices as to the eligibility of domestic partners for those benefits and privileges differ; some are in flux, and some are simply unclear. It is the intent of the Task Force that the University policy we recommend be uniformly applicable and that the registration process be centrally administered, thereby reducing inefficiency, inconsistency, and intrusiveness.

These recommendations concern faculty and staff of the University. Some of the same issues may arise with respect to students, but lacking student members, we did not deem it appropriate to address them.

## Conclusion

The tenor of recent debate about proposed municipal legislation regarding domestic partnerships prompts us to end where we began. Current University benefits policy seeks to protect the financial security of employees and to enable the institution to remain competitive in the marketplace of talent. University policy also forbids discrimination in benefits on the basis of sexual or affectional preference and aspires to eliminate inappropriate patterns of unequal treatment. Lesbians and gays are valued members of this community. Many of them are, or may wish to be, involved in long-term committed relationships. The University is powerless to change the legal definition of a spouse or a family, but equity requires that it recognize and make adjustments for legal incapacity in formulating and implementing employee benefits policy.

### *Members of the Task Force*

Dr. Mary Frances Berry  
 Mr. Stephen B. Burbank, *Chair*  
 Mr. Richard J. Censits  
 Dr. Gloria Twine Chisum  
 Dr. E. Ann Matter  
 Ms. Katharine Pollak  
 Ms. Afi Roberson  
 Dr. Donald H. Silberberg

*Ex Officio:* Dr. Elsa Ramsden

### *Resource Persons*

Debra F. Fickler, Esquire  
 Dr. R. William Holland  
 Dr. Walter D. Wales

*Reporter:* Mary Furash

## Statement on Domestic Partner Benefits

In cooperation with the Task Force on Benefits for Domestic Partners, the Division of Human Resources has sought to obtain information on domestic partner benefits from a variety of sources to aid members of the task force in coming to a clear understanding of the issues, including the cost implications that extending benefits to domestic partners might have for the University. The extension of benefits to domestic partners is a relatively new aspect of employee benefit packages. As a result, information on the issue was primarily gathered directly by surveying employers currently offering domestic partners benefits. As one would expect, their experience with the issues and associated costs is currently limited. Consequently, conclusions based on this experience represent "best guess" estimates which undoubtedly will be influenced as more experience is gained. An additional source of information was a paper drafted by Hewitt Associates. Our inquiries have yielded the following information.

- Several municipalities in California, a few private sector employers and universities offer benefits to domestic partners of employees.
- Employers have indicated that the average costs of medical insurance for domestic partners is approximately the same as the average cost of medical insurance for spouses. Generally, any added cost experienced by employers seems to result from adding individuals to the employers' medical plans and not from a higher incidence of catastrophic diseases.
- Employers typically have specific concerns regarding AIDS when investigating the possibility of offering domestic partner benefits: 1) The belief that the cost of treating AIDS is prohibitive. 2) Employees would be inclined to seek medical coverage for a domestic partner with AIDS. Experience of employers, to date, has indicated that the above concerns have not been realized. The cost of treating AIDS is no more significant than other serious illnesses that are more common. There is also no evidence that employees with domestic partners are more inclined to seek coverage for partners with AIDS.
- Overall, employers have indicated that the ratio of employees choosing coverage for their domestic partners in comparison to the

number of benefits eligible employees is small. Employers offering domestic partner benefits to same-sex and opposite-sex domestic partners have experienced greater utilization of the benefits by opposite sex partners.

It can be concluded, with the limited information available, that the cost of providing domestic partners and their dependent children with medical insurance is directly related to the number of partners and children insured. While it is not possible to accurately predict the number of Penn employees who would choose domestic partner coverage should it be offered, it seems reasonable to assume that Penn's experience in the area of medical insurance would be similar to that of other employers.

With respect to tuition benefits for dependent children, the cost of providing the benefit is again related to the number of dependent children using the benefit. Since few employers offer tuition benefits for dependent children comparable to Penn's benefit, there is no basis of comparison to determine usage trends. Penn's tuition benefit is generous. It is possible that employees who would not insure a partner and his/her children through Penn's medical benefits would use the tuition benefit for a partner's dependent children. The potential exists for greater utilization of the tuition benefit than other more standard benefits.

It is reasonable to conclude from the available information that the cost of extending medical coverage to domestic partners and their dependent children would not be burdensome. If usage trends of the tuition benefit parallel the usage trends of medical coverage experienced by other employers, the same conclusion can be drawn regarding the extension of tuition benefits. It must be noted that such a conditional conclusion is potentially unfounded and can only be tested with experience.

The Division of Human Resources recognizes that there is a cost impact in extending benefits to same-sex domestic partners. In extending those benefits there is a need for clarity concerning precisely who is eligible to receive benefits and under what circumstances.

— R. William Holland,  
Vice President for Human Resources

## For Working Families at Penn: A Fair October 28

Penn's first on-campus fair for working families, co-sponsored by the Family Resource Center and the Office of Human Resources, will be held Thursday, October 28, from 11 a.m.-2 p.m. in Alumni Hall at the Faculty Club. Titled the *Celebrating Working Families at Penn Fair*, it will feature information on services, benefits, recreation and products for working parents and children of the University community.

### Advice for Living

At Q&A tables there will be experts on:

*African-American Parenting:* Isabel Sampson-Mapp, African American Resource Center;  
*Child Development:* Jean Fridy, Graduate School of Education;  
*Divorce and Stepfamilies:* Rose Maruca, Child Guidance;  
*Eldercare:* Carol Bennett-Speight, Faculty/Staff Assistance Program;  
*Fire Safety:* John Cook, Fire and Occupational Safety;  
*Halloween Safety:* Lieutenant Susan Holmes, Public Safety;  
*Lead Poisoning:* Frederick Henretig, Poison Center, CHOP;  
*Legal Issues:* Robert Wilson, L'80, Ingram, Robinson & Wilson;  
*Midwifery:* Jerrilyn Meyer, School of Nursing;  
*Nutrition:* Fran Burke, HUP.

### Products and Services

At other tables, representatives of specific services and products will be posted. Among them:

*Health Plans:* U.S. Healthcare, Keystone, BC/BS, Greater Atlantic;  
*Dental Plans:* Penn Faculty Dental Service, Prudential Dental Plan;  
*HUP Pharmacy;*  
*Tuition and Scholarship Programs;*  
*Pre-tax Expense Accounts;*  
*Recreation:* Hutchinson Gym;  
*Day Care Centers:* Penn Children's Center, The Caring Center, Any Situation Nanny Service;  
*Discovery Program* of the University's College of General Studies;

*Children's Books:* The Penn Bookstore will display and sell them, with 15% off those bought at the Fair;

*Children's Software:* The Computer Connection will also offer 15% off purchases made at the Fair;

*Cook Travel:* the Penn-designated agency. Mortgage and credit literature will be provided by the Treasurer's Office and Penn Credit Union, respectively. And a wide spectrum of cultural/recreational opportunities will be laid before Penn faculty and staff at the fair—what's happening, and how to get in on it, at the University Museum, Morris Arboretum, Ice Rink, Annenberg Center, Institute of Contemporary Art, Girl Scouts, YMCA and Philadelphia Zoo.



### Drawing for Prizes

Attendees will have a chance to win:

- a family trip to Williamsburg from Cook Travel;
- a smoke detector or fire extinguisher from Fire and Occupational Safety;
- sweat suits for the entire family from U.S. Healthcare;
- a \$50 gift certificate from the Bookstore;
- tickets to the Annenberg Center, Ice Rink, University Museum and the Zoo.

## Why Penn's Way? Because Children Are at Risk

I have always lived in the middle of big cities and I care about their future and the futures of the people who live in them—especially children at risk. For this reason I became a board member of Boys & Girls Clubs of Metropolitan Philadelphia, a not-for-profit organization which provides havens for inner-city children in six communities in the city.

Here children and teenagers can become involved in educational, athletic and recreational activities and attend summer camp. I have particularly enjoyed linking high schoolers in the clubs who are interested in careers in health care to summer jobs. I appreciate the enthusiastic cooperation of the Penn and Children's Hospital staff and faculty who have provided summer work experience for Boys & Girls Club members in their offices and labs.

Boys & Girls Clubs, a United Way agency, is a truly positive place for kids.

I have felt better about charitable giving at Penn since our campaign opened up to enable us to target the agencies in which we are personally interested. So now I can give to Boys & Girls Clubs and Women's Way—another agency that provides many valuable services to women and children in Philadelphia—conveniently through payroll deduction.

—Kristin Davidson, Assistant Dean for Administration, School of Nursing

**Correction:** In the October 12 *Almanac* article on *In-Home Child Care Options for Faculty and Staff*, it was indicated that long-term live-in and live-out nannies are available through Any Situation, Inc. However, *live-in* nannies are not available, according to the Family Resource Center, which regrets the error. Long-Term live-out nannies for children and long-term companions for Adult Dependents are available in addition to the Merry Pop-in Nannies and Companions for short-term care.

## Summary Annual Report Retirement, Health and Other Benefits

*Summary Annual Reports for the Retirement Plan for Faculty and Executive, Professional and Administrative Staff, TIAA/CREF Tax Deferred Annuity (Supplemental Retirement Annuities) Plan, Health Benefits Program for Eligible Employees of the University of Pennsylvania and the Dependent Care Expense Account for Plan Year ending December 31, 1992.*

This is a summary of the annual reports for the Plans named above of the University of Pennsylvania for the Plan Year beginning January 1, 1992 and ending December 31, 1992. These Plans are sponsored by The Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania whose federal employer identification number is 23-1352685. The annual reports have been filed with the Internal Revenue Service as required under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA).

It is also required under the terms of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 that these Summary Annual Reports be furnished to plan participants. To facilitate publication, the reports for the plan year ending December 31, 1992 have been combined. Consequently portions of this summary may refer to plans in which you are not currently participating. If you are uncertain about your participation, please consult your 1992 Benefits Statement mailed to you last March with your Open Enrollment Packet or contact the Benefits Office at (215) 898-7281.

### Retirement Plan for Faculty and Executive, Professional and Administrative Staff

Funds contributed to the Plan are allocated toward the purchase of individual annuity contracts issued by Teachers' Insurance Annuity Association of America/College Retirement Equities Fund (TIAA/CREF) and individually owned fully funded custodial accounts sponsored by the Vanguard Group of Investment Companies and the Calvert Group. The total premiums paid for the plan year ending December 31, 1992 for TIAA/CREF were \$24,369,696.77.\*

### Supplemental Retirement Annuities: Basic Financial Statement

Funds contributed to the Plan are allocated toward the purchase of individual annuity contracts issued by Teachers' Insurance Annuity Association of America/College Retirement Equities Fund (TIAA/CREF). The total premiums paid for the plan year ending December 31, 1992 were \$1,865,117.00\*.

### Health Benefits Program: Insurance Information

The Plan has contracts with Independence Blue Cross/Pennsylvania Blue Shield and with five health maintenance organizations (HMOs) of the Delaware Valley to pay all health insurance claims covered under the terms of the Plan. The total premiums paid for the plan year ending December 31, 1992 were \$26,073,853.81.

Because the Independence Blue Cross/Pennsylvania Blue Shield contracts are so-called "experience rated" contracts, as opposed to the HMO contracts which are "community rated" contracts, the Independence Blue Cross/Pennsylvania Blue Shield premium costs

are affected directly by the number and size of claims the University participants "experience." Of the total \$26,073,853.81 premiums paid, a total of \$16,940,425\*\* were paid under Independence Blue Cross/Pennsylvania Blue Shield "experience rated" contracts and a total of \$19,459,607 benefit claims were charged by Independence Blue Cross/Pennsylvania Blue Shield under these "experience rated" contracts for the plan year ending December 31, 1992.

### Dependent Care Expense Account

The Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania maintain a program providing reimbursement of dependent care expenses funded through salary reduction agreements for full-time and part-time faculty and staff. The University provides these benefits in accordance with the terms of the Plan.

### Your Rights to Additional Information

You have the right to receive a copy of the full annual reports, or any part thereof, on request. Insurance information is included in those reports. To obtain a copy of a full annual report, or any part thereof, write or call the office of the Vice President of Human Resources, Room 538 A, 3401 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104, (215) 898-1331, who is the Plan Administrator. The charge for the full annual report for the Health Benefits Program will be \$1.50; the charge for each other full annual report will be \$2.00; the charge for a single page will be 25 cents.

You also have the legally protected right to examine the annual reports at the University of Pennsylvania, Benefits Office, Room 527 A, 3401 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104.

You also have the right to examine the annual reports at the U.S. Department of Labor in Washington, D.C. or to obtain copies from the U.S. Department of Labor upon payment of copying costs. Requests to the Department should be addressed to Public Disclosure Room, N4677, Pension and Welfare Benefit Programs, Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20216.

—Office of Human Resources/Benefits

\* This figure does not include payments to the Vanguard Group and the Calvert Group. Payments to the Vanguard Group were \$13,652,087 of which \$7,326,009 comprised institutional contributions. Payments to the Calvert Group were \$901,827 of which \$505,896 comprised institutional contributions.

\*\* This figure represents actual payments made in 1992. It includes 1991 premiums paid in 1992 and excludes 1992 premiums paid in 1993.



### Statement of Purpose

The Research Foundation encourages the exploration of new fields across a broad spectrum of disciplines. In doing so, the Foundation expands opportunities for faculty to attract support and resources from external sources while encouraging work in fields that are traditionally under-funded.

The Foundation supports two levels of grants. The first level, Type A grants, provides support in the range of \$500 to \$5000. The second level, Type B grants, provides support in the range of \$5000 to \$50,000. The standard application for a Type A grant is briefer than that for a Type B grant, reflecting respective funding levels. However, the review criteria for Type A and Type B grants are similar, and several general factors are considered in evaluating an application for either type of grant. They are:

- Its contribution to the development of the applicant's research potential and progress.
- The quality, importance and impact of the proposed research project.
- Its potential value for enhancing the stature of the University.
- Its budget appropriateness in terms of the project proposed, including consideration of need and availability of external support.

### The Application Process

The Research Foundation Board will review both Type A and Type B applications in the fall and spring of each academic year. Applications for the fall cycle are due on or before *November 1* of each year, while spring cycle applications are due on or before *March 15* of each year. All research projects involving human subjects or animals *must* receive Institutional Board approval *prior* to funding. Questions concerning human/animal research should be directed to Ruth Clark at Ext. 8-2614. All research projects involving the use of hazardous or biohazardous materials must receive approval from the Office of Environmental Health and Safety (OEHS) prior to initiation of experimentation. Questions about this approval process should be directed to Harriet Izenberg at Ext. 8-4453.

An original and ten copies of both Type A and Type B proposals should be submitted to the Office of the Vice Provost for Research, 217 College Hall/6381.

Please see also the Foundation's *Spring Cycle Awards*, pp. 13-14.

## The Research Foundation: November 1 Deadline

**Type A** proposals should contain a brief description of the research and the specific needs which the grant will cover. The proposal should include:

#### I. Cover page(s)

1. Name, Title, Department, School, Campus Mailing Address, Signatures of Department Chairperson and Dean.
  2. Title of proposal.
  3. Does the project utilize human subjects or animals?
  4. Does the project involve the use of any of the following:
    - potentially infectious agents including human blood, blood products, body fluids or tissues?
    - in vitro formation of recombinant DNA?
    - hazardous chemicals (acutely toxic chemicals, reproductive hazards, carcinogens)?
  5. Amount requested.
  6. 100-word abstract of need.
  7. 100-word description of the significance of the project for the educated non-specialist.
  8. Amount of current research support.
  9. Other pending proposals for the same project.
  10. List of research support received during the past three years. Include funds from University sources such as schools, department, BRSBG, or Research Foundation. If you were funded by the Research Foundation in the last three years, please submit a brief progress report with publications and grants proposed or received (no more than one page).
  11. A one-page biographical sketch of the investigator(s) listing educational background, academic positions held, and five recent publications.
- II. A back-up of the 100-word abstract in the form of a 3- or 4-page mini-proposal.
- III. A budget list that justifies the specific items requested and assigns a priority to each item. Budgets should not exceed a two-year maximum time period.
- Categories of Research Foundation support for Type A proposals will focus on:
- Seed money for the initiation of new research.
  - Limited equipment requests directly related to research needs.
  - Summer Research Fellowships, with preference for applications from Assistant Professors.
  - Travel expenses for research only.
  - Publication preparation costs.

**Type B** proposals are limited to ten single-spaced pages in length. The following format is suggested for Type B proposals:

#### I. Cover Page(s)

1. Name, Title, Department, School, Campus Mailing Address, Signatures of Department Chairperson and Dean.
2. Title of proposal.
3. Does the project utilize human subjects or animals?
4. Does the project involve the use of any of the following:
  - potentially infectious agents including human blood, blood products, body fluids or tissues?
  - in vitro formation of recombinant DNA?
  - hazardous chemicals (acutely toxic chemicals, reproductive hazards, carcinogens)?
5. Amount requested.
6. 100-word abstract of need.
7. Amount of current research support.
8. Other pending proposals for the same project.
9. Listing of publications and research support, including titles, amounts, and grant periods, received during the past five years. Include funds from University sources such as schools, department, BRSBG, or Research Foundation. If you were funded by the Research Foundation in the last three years, please submit a brief progress report with publications and grants proposed or received (no more than one page).
10. A brief curriculum vitae for the principal investigator.

#### II. Introduction (2 to 3 pages)

Statement of the objectives and scholarly or scientific significance of the proposed work.

#### III. Methods of Procedure (3 to 4 pages)

Description of the research plan and methodologies to be employed.

#### IV. Description of the significance and impact of the project.

#### V. Description of how a Research Foundation grant will facilitate acquisition of future research funds.

#### VI. Budget (one page) two-year maximum

Each budget item should be listed in order of priority.

Categories of Research Foundation support for Type B proposals focus on several areas of need. These are:

- Matching funds, vis-a-vis external grant sources.
- Seed money for exploratory research programs.
- Support for interdisciplinary research initiatives.
- Faculty released time.

Requests for student tuition and dissertation fees will not be considered by the Foundation.

# Research Foundation Awards—Spring Cycle 1993

William Armstead, Anesthesia & Pharmacology/Med, *Cellular Aspects of Opioid-Induced Influences on Cerebral Hemodynamics*.

David Asch and Nicholas Christakis, Medicine, *What Determines Response Rates to Medical Mail Surveys?*

Timothy Baker, Social Work, *Memories and Behaviors of Traumatized Children*.

Frederic G. Barr, Pathology & Laboratory Medicine/Med, *Sequence-Based Assays for Translocation Detection in Alveolar Rhabdomyosarcoma*.

David S. Bates, Finance, Wharton, *Jumps and Stochastic Volatility: Exchange Rate Processes Implicit in PHLX Foreign Currency Options*.

Jean Bennett, Ophthalmology/Med, *Development of a System to Target Genes to Differentiated Retinal Photoreceptors*.

Philip G. Berger, Accounting, Wharton, *Effects of Corporate Diversification on Firm Value*.

Mark S. Berger, Internal Medicine, *Analysis of the Functional Importance of the Second Exon of C10, a member of the B-chemokine Family of Cytokines*.

Daniel K. Bogen, Bioengineering, SEAS, *Instrumentation System for New Research Initiative in Neurorehabilitation Engineering*.

David Brunswick, Psychiatry/Med, *Corticosterone and ACTH Sample Collection by In Vivo Ultrafiltration*.

Elizabeth A. Bucher, Cell & Developmental Biology/Med, *Mechanisms of Muscle Lineage Regulation and Function in C. Elgans*.

Eugene Buckley, Linguistics, SAS, *Fieldwork on the Phonology of Kashaya, Tigrinya, and Zuni*.

Rebecca Bushnell, English, SAS, *The Subject of Humanism in Early Modern Britain*.

Brenda B. Casper, Biology, SAS, *Plant Responses to Soil Resource Heterogeneity*.

Mortimer M. Civan, Physiology/Med, *Role of Protein Kinase C in Regulating Sodium Channels*.

Christos Coutifaris, Ob-Gyn, *Osteopontin as a Regulator of Human Trophoblast Function*.

Simon Cutting, Microbiology/Med, *Identifying the Function of an Unusually Small Developmental Protein in the Prokaryote Bacillus Subtilis*.

Gabriel de la Haba, Cell & Developmental Biology/Med, *The Possible Contribution of Collagen to the Failure of the Mammalian Spinal Cord Neurons to Regenerate*.

Patricia M. Dechow and Andrew Heyer, Accounting, Wharton, *The Impact of Financial Reporting Policy on Firm Value*.

John Detre, Neurology/Med, *Magnetic Resonance Studies of Focal Forebrain Ischemia*.

Joseph DiRienzo, Microbiology/Dent, *Use of Subtractive Hybridization and Difference Cloning to Identify Putative "Virulence Genes" in the Periodontopathic Bacteria*.

Robert W. Doms, Pathology & Laboratory Medicine/Med, *Neutralizing Antibodies Against Oligomer Specific Epitopes in the HIV-1 Envelope Glycoprotein*.

Karen L. Donohue, Decision Science, Wharton, *Designing Capable Manufacturing Systems*.

Richard L. Doty, Otorhinolaryngology/Med, *Structure of Olfactory Epithelium in Alzheimer's Disease and Idiopathic Parkinson's Disease*.

Paul Ducheyne and Solomon R. Pollack, Bioengineering, SEAS; Dawn Bonnell, Materials Science & Engineering, SEAS; John Cuckler, Orthopaedic Surgery/Med; and Irving Shapiro, Biochemistry/Dent, *Porous Glass Templates for*

*In Vitro Synthesis of Bone Tissue*.

James F. English, English, SAS, *Competitive Culture: Prizes, Awards, and the Circulation of Cultural Value*.

Constantine Gonatas and Arjun G. Yodh, Physics, SAS, *3-D Visualization of Foams by Magnetic Resonance Imaging*.

Miguel Gouveia, Economics, SAS, *Voting Over the Public Provision of Health Care: A Cross-Country Empirical Analysis*.

Gregory M. Guild, Biology, SAS, *Transcription Factor Isoforms Required for Insect Metamorphosis*.

Christopher Hanes, Economics, SAS, *Construction of Annual Output Indices and Business Cycle Dates for the Antebellum United States*.

Joseph W. Harder, Management, Wharton, *To the Survivors Go the Spoils: Distributive Justice in Downsizings*.

Ian Harker, Geology, SAS, *Expedition to Collect Soil Creep Data from Mt. Rainier National Park*.

Mark Haskins, Pathobiology/Vet, *Gene Therapy in Mucopolysaccharidosis*.

Cynthia Huffman, Marketing, Wharton, *The Use of Consumer Experiential Knowledge in Goal Specification Under Conditions of Low Product Expertise and Preference Uncertainty*.

Larry W. Hunter, Management, Wharton, *Who Progresses in a Pay-for Knowledge System?*

Sabine Iatridou, Linguistics, SAS, *Cross-Linguistic Investigation of the Syntax of Counterfactual Conditionals*.

Christopher D. Ittner, Accounting, Wharton, *Product Options, Variability, and Manufacturing Performance*.

Madeleine M. Joullie, Chemistry, SAS, *Cyclodextrin Mimics of Heparin*.

Kevin D. Judy, Surgery/Med, *Evaluation of Local Therapy With TGF- $\alpha$ -PE in the Treatment of Primitive Neuroectodermal Brain Tumors*.

Frederick S. Kaplan, Orthopedic Surgery, Med, *Fibrodysplasia Ossificans Progressiva: Molecular Genetics of Ectopic Endochondral Osteogenesis*.

Michael B. Katz, History, SAS, *Public/Private Relations and the Welfare State: Germany, England, and the United States from the 1870s to the 1930s*.

Webb Keane, Anthropology, SAS, *Representational Practice in Eastern Indonesia*.

Patrick J. Kehoe, Economics, SAS, *Models of Transition in Economies Undertaking Large Scale Reforms: An Application to Eastern Europe*.

Alan Kelly, Pathobiology/Vet, *Novel Vector/Transgenic Mouse System for Efficient Transfer of C-Ski cDNA into Developing and Mature Muscle*.

Robert J. Ketchum, Surgery/Med, *Prevention of Autoimmune Diabetes in BB/Wor Rats by Intrathymic Transplantation of Isolated Syngeneic and Allogeneic Perinatal Islets*.

Jonathan Korostoff, Microbiology/Dent, *An Analysis of the Role of Humoral Immunity in the Pathogenesis of Human Periodontal Disease*.

Anthony Kroch, Linguistics, SAS, *Syntactic Database of Early English*.

Dean A. Kujubu, Medicine, *Pathogenesis of Minimal Change Disease*.

Kenneth Lande, Astronomy, SAS, *Development of an Iodine Solar Neutrino Detector*.

Yin Liang, Biochemistry & Biophysics, Med, *Kinetic Analysis of Recombinant Human Glucokinase*.

Paul A. Liebman and Yefim Manevich, Neuroscience/Med, *Spectrofluorometer for Analysis of G-Protein Structure, Dynamics and Interaction in Signal Transduction*.

Mark Low, Statistics, Wharton, *Statistical Comparison of Model Selection Criteria*.

Ian S. Lustick, Political Science, SAS, *History, Historiography, and Political Science*.

Margaret M. Mahon, Nursing, *Children's Experiences Following the Death of a Sibling*.

Tracy K. McIntosh, Surgery/Med, *Molecular Sequelae of Experimental Brain Injury: Relationship to Neurodegenerative Pathology of Alzheimer's Disease*.

Margaret A. Mills, Folklore & Folklife, SAS, *Encyclopedia of South Asian Folklore Publication Preparation (Ongoing)*.

Yiorgos Mylonadis, Management, Wharton, *The "Green" Challenge to the Industrial Enterprise Mindset: Survival Threat or Strategic Opportunity?*

Vivianne T. Nachmias, Cell & Developmental Biology/Med, *Regulation of Thymosin Beta Four TB<sub>4</sub> in PC12 Cells in Relation to Neurite Extension*.

Jack H. Nagel, Political Science, SAS, *The Rise, Decline, and Repudiation of Majoritarian Democracy: A Dialogue Between Democratic Theory and the Political History of New Zealand*.

Philip M. Nichols, Legal Studies, Wharton, *Reconciling Conflicts Between Free Trade and Sanctions for Lax Environmental Standards*.

Ana Lia Obaid, Neuroscience/Med, *Mammalian "Simple" Nervous System: Multiple-Site Optical Recording of Electrical Activity in the Submucous Plexus of the Guinea-Pig Ileum*.

Mark V. Pauly and James P. Highland, Health Care Systems, Wharton, *The Impact of Regulated Government Prices on Hospital Private Sector Pricing*.

Trevor M. Penning, Pharmacology/Med, *Site-Directed Mutagenesis of 3 $\alpha$ -Hydroxysteroid Dehydrogenase*.

Bob Perelman, English, SAS, *Language Writing and Literary History*.

Hermann W. Pfefferkorn, Geology, SAS, *Microscope-Based Morphometric System for Paleoclimatological Studies*.

Scott Poethig, Biology, SAS, *The Genetic Regulation of Shoot Maturation in Arabidopsis Thaliana*.

David P. Pope, Materials Science & Engineering, SEAS, *Upgrade to Existing Optical Imaging Floating Zone Crystal Grower*.

Helen Quill, Pathology and Laboratory Medicine/Med, *A Novel Molecular Approach to the Analysis of Intracellular Signalling Pathways in CD4<sup>+</sup> T Lymphocytes*.

Jean-Michel Rabate, English, SAS, *After Roland Barthes: An International Conference (Lauder-Hall, 15-17 April 1994)*.

Jagmohan S. Raju, Marketing, Wharton, *Market Information as a Determinant of Price Leadership*.

Matthew Richardson, Finance, Wharton, *Industry Returns and the Fisher Effect*.

David M. Roof, Physiology/Med, *Function and Regulation of a Putative Microtubule Motor Protein in Yeast Mitosis*.

Paul Rosenbaum, Statistics, Wharton, *Statistical Inference in Observational Studies*.

Paul Rothenberg, Pathology & Laboratory Medicine/Med, *Molecular Cloning of a Novel Cellular Substrate of the Insulin Receptor Kinase*.

Jaewoo Ryoo, Economics, SAS, *Ability,*



## Research Foundation Awards

from page 13

*Labor Specialization, and Firm Size.*

Jorge Salessi, Romance Languages, SAS, *Immigration and Nationalism.*

Jean M. Sanger, Cell & Developmental Biology/Med, *Myofibrillogenesis.*

Steven S. Scherer, Neurology/Med, *Trophic Factors for Motor Neurons.*

Nancy M. Shawcross, University Libraries, *Farrell Project.*

Richard Shell, Legal Studies, Wharton, *Computer-Assisted Negotiation: An Empirical Test.*

Eileen M. Shore, Orthopaedic Surgery/Med, *Isolation and Characterization of Bone Morphogenetic Protein Genes.*

Charles A. Stanley, Pediatrics/Med, and Richard Spielman, Genetics/Med, *Genetic Basis of Congenital Hyperinsulinism.*

Nancy Shatzman Steinhardt, Asian & Middle Eastern Studies, SAS, *Chinese Monastery Architecture.*

Peter Sterling, Neuroscience/Med, *Molecular Basis for Human Visual Acuity.*

Saul Sternberg, Psychology, SAS, *Dissociations in Human Time Perception and Production.*

Robert A. Stine, Statistics, Wharton, *Framework for Symbolic Computing in Statistics.*

Ann L. Strong, City & Regional Planning, GSFA, *Privatization of Land and Housing in Czechoslovakia, Poland and Bulgaria.*

Albert J. Stunkard, Psychiatry/Med, *Prospective Study of Adiposity in Infants.*

Naren Udayagiri, Management, Wharton, *Cross-Product Spillovers and Firm Differences in Learning-by-Doing.*

Jay Wallace, Philosophy, SAS, *Responsibility and the Moral Sentiments.*

Eric S. Weinberg, Biology, SAS, *The Regulation of the Zebrafish MyoD Gene and its Role in Myogenesis.*

Saul Winegrad, Physiology/Med, *Regulation of the Contractility of the Heart by Factors Derived From Endothelial Cells.*

Xiaoping Yun, Computer & Information Science, SEAS, *Experimental Study of Mobile Manipulators.*

Ping Zhang, Statistics, Wharton, *A Study of Optimal Ais Algorithms.*

The following is excerpted from a letter sent for publication by Lyn Hutchings, Travel Administrator at Penn.

## Charge Against Hunger

*One in every eight American children under age 12 suffers from hunger.* As startling as that fact is, did you know that more than 30 million Americans experience some degree of hunger each week? In fact, on average, 21% of requests for emergency food assistance in the U.S. went unmet in 1992.

*Charge Against Hunger* is an American Express initiative to raise up to \$5 million for hunger relief. You can be a part of this effort. Every time a Card member uses the American Express® Corporate Card to make a purchase between October 5 and December 31, 1993, American Express will donate two cents to Share Our Strength (SOS)\*, one of the nation's largest non-profit sources of funds for hunger relief.

Founded by Bill Shore in 1984, SOS draws upon the talents of more than 5,000 chefs, restaurateurs, writers, artists, and other creative professionals to raise and distribute funds for hunger relief throughout the world. Since its inception, SOS has raised almost \$11 million for distribution to more than 300 hunger relief and community development organizations in the U.S., Canada, and developing countries.

—Roger Ballou,  
President, Travel Service Group,  
USA, American Express

\* American Express will guarantee a minimum donation to Share Our Strength of \$1,000,000 and will donate up to an additional \$4,000,000 based on Card purchases at 2¢/Card purchase. Donation is not tax deductible for Cardmembers.

## An Evening with Elie Wiesel: October 25

All faculty, staff and students of the University are invited to two events October 25 welcoming the Nobel laureate Elie Wiesel for a lecture.

- A reception, 6 to 7 p.m. in Bodek Lounge of Houston Hall, is sponsored by the Office of University Life on behalf of the University.
- Professor Wiesel's lecture, at 7:30 p.m. in Irvine Auditorium, is under the auspices of the Steinhardt Jewish Heritage Program.

A survivor of Auschwitz whose memoir, *La Nuit*, has been translated into 18 languages, Elie Wiesel is now the Andrew W. Mellon Professor in the Humanities at Boston University, where he also holds the title of University Professor. For his writing and worldwide humanitarian efforts, Professor Wiesel received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1986. He was also awarded this country's Presidential Medal of Freedom, Congressional Gold Medal and Medal of Liberty, and in France was given the rank of Grand Officer in the Legion of Honor. After receiving the Nobel Prize, he created the Elie Wiesel Foundation for Humanity as a forum for the discussion of urgent ethical issues confronting humanity.

## Memorial Service: Dr. Trist

The Center for Applied Research invites friends and colleagues of Dr. Eric Trist to a memorial service at 4 p.m. on November 12 in rooms 1 and 2 on the third floor of the Faculty Club. Dr. Trist, emeritus professor of organizational behavior and social ecology at the Wharton School, died on June 4 at the age of 83 (see *Almanac* July 13). A short video of Dr. Trist will be shown at the service. His wife, Beulah, and daughter, Carolyn, will attend.

## Latino Festival: October 25-29

Sigma Lambda Upsilon and Señoritas Latina Unidas sponsor the following events during the third annual Latino Awareness Week in October:

**25:** *Flan/Cake Sale*, Locust Walk; *The Latino Experience at Penn*, 7:30 p.m., Rooftop, Harrison House.

**26:** *Voices of Our Culture*; Prose and Poetry Reading; 8 p.m.; 16th Floor Lounge, Harrison House.

**27:** Address by Ofelia Garcia, Rosemont College President; 8 p.m.; Smith-Penniman, Houston Hall.

**28:** *Mambo Mouth: A Savage Comedy*; 7 p.m.; TV Lounge, Modern Languages College House.

**29:** *La Fiesta Del Año*; Salsa/Merengue Party; 10 p.m.-2 a.m.; Bodek Lounge, Houston Hall.

## Ph.D. Support in Germany

Fellowships for dissertation research or coursework at the Freie Universität Berlin (F.U. Berlin) are available for the academic year, October 1994 to July 1995 for Ph.D. candidates in SAS. Applicants must be proficient in German since all instruction is in German and their field of study must be available at F.U. Berlin. For the second year, the F.U. Berlin fellowships will provide DM 12,800 (approximately \$8,000) for ten months' support to cover housing, meals, health insurance, fees and books. For more information, contact either the home department chair, graduate chair, or Dr. Joyce Randolph, Director, Office of International Programs, 133 Bennett Hall/6275, Ext. 8-4665. The applications deadline is February 1, 1994.

## Bloodborne Pathogen Training

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) requires mandatory training for all University employees who work with human blood, blood products, body fluids, and human tissue specimens.

The Office of Environmental Health and Safety (OEHS) will offer Bloodborne Pathogens Training for all new and previously untrained workers on October 25 from 1:30 to 2:30 p.m. in Class of 1962 room, John Morgan Building.

This program will review OSHA's regulation "Occupational Exposure to Bloodborne Pathogens" as well as Penn's biosafety program. Information about free Hepatitis B vaccination for all at-risk employees will also be provided. Attendees are requested to bring their PennID cards to facilitate course registration. Call Barbara Moran at OEHS, Ext. 8-4453, with any questions.

## Annual Biosafety and Chemical Safety Refresher Training

The Office of Environmental Health and Safety (OEHS) is mandated by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) to conduct annual safety training for all personnel who work in laboratories. Refresher training will cover the University's Biosafety and Chemical Safety Programs. Attendance at a one-hour session will be mandatory for all personnel who work in laboratories. The dates, times, and locations for the sessions are listed below. Laboratory personnel must have attended either the initial Bloodborne Pathogens Training and/or Chemical Hygiene Training, before attending the refresher training. Initial Bloodborne Pathogens Training and Chemical Hygiene Training will continue to be held on a monthly basis, for new and previously untrained laboratory personnel.

Wednesday, October 20	10:30-11:30 a.m.	Class of 1962	John Morgan Bldg.
	3:30-4:30 p.m.	Lecture Room B	John Morgan Bldg.
Thursday, October 21	1:30-2:30 p.m.	Class of 1962	
Friday, October 22	10:30-11:30 a.m.	Class of 1962	
	3:30-4:30 p.m.	Lecture Room B	
Tuesday, October 26	10:30-11:30 a.m.	Lecture Room B	
	3:30-4:30 p.m.	Lecture Room B	

Attendees are requested to bring their PennID cards to facilitate registration. Additional sessions will be scheduled throughout the academic year, for those unable attend the sessions above. Contact Barbara Moran at OEHS, Ext. 8-4453, with any questions.



# Update

OCTOBER AT PENN

## CONFERENCE

**22** *The Politics of the Body in Italian Literature and Culture*; 1-5:30 p.m.; Gates Room, Van Pelt Library; reception, 5:30-7 p.m., 405 Lauder-Fischer Hall (Center for Italian Studies, Romance Languages). *Continues October 23.*

## FILMS

**21** *Rebel Without A Cause*; Nicholas Ray, director; 7 & 9:30 p.m.; B-6 Stiteler Hall; \$3, \$2/PennID holders (Penn Film Society).

**22** *El Mariachi*; Robert Rodriguez, director; 7 & 9:30 p.m.; B-6 Stiteler Hall; \$3, \$2/PennID holders (Film Society).

## FITNESS/LEARNING

**21** *Ki-Aikido Martial Art Seminar*; Koichi Kashiwaya, 6th degree black belt, Seattle; 6 p.m.; Hutchinson Gym (Penn Ki-Aikido Club).

## MEETINGS

**21** *WXPN Policy Board Meeting*; noon-1:30 p.m.; Room 200, Houston Hall.

**26** *Women's Club Newcomers Meeting*; cake and coffee, 10:30 a.m.; campus tour, 11 a.m.; first floor lounge, Faculty Club.

## MUSIC

**24** *The Gregorian Heritage*: Medieval, Renaissance and 20th century choral works, performed by the Delaware Valley's newest professional chorus; St. Mary's Church, 4 p.m., Admission: \$12, \$8, students, senior citizens, call 525-6497 for tickets (Voces Novae et Antiquae).

## SPECIAL EVENTS

**23** *Pre-Game (Penn v. Brown) Brunch*; 10:30 a.m.-1 p.m.; Faculty Club; \$11 plus 18% service charge; reservations: Ext. 8-4618.

**24** *International Tree Tour*; honoring United Nations Day; 2 p.m.; Morris Arboretum; \$3, \$1.50/seniors, children under 12, free/members, children under six; Info: 247-5777.

**25** *Open House: Newly-renovated OB/GYN and Family Planning Clinics*; noon-2 p.m.; first floor, Gates Building.

## TALKS

**22** *Rational Approach to Antimicrobial Therapy*; Neil Fishman, infectious diseases; 8 a.m.; Alumni Hall, Maloney Building (Medicine).

**25** *The Drive to Sleep and the Need to Wake: Neurobehavioral Consequences*; David Dinges, psychology; 4 p.m.; B-26 Stiteler Hall (Psychology).

**26** *Characterization and Disruption of Murine Endothelial Adhesion Molecules*; Mark A. Labow, Hoffman-La Roche, Inc.; 11 a.m.; Grossman Auditorium, Wistar Institute (Wistar).

*Old Houses Made New: The Greening of West Philadelphia*; William Zucker, creative management and Hanley Bodek, Dynamics of Organization; 1 p.m.; Faculty Club (Women's Club).

*The View From Japan*; Ambassador Hiromoto Seki, Consul General of Japan in New York; 4-5 p.m.; Foreign Policy Research Policy Library, 3615 Chestnut; Reservations: 382-0685 (FPRI).

*Ayurveda: The Traditional Medicine of India and Southeast Asia*; Narayan Patel, University of Delaware and International Health Products, Inc.; 7 p.m.; A-8, Rittenhouse Laboratory (South Asia, Biomedical Research and John Morgan Pre-Health Societies and SARS).

**28** *Generating Symbolic Heat: Experiences of an Anthropologist in Sri Lanka and South India*; Dennis McGilvray; University of Colorado, photographer and curator of University Museum exhibit; 6 p.m., Rainey Auditorium; reception, 7 p.m., Mosaic Gallery, Museum. RSVPExt. 8-4890 (Museum and South Asia Regional Studies).

**About the Crime Report:** The report for the City of Philadelphia's 18th District did not arrive this week in time for publication. Below are all the Crimes Against Persons and Crimes Against Society listed in the campus report for the period October 11 through 17, 1993. Also reported during this period were 28 thefts (including one of auto, eight of bikes, six from auto, and two burglaries) and six instances of criminal mischief/vandalism. The full report can be found in Almanac on PennInfo. —Ed.

## The University Of Pennsylvania Police Department Community Crime Report

This summary is prepared by the Division of Public Safety and includes all criminal incidents reported and made known to the University Police Department between the dates of October 11 and October 17, 1993. The University Police actively patrol from Market Street to Baltimore Avenue, and from the Schuylkill River to 43rd Street in conjunction with the Philadelphia Police. In this effort to provide you with a thorough and accurate report on public safety concerns. We hope that your increased awareness will lessen the opportunity for crime. For any concerns or suggestions regarding this report, please call the Division of Public Safety at Ext. 8-4482.

### Crimes Against Persons

**34th To 38th / Market To Civic Center:** Robberies ( & Attempts ) — 1, Simple Assaults — 1, Threats & Harassment — 8

10/11/93	9:59 AM	McKean Dorm	Unwanted phone calls received
10/11/93	3:04 PM	38th & Sansom	Complainant robbed by male w/knife
10/11/93	1:09 PM	Phi Kappa Sigma	Resident received unwanted calls
10/12/93	3:09 PM	Nichols House	Desk receptionist received harassing calls
10/12/93	4:24 PM	Nichols House	Receptionist received unwanted calls
10/13/93	6:16 PM	Nichols House	Racial/threatening phone calls received
10/13/93	6:41 PM	Nichols House	Racial/threatening phone calls received
10/14/93	3:44 PM	Quad Office	Unwanted phone calls received
10/15/93	5:16 PM	3600 Block Walnut	Dispute between vendors
10/16/93	2:57 PM	200 Block 38th	Auto with loud offensive audio tape

**38th To 41st / Market To Baltimore:** Robberies ( & Attempts ) — 2, Aggravated Assaults — 1, Threats & Harassment — 20

10/11/93	7:42 PM	Van Pelt House	Unwanted phone calls received
10/12/93	1:03 AM	Van Pelt House	Racial/threatening phone calls receive
10/12/93	10:48 AM	251 S. 41st St.	Complainant robbed of U.S. currency
10/12/93	3:08 PM	Low Rise North	Desk receptionist received unwanted calls
10/12/93	3:08 PM	Low Rise North	Desk receptionist received unwanted calls
10/12/93	3:09 PM	Low Rise North	Desk receptionist received unwanted calls
10/12/93	3:24 PM	Low Rise North	Resident receiving unwanted phone calls
10/12/93	5:01 PM	Low Rise North	Resident receiving unwanted phone calls
10/12/93	5:01 PM	Low Rise North	Resident receiving unwanted phone calls
10/12/93	5:09 PM	Low Rise North	Resident receiving unwanted phone calls
10/15/93	4:10 PM	Low Rise North	Racial/threatening phone calls received
10/11/93	1:00 AM	Low Rise North	Racial/threatening phone calls received
10/12/93	5:26 PM	Low Rise North	Resident receiving unwanted phone calls
10/12/93	6:54 PM	Low Rise North	Racial/threatening phone calls received
10/12/93	8:02 PM	Low Rise North	Resident receiving unwanted phone calls
10/12/93	10:02 PM	Low Rise North	Resident receiving unwanted phone calls
10/15/93	4:10 PM	Low Rise North	Resident receiving unwanted phone calls
10/12/93	5:33 PM	300 Block 40th	Currency, jacket taken by unknown male
10/12/93	6:22 PM	4039 Locust St.	Resident receiving unwanted phone calls
10/12/93	8:22 PM	Van Pelt House	Resident Receiving Unwanted Phone Calls
10/12/93	8:29 PM	Van Pelt House	Desk receptionist received unwanted calls
10/14/93	3:34 AM	4000 Block Locust	Complainants assaulted by males w/club
10/17/93	12:58 AM	Harrison House	Resident receiving unwanted phone calls

**41st To 43rd / Market To Baltimore:** Robberies ( & Attempts ) — 4

10/11/93	6:39 PM	43rd & Spruce	Complainant robbed of wallet by male
10/11/93	11:58 PM	4100 Block Locust	2 complainants robbed by two males
10/16/93	9:56 PM	4400 Block Pine	Complainant robbed by 2 males/2 arrests
10/17/93	6:28 PM	42nd & Locust	Complainant robbed by 2 males

**Outside 30th - 43rd / Market - Baltimore:** Robberies ( & Attempts ) — 2, Threats & Harassment — 1

10/13/93	8:38 PM	4400 Osage Ave	Complainant robbed of wallet by male
10/14/93	6:35 PM	3500 Powelton	Unwanted phone calls received
10/15/93	7:05 PM	46th & Locust	Complainant robbed of wallet by male

### Crimes Against Society

**34th to 38th / Market to Civic Center:** Disorderly Conduct — 1

10/15/93	8:56 AM	38th & Chestnut	Male caused disturbance/wanted on warrant/arrested
----------	---------	-----------------	--



*Almanac*

3601 Locust Walk Philadelphia, PA 19104-6224  
(215) 898-5274 or 5275 FAX 898-9137  
E-Mail ALMANAC@A1.QUAKER

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 Scholl
STUDENT AIDES	Shari L. Bart, Melanie L. Chang, Suma CM, Jahmae Harris, Stephen J. Sanford, Timothy D. Valuk

ALMANAC ADVISORY BOARD: *For the Faculty Senate*, Roger H. Walmsley (Chair), Phoebe S. Leboy, Barbara J. Lowery, Ann E. Mayer, Gerald J. Porter, Paul F. Watson; *for the Administration*, Stephen Steinberg; *for the Staff Assemblies*, A-1 to be named, Diane Waters for the A-3 Assembly; Mark Colvson for Librarians Assembly.

## In the Interim, Some Fundamental Thoughts

I have been thinking a lot lately about some of the basic principles —distilled from a lifetime of experiences in and outside of academe — which have been shaping my vision of Penn and guiding many of my actions as Interim President. I'd like to share with you some of these basic ideas early on, so that you will have a better understanding of the way I am approaching the presidency during this academic year. (If I waited until I had this letter in perfect form, my "term" would be close to completion. So I ask your forbearance for any omissions of important principles as well as for a far from ideal literary style.)

Our campus is a vital and vibrant environment, and a president, interim or not, is engaged in a vast variety of activities which call for a wide repertoire of responses. Many of the situations in which I am involved are a continuation of my life as dean and faculty member. Others are new to my experience as an administrator. But there are a few ideas that guide me in all of these situations.

I have written and spoken about some of my beliefs in various "addresses" and "statements." Some of what follows will also sound a lot like the "Report of the President's Committee on University Life" (*Almanac* October 16, 1990), since that report defines so well the ideal community that we want to achieve at Penn: a pluralistic campus, "enriched by both its members' differences and their similarities," devoted to the free and vigorous exchange of ideas.

As Marvin Lazerson and I said in our "Welcome Back" letter (*Almanac* September 7, 1993), the fundamental mission of the University is the generation and transmission of knowledge through teaching, research, and service. Therefore, a critical question in making decisions must always be: What choice best furthers our fundamental mission?

Freedom of ideas is of preeminent importance. All members of the University community are, and must feel that they are, free to think, believe, express, and publish their views, however controversial those views may be. We can never afford to allow any one view, any one perception, any one dogma, to come to totally dominate the University. We thrive on the competition of ideas, and therefore our knowledge should be shared, expressed, tested, criticized, discussed, and used, in public or scholarly debate, in community service, and in professional practice.

We have had several very public disputes recently and can expect to have quite a few more in coming years. I believe strongly that the preferred mode for resolving disputes, for debating controversial issues, and for working out our common lives together is through dialogue, cooperation, civility and mediation — at the level closest to where those controversies occur. I think most of us would agree that adults who respect each other generally behave in that way. That is how each of us tries to behave in our own homes. That is the best way to ensure that we can work together in the University to further our mutual education.

Every member of the University community has a right to participate fully in the life of the community. Discrimination, intimidation, rudeness, and the abuse of power relationships are incompatible with this right. In an educated community, such as Penn, I believe our expectations for the behavior of every member of our community justifiably may differ from those in the world around us. I also believe our solutions to problems need to set standards that reflect our privileged status.

As a dean, I treasured my relationships with faculty. I think I have been clear about my expectations and also about the relative responsibilities and accountability of members of the administrative staff and faculty in all of my previous positions. As I reflected on recent experiences at Penn, it struck me that the role and function of any administrative office is very much a reflection of the personal style and administrative goals

of the person who holds the office. Therefore, it is inevitable that the way the roles of the president and provost evolve this year will reflect my and Marvin Lazerson's vision of what works for us and will work best for Penn in the years to come.

My own philosophy of administration, learned early in my psychiatric nursing career, assumes that decisions and solutions to problems should be made as close to the source as possible. Accountability and power must go with responsibility. Only when there is a failure at the level accountable and closest should anyone intervene, and that intervention cannot go on for very long. This approach will inevitably lead to changes in the relative roles of the offices of the president and provost. One result of this will be to strengthen the office of the provost. Since the provost is the "chief academic officer," this should inevitably strengthen faculty and students as well.

Provost Lazerson shares this philosophy with me, and I hope that you will see various changes which will reflect the view that responsibility and accountability go together. For example, the president's office seems to have become the focal point for crises and decisions that, in my view, belong elsewhere.

In line with this philosophy, I seek the faculty's leadership on many issues, and I welcome their participation and partnership in developing the models we will need to make Penn the exemplar for American higher education. I have always expected faculty to give me all the advice they were willing to share; invited and uninvited. The faculty also have special responsibilities for the academic life of the University and its schools. Our focus needs to remain on the fundamental educational mission of the University. When that focus is clear and collegial relationships work, our students can have no better role models than our faculty, as the students move

through the complexities, strains, frustrations, anxieties, fears, and we hope, fun of our complex and diverse living-learning environment. We must always remember that for our students, the support of faculty for their primary agenda—learning—is crucial.

A well functioning university is like a well functioning family. In functional families, adult members do not pull their children into their disputes. In a functional university family there are lots of opportunities for students, faculty and staff to engage in controversy among themselves and with each other. That is part and parcel of our commitments to freedom of expression and to including all members of our family—faculty, students and staff—in the discussions of "family matters" that will affect their lives and educational attainments. But we should not let even such important family disputes distract either ourselves or our students from the important task of their getting an education.

These are a few of the ideas that guide me. I may sound like a Pollyanna to some and a sermonizer to others. However, these principles have worked for me and guide my behavior. No doubt there are others I haven't thought to mention. But there is one more that I think is probably obvious to anyone who has been watching me and the campus scene here at Penn since last July: I am an activist, and I believe in taking an active approach to the solution of problems. I don't sit back and hope they will go away. If I could meet with every member of our university community, I would. Although my tenure in the president's role will be brief, I am totally committed to the job and to Penn, and I have a lot of confidence that together we can move the University to readiness for its next iteration in time for a great new presidency to take it further.



*David E. Johnson*

Illustration: from a drawing by Rudy DiFelice, courtesy of the School of Social Work