

**Preliminary Report
of the
Commission on
Strengthening the University Community**

Almanac Supplement
February 1, 1994

To the University Community:

As directed in its charge, the Commission on Strengthening the Community presents the preliminary version of its report on the current state and future of University of Pennsylvania's community. This report is the product of five months of intensive research and consultation, and many hours of deliberation.

The Commission now invites all members of our community, as well as concerned people in the external community, to read and comment on this preliminary assessment and accompanying recommendations before the Commission prepares its final draft by March 31, 1994. Written comments can be directed by March 16 to the Commission at 100 College Hall / 6303 or by e-mail at

Commission@A1.Quaker.

People are also invited to two open forums to be held on February 22 at 12:00-1:30 p.m. in Room 1206 Steinberg Hall-Dietrich Hall, and March 16 at 4:30-6:00 p.m. in Room 351 Steinberg Hall-Dietrich Hall. Copies of the relevant background materials, including previous committee reports and reports from other institutions, will be available for reading in the Rosengarten Reserve Room in the Van Pelt Library.

Throughout the fall, the Commission listened carefully to many people across the University, and it will continue to do so in the next two months. It is our understanding that this is still a preliminary report, and we are still open to your opinions and suggestions.

— *Commission on Strengthening the Community*

Preliminary Report of the Commission on Strengthening the University Community

February , 1994

Introduction

The Commission on Strengthening the Community was established at the University of Pennsylvania in June of 1993 with the following charge:

To promote an academic community in which all members may learn from and be enriched by their similarities and their differences and in which the free exchange of ideas may flourish, we have established a Commission on Strengthening the Community. Identifying the core issues, the Commission will examine what we have done and recommend what we must do to strengthen and maintain a full sense of participation in a pluralistic community working toward common goals and to promote a civil atmosphere built on mutual respect among all faculty, students and staff at Penn. The Commission will work throughout the Fall Semester and will present a progress report and preliminary recommendations to the President and the University Community by January 1994, and present its final report and recommendations by March 31, 1994.

The Commission on Strengthening the Community was formed partly in response to the events of last spring, events that included episodes of name-calling and the confiscation of newspapers. These incidents made manifest to all our continuing difficulty in living together in such a way that we can achieve our primary mission: the cultivation and dissemination of knowledge. However, the Commission does not see its role as merely mending tears in an old fabric. Instead, the Commission's report is meant to guide the University in weaving together into a new design people of different cultures and backgrounds, and thus leading the way for higher education in an open world. Uncivil speech, we believe, is symptomatic of our current underlying difficulties in living and working together. Far from fettering speech, our main concern is to address these difficulties by recommending measures that we believe will foster sensitivity and respect among members of the University community.

The Commission was designed to provide the broadest possible range of perspectives on the University. The plenary Commission, structured to provide a comprehensive view of the University, was composed of trustees, faculty, staff, alumni, students and friends of the University, all of whom were familiar with the University and its environment. Throughout the summer, the Commission leadership worked on bringing the Commission up to full strength, which meant urging the selection of student, administrative and staff members of the Commission by the representative groups. In addition, four working groups were organized in order to make the task of collecting and interpreting information manageable. The working groups, composed of plenary group members and supplemented by additional administrative, staff, and student members, were concerned with Judicial Policies and Procedures, Faculty/Student/Staff Interaction, Student Life, and Communications.

The Commission's work began in earnest with its first meeting in September when all permanent members of the Commission except the students had been identified (at that meeting, temporary student members participated and made significant contributions to structuring the work of the Commission). The Commission leadership planned many meetings

with a broad range of groups across campus, and subsequently undertook a survey of a representative sample of student, faculty, and staff opinion on matters of community relations. At the time of the writing of the preliminary report, the survey data had not been fully analyzed, but the survey results will be incorporated into the final version of the report.

As we began our work, it was obvious that the issues the Commission would address were neither new nor confined to the University of Pennsylvania. Thus, the Commission began by studying the results of efforts at Penn and elsewhere to identify and address the systemic difficulties disrupting relations among members of the University community. The President's Committee on University Life (1990) contained useful and insightful observations on the University community, and it made many recommendations that are still valid today. Another effort was the Committee to Diversify Locust Walk (1991). The Commission used these and other committee reports, a *Daily Pennsylvanian* survey conducted this fall, and reports from universities around the country that have dealt with issues of campus racial, ethnic, sexual, and social incivility and strife.

As was pointed out at one of the early meetings held with campus groups, no commission can strengthen the community. This Commission can only identify impediments to a sense of a Penn community, and urge its members to take steps that will allow them to appreciate and grow from their similarities and differences. In recent years on campus, a number of racial, gender, and ethnic groups have formed to address needs their members perceive. Those groups will surely continue to exist and can form networks of interactions to bring people on campus into closer and more constructive contact with each other. On a recent visit to Philadelphia Maya Angelou commented that the more we get to know one another, the more we find we have in common, but our differences bring texture and interest to our lives. It is clear that we do not yet fully appreciate those similarities and differences, and that race, gender, sexual orientation and ethnic animosities are at the heart of many of our problems. Every group with whom we talked addressed the lack of sensitivity that some of its members experienced in dealing with other people at the University. Until we can convince members of this community that learning about different people and accepting those differences are important, we can expect aberrations in behavior that are potentially explosive. Some of our recommendations are therefore aimed at bridging, through educational means, the knowledge gap that accompanies racial, ethnic and sexual chauvinism.

It is also clear from the Commission's research that the University community wants to do better. Preliminary results of the survey we conducted confirm some of the complaints that the Commission heard about impediments to intergroup relations on campus, and differences across various groups in the perceptions of experiences and attitudes. But the survey also shows some underlying commonalities. For many issues addressed in the survey, there were no statistically significant differences in responses across ethnic groups. In addition, the overall impression is that the members of our community care about the quality of the Penn experience (although they may differ on how best it can be improved). They are quite tolerant of differences across ethnic groups and object to stereotyping such differ-

ences. Finally, they display a deep concern for civility and a substantial willingness to object publicly to uncivil behavior. Those results reinforce our belief that implementation of our recommendations will strengthen the community here at Penn. It is gratifying and encouraging to see that on their own some community members have already begun to undertake some of the projects we recommend. We recognize this as a sign that the members of this community are people of good will who sincerely want to see the atmosphere improve.

We also believe that the members of this University see this institution as an intellectual community that aspires to the responsible exercise of free speech. Responsible people will recognize that, as Toni Morrison said in her Nobel Prize lecture, "Oppressive language ... does more than represent limits of knowledge; it limits knowledge." Each person who addressed the Racial Harassment Policy at University Council on October 13, 1993, recognized the need to use speech to enhance, not limit, debate lest the *raison d'être* of the University be lost. Debate of issues must be paramount in a university setting where the generation and dissemination of knowledge are our basic functions. Name-calling and vicious speech discourage intellectual pursuit both for those who are the objects of the disdain and for those who express the disdain. They may also provoke aggressive responses. It may not be possible to prevent uncivil activities by some members of the community, but the community can surely make those who engage in such persistent incivility more uncomfortable than those against whom such behavior is directed.

As the Commission worked throughout the fall it became apparent that some structural impediments that contribute to frustrations and negativism in relations between community members could probably be dealt with expeditiously. Some other structural problems would require somewhat longer to address. Addressing those problems will remove additional sources of irritation, and make a significant contribution to the development of a more civil, cooperative and constructive sense of community on this campus. Other issues were identified that can only be addressed by members of the community on an individual or group basis over an extended time. We have summarized many of these in our report, which covers a broad range of topics. The body of our report contains our recommendations, based on those of the working groups and the rationales for those recommendations.

We begin our recommendations for strengthening the community by addressing the regulation of speech as it has been applied to students. We recommend that student speech *qua* speech not be subject to formal sanction. We are, however, quite alert to the impulses motivating the regulation of speech, such as the community's growing sensitivity to uncivil language, and the dangers of incivility to our community and its educational mission. In the rest of our report, we make recommendations for reform that we

believe may reduce the temptation to indulge, either deliberately or through ignorance, in uncivil speech. Although the speech focus is thus the leading edge of this report, our main concern is to address the circumstances that we believe provoke uncivil speech on campus.

Our recommendations fall into two general categories. One includes steps toward the creation of a normative atmosphere in which uncivil speech is simply unacceptable to the University community. The recommendations in this category emphasize education and understanding of differences, and the use of free speech to counter incivility. The second category of recommendations addresses what members of our community have told us are major irritants in their daily lives, irritants that we believe may be inappropriately expressed in uncivil speech that refers to group stereotypes.

More specifically, the recommendations and their rationales cover seven different areas concerning the life of the University community:

- a) changes in policies and procedures regarding student conduct, in particular the regulation of speech and in the handling of offenses in student conduct;
- b) the faculty's role in the University community, especially in advising and in conflict resolution;
- c) the function of academic knowledge in building community;
- d) changes in the arrangements of residential living that should help to bring people together;
- e) the transformation of the general campus environment, to make it safe, inviting and equally accessible to everyone;
- f) improvements in the ways in which we all communicate with each other; and
- g) the advancement of the general quality of work life, especially for University staff members.

We note that we have not addressed the impact of the University budgeting process and administrative structures on interactions across the University, but we think that these areas require attention to remedy any negative impact they have on the community.

The final section distinguishes between those recommendations that can be acted upon immediately and those that will require more time. That section can serve as a working document for those whose tasks will be implementation of the recommendations. We do not expect this Commission's report to gather dust on a shelf. In order to avoid that, we have identified the executive organization responsible for each of the recommendations. We urge the President to identify an officer on her staff who will be responsible for facilitating implementation of the recommendations, and ask the Chairman of the Board of Trustees to identify the Trustee committee responsible for oversight of the implementation of these recommendations.

Recommendations and Rationales

A. Policies and Procedures Regarding Conduct

All of the Commission's working groups addressed the troubling problem of faculty, student and staff conduct that disrupts our community. In our meetings with a wide range of University members, we heard reports of negative or harmful behavior in classrooms, residences, student service offices, and in the street and surrounding communities: these incidents ranged from thoughtless insults to physical violence, directed at a person's age, class, ethnicity, gender, physical disability, race, religion or sexual orientation. We assume that no group is exempt from responsibility, nor is any group chiefly responsible.

Improving the standard of conduct on campus, without infringing upon individual rights, is the most difficult task facing us. We believe that a university promoting civility and a high standard of conduct should not, and need not, undermine any constitutional rights we hold. At the same time, we think that the free exchange of ideas can best take place in conditions of mutual respect and understanding. Much of the recent debate over free speech and the regulation of verbal harassment has not, in fact, addressed the history and reality of prejudice that generates objectionable speech and inhibits the freedom of others.

The Commission's recommendations on policies and procedures regarding conduct suggest several ways to raise the standards of conduct in the University: education, regulatory policies, and judicial procedures. Above

all, the Commission believes that, as an educational institution, we have the responsibility to teach our students how to work and live together. Most of the Commission's recommendations thus concern the issue of conduct, directly or indirectly. We recognize that Interim President Fagin has announced that the current version of the Racial Harassment Policy will be suspended on June 30, 1994. She has directed the Commission to provide "principles and recommendations" to address "the problems of racial and ethnic harassment, student conduct, and incivility on campus" its report. In response to our report, a committee will be convened that will be "charged to develop specific proposals for improving student conflict resolution."

In undertaking to respond to President's Fagin's charge, we will begin by referring to certain background events. Revisions were made to the Charter and the Code of Academic Integrity in 1991 following a two-year process of study and consultation involving three committees. At that time the Committee to Review the Charter noted a tension "between the traditional administrative model of student discipline and the adversarial model of the legal world, and, at a deeper level, between the desire to foster perceived community values and concern for the protection of the individual." Persuaded "that in some, perhaps many, instances, an adversarial approach to [disputes involving student conduct] may ill serve both the interests of the students involved and of the community as a whole," the Committee

nonetheless decided not to recommend radically changing the Charter, because the adversarial model long in place had “created expectations, a claim of rights, among students.” In addition, the Committee observed that in a university such as ours, “community cannot simply be imposed; it must reflect shared commitment to common values.”

In proposing revisions to the Charter, the Committee followed the guiding principles that a University system of dispute resolution should “(1) include [] substantial protections against action that is either arbitrary or insufficiently attentive to the contingency of truth and justice; (2) involve [] a cross-section of the University in decision-making, and (3) . . . not give up the notion that a residential academic institution has distinctive values and problems that properly may be considered in deciding what process is due.”

The Committee to Revise the Code of Academic Integrity concluded that the University of Pennsylvania is not yet ready for an honor code, but it proposed structural changes designed to increase attention to, and education about, issues of academic integrity.

Many concerns about judicial procedures are little if any different today than they were in the period 1989-91. The system is thought to be complex and its workings protracted. Students, whether respondents or complainants, have trouble finding informed advisers. Although cheating is said to be rampant, few violations of the Code of Academic Integrity are reported. It is possible that the changes emerging from the process of study and consultation in 1991 were simply inadequate. Before reaching that conclusion, one should note: (1) no real effort has been made to canvass the University broadly for advisers; (2) the summary of rights and responsibilities required by the revised Charter and designed to make it less mysterious and more accessible is perfunctory; (3) the new system for putting together hearing panels, which would eliminate a major source of delay, has not been implemented in practice, although it has been formally adopted; (4) the statistical system required by the revised Charter has not been implemented; and (5) to our knowledge, no one ever studied the “simpler, less formal, alternative judicial procedure” that the Charter formerly offered but that was never resorted to. The Committee recommended such a study. In addition, the Committee charged with the duty to educate the community about academic integrity issues has not met this year. Apart from these failures, but related to them, the Judicial Inquiry Office lacked a permanent head for two years, and the professional and secretarial support were inadequate during the same period.

The incidents of last spring evoked several of these recurrent concerns, including delay in adjudication, perceived imbalance of power linked to the respondent’s and complainants’ initial difficulty in finding advisers, and the perceived imbalance in the complainants’ access to the media created by the Charter’s provisions on confidentiality. These incidents were, of course, about much more than *judicial procedures*. But that controversy has also brought more sharply into focus the question of whether, the content of conduct rules apart, all such rules should be enforced by a common set of procedures. More important, it has made clear that considerations previously brought to bear on rules of procedure are relevant to rules of conduct, in particular the above-mentioned principles that community “must reflect shared commitment to common values” and that an adversarial approach to student conduct disputes may not serve the student’s or community’s interests.

In recent years various student initiatives provided reason to question the premise that student preoccupation with rights and the procedural protections of an adversarial model would preclude major changes to the Charter. Although the structural mechanisms intended to promote education and concern about academic integrity have not worked, students have taken it upon themselves to generate debate about these issues. Finally, the events that led to this Commission’s formation and the discussion it has stimulated have brought renewed attention to residential education’s role with respect to student conduct.

The following recommendations are centered on *student* conduct. We recognize that there are two different forms of harassment: harassing or negative behavior that occurs between equals, e.g., student to student; and harassing behavior between people who are not equally powerful, e.g., faculty to student, or supervisor to staff member. While the latter, i.e., hierarchical, harassment is more damaging, insofar as the person attacked may not be willing or able to defend him or herself, substantial aspects of this are also covered by current federal policies concerning harassment in the workplace. The faculty-student case is a more complex issue: expectations concerning faculty conduct in this regard should be addressed by the ad hoc committee on faculty roles and responsibilities called for in Section B.1. Additionally, the judicial policies and procedures for faculty are currently under review.

However, while our focus is for the most part on student conduct and judicial policies and procedures, many of the general principles should be taken to apply to faculty and staff as well.

A 1. *The following recommendations should serve as guidelines to the committees responsible for the replacement of the Racial Harassment Policy and the revision of student judicial procedures.*

A.1.a. *Student speech, as such, should not be the basis of disciplinary action.*

This recommendation concerns only the speech of students acting as such, and it thus does not address permissible disciplinary action in an employment or supervisory context. Moreover, it concerns only speech *qua* speech.

Universities exist for the production and dissemination of knowledge. Both require the freedom to think and to speak if they are to flourish. The regulation of speech may for some purposes and on some occasions be justified, but in a university the regulation of speech is fraught with special dangers.

In a university there should be no orthodoxy, no idea that is immune to skeptical inquiry. The acceptance of ideas, even including the idea of community, cannot be imposed on unwilling listeners or closed minds. The impact of epithets derives precisely from the ideas thought to lie behind them, and calling them verbal conduct merely enables a conclusion that regulation is permissible. The regulation of speech may reduce the number of those willing openly to use certain epithets to espouse hateful ideas. It also runs the risk of closing minds, both the minds of those who espouse ideas thought to be hateful and the minds of those who so regard them. Few people may want to engage in discussion and debate, or to be taught, about contested ideas. The cost is high, too high for a university, we believe, when the benefits are so difficult to perceive, let alone realize.

Discipline can be educational for those who have offended against prescribed norms, but no matter what the trappings, that is not the way it is perceived by many, including both those involved in the process and those outside the University. An adversarial process is particularly ill-suited to the goal of education. Both the stakes and the process rarely contribute to any educational goals.

From the perspective of those who have been the object, or otherwise suffered because of offending speech, a disciplinary remedy may offer retribution, but given the stakes and the process, retribution will usually not come swiftly. More important, the effort is misleading to the extent that it may suggest that punishing speech is an effective means of combating the ideas of which it is a symbol.

In sum, recent and painful experience at this University suggests that the entire enterprise of attempting to discipline student-to-student speech deflects attention from the underlying problems. The message is wrong for offender and offended alike, and the process is likely to open more wounds than it heals. We believe that the same conclusion follows from analysis under the First Amendment, but we need not rely on such analysis. Of course, a conclusion that speech cannot be prohibited under the Constitution, or that a university should not treat student speech as a matter for discipline, does not mean either that the speech is good or that it should be left unanswered. On the contrary, a university has a special obligation to ensure that answers are forthcoming, including from faculty. We also recognize that the cost of not regulating hate speech is the somewhat greater likelihood of physical altercations.

A.1.b. *Student speech may be the subject of discipline under general rules of conduct.*

The freedom of speech that is essential to a university need not be endangered by the promulgation and enforcement of general conduct rules that seek to enforce norms unrelated to the content of speech. Thus, for example, to threaten physical harm (e.g., bomb threats) is a form of verbal conduct that is subject to discipline. Furthermore, utterances that accompany physical conduct, e.g., blocking the free mobility of another, may be evidentiary that the physical conduct is coercive and hence subject to discipline. In addition, rules regulating verbal coercive conduct, e.g., in connection with stalking, and disruptive noise (as indicated in the Guidelines on Open Expression) are not objectionable so long as they are interpreted and applied in an even-handed manner without regard to content.

A.1.c. *The University has a duty to educate for community. In particular, this duty encompasses fostering those values of tolerance and mutual respect that lie at the heart of the academic enterprise. Fidelity to those values is*

crucial if the paramount mission of a secular academic institution—the shared adventure of seeking knowledge—is to be accomplished.

To date, our commitment as a university to the goal of community has been easier to read about than it has been to see in action. Crash courses on tolerance are, by nearly all accounts, a failure, and we have concluded that judicial policies regarding student speech as such are counterproductive. We believe that education for community is best conducted where its relevance is clearest and the messages are hardest to ignore.

The University's educational functions are, of course, primarily the province of the faculty; but administrators—and especially those administrators who are also faculty members—are also expected to participate in articulating and promoting the University's core values. Other sections of this report address the ways in which the values of community can and should be articulated in every part of the campus, and in particular, in the residences.

A.1.d. *There should be a level of discipline for minor offenses that is not reported outside the University (e.g., to graduate schools or prospective employers) and a mechanism for diverting appropriate cases to a process that is empowered to impose discipline only at that level.*

Under the current system, we are informed, the prospect of discipline is often less intimidating to a student, and less productive of gamesmanship, than is the requirement that the fact of discipline be reported to graduate schools or prospective employers. Other universities have found that respondents are less likely to engage in gamesmanship, and more likely to participate constructively, if they know in advance that, whatever the process yields, it cannot be a sanction reported outside the University.

A.1.e. *The process or processes used to resolve allegations of minor student misconduct should be less formal and more expeditious than the process used to resolve allegations of serious student misconduct.*

Using the Charter to process allegations of minor or non-serious misconduct is like using a cannon to kill a gnat. To be sure, most cases are resolved by settlement, but the elaborate, formal process slows everything, and cases of serious misconduct must compete for limited attention. We hope that students are ready to accept a more streamlined process for the resolution of some complaints. We do not specify what such a process should include, leaving that to other bodies. Elsewhere, however, we express as an ideal a binding decision by a single individual. We would also anticipate that there would be an opportunity for a hearing promptly after the complaint was filed. We believe that students should be willing to accept a streamlined process if the category of minor misconduct is defined so as to permit only discipline that need not be reported outside the University (respondents should be able, however, to elect the streamlined process for any offense, if the JIO concurs). A decision to divert a complaint to the proposed non-serious track will require wise judgment exercised under clear guidelines. The mechanism used to accomplish that should probably be used as well for tracking between central University and residence-based systems.

A.1.f. *Attention should be given to the development and full utilization of residential disciplinary processes.*

Existing disciplinary processes at the residential level resolve many complaints about student conduct, and effort has been made to coordinate and rationalize those efforts. We applaud these efforts and encourage the University administration to facilitate them. In our view, however, it would be a mistake to model a residential disciplinary system too closely after either the Charter or the central University streamlined system we recommend above. The latter ideally should involve a single individual making a binding decision; however, residential discipline should take full advantage of the resources of the relevant community, and students in particular, and thereby strive to further the opportunities for education that a disciplinary process can afford. At the same time, however, both the incentives we have discussed and the goal of a rational University system of student discipline suggest that residential processes be confined to alleged misconduct that, if handled centrally, would be eligible for the streamlined process. Attention should be given to adequate data-gathering on incidents that do occur.

A.1.g. *The University should consider the establishment and support of a dispute resolution service, to be available when both a complainant and respondent choose it instead of formal processes and also upon referral from the JIO.*

Such a service could take advantage of the academic strengths in the University and thus broaden the educational benefits of all involved. In a matter referred by the JIO, any proposed resolution should require his or her approval, if it is to be considered final within the University.

A.1.h. *Faculty members should continue to play an important role in student disciplinary processes.*

We applaud the interest and initiative students have shown in addressing perceived weaknesses in current disciplinary arrangements. We believe that, for the future, continued faculty involvement is essential in matters of academic integrity and highly desirable in all contested proceedings that involve allegations of serious misconduct. It is precisely such proceedings that are likely to implicate the interests of the entire community, and we do not strengthen the community by excluding faculty from it, or encouraging them to opt out of decisions about it. In addition, faculty should play a role in residence-based disciplinary systems.

A.2. *The University administration should ensure that the Charter and Code of Academic Integrity, as recently revised, are faithfully implemented.*

As described above, many recent revisions to the Charter and the Code have not in fact been implemented or have been implemented in a perfunctory manner. Until additional changes have been made in these documents, existing policies and procedures should be faithfully carried out.

A.3. *The University administration should ensure that adequate resources are available for the number and quality of personnel required to resolve student conduct issues fairly and efficiently.*

Penny wisdom in this area, we now know, exacts a heavy toll. We are informed that more adequate professional and secretarial support will soon be provided to the Judicial Inquiry Officer (JIO). Changes of the sort we recommend are likely to call for a greater commitment of resources.

A.4. *The University administration should reconsider the reporting relationship appropriate for the JIO. A clear line of responsibility for reporting should be defined.*

When rethinking the Office of the Vice Provost for University Life, the University administration should reexamine the reporting relationship of the JIO. Particularly if a division is made between serious and minor offenses, as we suggest above, the JIO should probably report directly to the Provost.

A.5. *The President and Provost should designate a crisis team, composed of the President, senior administrative and academic officers, campus security, faculty and student representatives to assess incidents and mobilize the campus to respond to crisis incidents of intolerant behavior. A hotline should be set up to allow reporting of incidents, and to provide accurate information to the campus community regarding incidents and to dispel rumors.*

The recommendations in this report are directed at the prevention of incidents that might grow into crises. Realistically, however, we recognize that incidents will occur. In order to deal with such incidents, the President, the Provost, and senior University officers must state publicly and in the most powerful way that intolerant behavior has no place on this campus. In addition, a prompt response must be planned and carried through at the highest administrative levels.

B. Faculty Roles and Responsibilities

The faculty is responsible for establishing the intellectual standards of the University, but it also plays a critical role in transmitting moral values and setting a civil tone at the University. Unless the faculty engage in the life of the University, efforts to establish those values will fail. Faculty members must recognize that they are role models for students and staff. Expectations for the faculty must be clear; among those expectations should be participation in establishing an atmosphere of civility and cooperation at Penn. At the same time, we believe strongly that a faculty member's academic freedom must never be abridged and must be vigilantly protected by the University.

Recommendations

B.1. *The Provost should convene an ad hoc faculty committee on faculty roles and responsibilities. The Committee should address:*

- 1) the defining of University values, including the standards of faculty conduct; and*
- 2) the ways in which the faculty's traditional teaching and research responsibilities are related to constructive engagement in the life of the University community, and the wider community of which the University is a part.*

This discussion should produce a clear statement of expectations regarding faculty roles and responsibilities within one year.

(continued next page)

In recent years many faculty members have discussed faculty responsibility in different committees with much good will, but none of these groups has produced a statement that has authority for the faculty as a whole. The current *Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators* offers a brief statement on Faculty Responsibility that was issued by the Office of the Provost in 1980 (pp. 40-41). The time has come to revise and amplify that statement. In particular, this committee should be directed to define standards of faculty conduct in the classroom that safeguard academic freedom while at the same time acknowledging the faculty's central role in the promotion of civility in the University. We urge this committee to present its final report to the Provost by April 1995. By June 1994 a mechanism should be developed to apply in the interim period, to incidents that would be covered by the former Racial Harassment Policy.

B.2. *The Provost and deans of schools should take steps to encourage faculty members to take a more active part in the life of the campus, particularly in activities that are conducive to building community, respect, and cooperation. In addition to teaching and research, this aspect of faculty performance should be considered in all salary and promotion decisions.*

Currently, hiring and promotion decisions are geared primarily to research accomplishment, and secondarily to teaching. As it now stands, participation in the life of the University community gets little recognition at all in decisions regarding salary and promotion. In effect, the current system discourages active involvement in service to the University community. In order to make the recognition of this kind of community service equitable, an effective method of evaluating it should be developed (this effort might be undertaken by the faculty committee named in Section B.1).

B.3. *The President, Provost and Deans should ensure that faculty members appointed to significant administrative and supervisory positions are provided with a suitable orientation in order to fulfill their budgetary, supervisory and other responsibilities.*

Deans, chairs and other senior administrators manage resources, resolve conflicts and set an example for other University members. In this, they have a significant role in creating community at Penn. Traditionally, those named to these positions have been faculty members respected by their colleagues for their excellence in teaching, service and scholarship. At the same time, we must recognize that these fields of accomplishment do not necessarily provide them with the skills necessary to handle the complicated issues of budgeting, management and conflict resolution that they constantly face. The Provost, President, and Deans should direct the Division of Human Resources to provide the appropriate orientation and ongoing advice for these and other faculty administrators.

B.4. *Senior administrators, faculty members, teaching assistants, and other academic supervisors should periodically be informed about issues concerning harassment on the basis of race, gender, ethnicity, age, religion, disabilities, and sexual orientation. Deans and department chairs in particular should be informed of the processes for receiving, forwarding, and resolving complaints of harassment.*

People in authority need clarification of the policies and procedures regarding harassment. The University currently has several resources available that can help provide information about these matters, including the Women's Center, the Office of Affirmative Action, the African American Resource Center, and the Program for the Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Community at Penn (to name a few). Students and other community members who have been harassed should be encouraged to report the incident to the appropriate office and/or departmental mediator, and should be guaranteed freedom from retaliation.

B.5. *The President, Provost, Executive Vice President, deans, and departments should strengthen their efforts to increase the number of women and minority graduate students, faculty, staff, and administrators.*

Some students need mentors who can understand their cultural background as well as academic needs. Especially in the case of graduate students who work closely with professors, we believe that effective mentorship helps them immeasurably; for undergraduate women and minority students, the presence of professors and leaders like themselves may encourage students to follow their lead. Yet some University departments still have no tenured female or minority professors. Previous reports (e.g., the report of the President's Committee on University Life in 1990) have called for an increase in the hiring of members of underrepresented groups, and we would urgently direct the University to sustain and increase that effort.

C. Academic Issues

We recognize that in all the schools of the University, the faculty, with the Provost, governs our students' academic experience. As previous committees that have examined University life have done, however, the Commission has considered aspects of our students' academic lives that may affect the nature of community, and it makes the following recommendations:

Recommendations

C.1. *The Provost should convene an ad hoc committee immediately to reassess the quality of, and the role of faculty members in, advising across the schools. Its report should be completed within a year.*

As other committees have done in individual schools, we have identified advising as an issue that affects all the schools of the University. Advising here concerns not only guidance in navigating academic requirements and professional mentoring, but also the provision of intellectual inspiration and models for adult conduct. The quality of advising is currently uneven in the schools, in undergraduate and graduate programs, and is particularly a problem in the first two undergraduate years. In a cross-school committee, the different schools could learn from what has worked and what have been persistent problems in other schools. The committee should consider whether faculty advising should be mandatory for all faculty or encouraged with special incentives and special attention during promotion decisions. In general the committee should seek ways to encourage additional faculty involvement in student life, inside and outside the classroom. When the *ad hoc* committee on advising deliberates, it should seriously consider the option of assigning a faculty adviser to every student for the first two years. The *ad hoc* committee should also discuss the desirability of non-faculty University advisers for students, including alumni/ae, upper-class students, and graduate students.

C.2. *The Provost and Undergraduate Deans of the appropriate Schools should call for the development of courses that would address: 1) the variety of cultures, races, religions and ethnic groups; 2) the history of cooperation and conflict among these groups; and 3) the social practices of stereotyping. Such courses should be well-advertised, capable of satisfying distributional requirements of the different undergraduate schools, and easily available and attractive to all students. In addition, the curriculum committees of the schools should consider whether these or similar courses already existing should be required.*

Discussion of mandatory courses on "diversity" or of "diversity requirements" has generated great controversy both at Penn and in other universities across the country, and it was also a subject of debate for the Commission. Unfortunately, such controversy tends to divide academic communities before it can heal them. Previous reports on University life have directed each faculty in the University to examine its curriculum's integration of a wide range of viewpoints, traditions, and experiences, and the Commission supports that aim. While the Commission did not reach a consensus that recommending a mandatory course or requirement would help us strengthen the community at this time, it does strongly recommend that courses be created that will make it easier for students to learn more about the traditions, experiences, and viewpoints of those different from themselves, and to investigate the ways in which people tend to create stereotypes about other groups. Course listings should flag existing courses that cover such issues. The Commission also believes that it is now time for the individual schools to consider the advisability of requiring that their students take such courses.

C.3. *The Provost and Undergraduate Deans should expand the number of courses taught in residences.*

Courses in residences, especially those taught in college houses, can bring together academic learning and residential living, as well as residents of different houses. Under the current decentralized system, students rarely have the opportunity to experience University residences other than their own. With academically rigorous courses taught in residences, however, students can benefit from both the academic classroom instruction and from the recognition of residences and college houses as both intellectual and social environments.

C.4. *Clear norms of civility, honesty, academic integrity, and responsibility for being an effective member of the community should be articulated to students during orientation, and regularly and consistently thereafter. Orientation should not be confined to the first week of the year, but should continue over the entire year. This orientation should address codes of con-*

duct and academic integrity, as well as the Guidelines on Open Expression (and thus require the leadership of the faculty and deans of the schools).

While current orientation programs provide much useful information, they miss some crucial areas because they must offer too much, too fast. We understand that while the Office of Residential Living organizes over three thousand residential and education programs each year, none is mandatory, and attendance is sometimes low. Increased participation in orientation programs over a longer period should result in a more informed and civil student body.

Orientation should cover two kinds of information: policies and procedures regarding student conduct, academic integrity, and open expression; and issues of health, safety, and community relations and the availability of University resources that deal with these issues. The faculty and schools should be responsible for covering the first category of information, and residential advisers and faculty in residence should make sure that students attend orientation in these areas. Residential advisers and faculty in residence should also strongly encourage first-year undergraduates to attend programs focusing on health, safety and community behavior, including sexual harassment and date rape, the University's alcohol policy, the lesbian/gay/bisexual community, religious and racial harassment, and HIV and AIDS awareness and prevention. We might also note that all incoming students should receive the student handbook, for which they must sign an acknowledgement of receipt (see recommendation F.1).

C.5. *The President and Provost should promote community service programs both inside and outside the established curriculum.*

Community service can forge links between the traditionally isolated campus and the West Philadelphia and other Philadelphia communities. According to many students, this year's "Into the Streets" Day for incoming first-year students not only helped students dispel some of their misconceptions about West Philadelphia but also gave them a stronger sense of responsibility for the community. Some potential methods of expanding community service include: setting up a service requirement across the schools, acknowledging service on transcripts, and increasing awareness of the Program for Student-Community Involvement. The University already accomplishes much in the way of community service: more people in both the external and internal community need to be made aware of that effort and of the mutual benefits it generates.

D. Residential Living

We believe that the pursuit of knowledge that occurs in a university extends beyond the classroom and in our judgment can best take place in an open, welcoming, and intellectually challenging environment, where civility and respect for others prevail. Penn must teach its students to live in a community that is not homogeneous. With its urban setting and international character, the University provides an opportunity for students to learn how to work and live in a place that resembles much of the outside world. Student experiences should match Penn's strengths: its racial, ethnic and national variety, intellectual vigor, internationalism, richness in tradition, urban setting, and strong connection to the city of which it is a part. We think that students may not learn how to work with others different from themselves if they remain sheltered in small groups of their "own kind" throughout their years at the University.

Integrated living-learning experiences, community service, community policing, and the creation of spaces where people can come together will help to foster this experience of living together in a complex and sometimes intimidating world. We can build on successful models that already exist at Penn. But some new thinking and new plans will also be required.

Recommendations

D.1. *The University must provide the structure and resources to ensure that the undergraduate first-year on-campus living experience reflects the rich variety of the Penn community. To fulfill this aim, the Provost should:*

- a) Assign all first-year students to designated houses/colleges for a trial period (academic year 1995-96 to 2000-2001);*
- b) With a committee of faculty and students, consider a variety of models for assigning students to first-year houses;*
- c) Design and execute a study that measures the quality of student life and the outcomes of undergraduate living experiences during this period;*
- d) Appoint a task force to explore our peer institutions' approaches that facilitate integrated residential living;*

e) Decide by the year 2000 on the residential model that would be the best fit for students in a pluralistic Penn community in the next century;

f) Direct the Penn fraternities and sororities to delay their rush period until the first semester of the second year.

The first-year experience of undergraduates offers a bewildering array of choices of friends, courses, faculty mentors, social activities, and living arrangements. More profoundly, first-year students face the need to define who they are, when far away from the familiar structures of family and a home community. It may be easier and more comforting to try to reproduce that known environment on a smaller scale; in doing so, however, a student may set a pattern of association that is hard to break in later years. While the comfort provided by a familiar group is an important support when dealing with the stresses of the first year, we believe that it is vital that students' lives and experiences remain as open as possible.

Under the current system, students are allowed to indicate their choices for their first-year residence. Over time, some first-year houses have come to be associated with specific groups of people, and incoming students are aware of these associations. In effect, these identifications have become a self-fulfilling prophecy.

When choices about residential living are delayed until after the first year, students will have the opportunity to gather more accurate and complete information about residential living at Penn, including Greek life, theme houses, and off-campus living. Meanwhile, a common experience for all first-year students, in which the first-year residential house is the hub of "freshman-focused activities," may help to minimize the cultural, ethnic, racial and gender barriers to individual and group interactions.

To make this approach work, several steps need to be taken. We request the Provost to develop the mechanisms for the assignment of housing: however that is accomplished, students should be involved in designing that mechanism. The prices and the attractiveness of both non-Quad and Quad living must be equalized. Information sessions about the options available for residential living for the sophomore through senior years (e.g., living/learning cluster groups, theme houses, Greek experience, and off-campus housing) should be held in first-year residences through the year. Students past the first year and graduate students should continue to serve as mentors for first-year students, and more faculty and staff should be recruited to contribute to the intellectual and social life of residential living. In addition, the residential governance system should be reviewed, and peer group advisory boards should be trained in conflict resolution to help to deal with individual and group conflicts in the residences before they go too far.

The need for a delay in the rush period for fraternities and sororities follows from this emphasis on the openness of the first-year experience, and the need to gather information about living options more slowly and accurately. A first-year rush is a time-consuming event that inhibits new students from exploring the variety of living and social options on campus, and has a negative impact on academic performance. Allowing first-year students more time to meet new people and to discover the many extracurricular opportunities at Penn before they commit themselves to a fraternity or a sorority will permit more informed choices and should lead to a more cohesive, integrated fraternity and sorority system. We recognize that this will cause a shift in the housing arrangements for sophomores, and we urge that special attention should be paid to their housing.

As a long-term strategy, evaluation of the first-year residential experience and its outcomes over a limited period (four years) and research on the activities of other institutions should provide the University with a first-year residential plan that is unique for Penn students. The University should learn from the successes and the problems encountered in this approach.

D.2. *The Provost should implement the University of Pennsylvania version of a College House system as soon as possible. Existing dormitories and other buildings should be used to the fullest extent to allow the prompt establishment of at least part of a house system. The planning necessary for full implementation of a living/learning environment should begin immediately.*

The Report of the Vice Provost for University Life on "Residential Planning for the 21st Century at the University of Pennsylvania" presents a comprehensive plan for the immediate creation of virtual colleges, which would provide a group identification for students centered around faculty affiliation, social and academic programs, and a common dining experience. The plan also calls for the University's commitment to fund renovation and maintenance of current housing, and the creation of additional on-campus

housing as we move into the twenty-first century. The Commission endorses this plan and calls for the University to proceed with its implementation as quickly as possible.

D.3. *The Provost and Executive Vice President should oversee the renovation and reorganization of the High Rises to create smaller community groups within each building.*

While they were designed to respond to student opinion in the 1960s, the High Rises have proven to be an environment in which residents feel isolated. Ideally, the buildings should be converted to other uses. For the present, however, simple changes such as removing the automatic door closers might help, but the High Rises should also be divided programmatically into smaller community units that have a lounge space and are centered around affiliated faculty, resident advisers, dedicated dining facilities, and community programs.

D.4. *The Provost should carefully evaluate the quality of off-campus housing. No substandard housing should be listed by the University, and the Executive Vice President should work with the Philadelphia Department of Licenses and Inspections to ensure that any housing offered for rent in the University vicinity meets at least minimum housing regulations. In addition, the University needs to increase its commitment to working with its neighbors for the improvement of the neighboring communities.*

Off-campus living has been part of Penn's culture for many years and should remain an option for those who want, for many good reasons, to live in the neighboring communities. However, off-campus living can affect a student's sense of connection to the University, as well as the University's relationship with the Philadelphia community. The Vice Provost for University Life's Report on Residential Living proposes to strengthen off-campus students' connection with the University through the creation of virtual colleges, and the Commission supports that plan. However, off-campus living also has an impact on the community in which students live: poorly maintained housing is bad both for students and for the University and its neighbors. An increased emphasis on community service on the part of students will not only tie off-campus students closer to the neighborhoods in which they live, but will also bring everyone closer together in our immediate environment. The University must develop a cooperative relationship with our neighbors, many of whom are members of our internal community, in order to identify ways in which our neighborhood can be improved.

D.5. *The Provost should make a particular effort to ease the transition of international graduate students into University life.*

Many international students do not feel part of the University. High Rises are not helpful places for international students, insofar as they tend to isolate people, and international students tend to be isolated already because of language and culture. Mechanisms should be put into place to ease the transition to living in this community, including help with identifying good housing, assistance with insurance, and attention to family needs.

E. The General Campus Environment

As earlier reports, including the Report of the President's Committee on University Life and the Report of the Committee to Diversify Locust Walk, have already stated, the spaces in which people live and work profoundly influence the way in which they interact. However, the University environment still contains considerable barriers to the free and frequent meeting of its community members. The following recommendations call for the removal of some of those barriers.

Recommendations

E.1. *A barrier-free coffeehouse and gathering place should be established on Locust Walk. This space should be accessible to all members of the University community and should be open late in the evening. We also recommend that the Bookstore have extended hours and consider adding a coffee and browsing area.*

E.2. *A new barrier-free student center, which will house meeting and performance spaces, socializing areas, and a common calendar advertising all campus events of interest to students, should be built as soon as possible. The timetable for its construction should be determined and made public as soon as possible.*

In its 1993 report to the University Council, the Bookstore Committee recommended that, before the projected Revlon Center is completed, the University should develop a bookstore/coffeehouse on Locust Walk. Even if

it does not contain a bookstore, such a facility would invite faculty-student and student-student interaction in an intellectual setting, where alcohol is not the focus of social activity. It is also important that this facility, and any comparable one on Locust Walk, be open for extended hours. Students and non-students alike are calling for the immediate diversification of Locust Walk, and the proposed coffeehouse should contribute to that, by providing an intellectual and social space to be shared by all. This place should continue to serve the community after the Revlon Center is completed.

E.3. *We strongly endorse the recommendation that Locust Walk be made as representative of the total community as soon as possible.*

The Commission supports the conclusions of the Report of the Committee to Diversify Locust Walk and urges the University to proceed expeditiously with plans to accomplish that aim.

E.4. *A fund should be established that would provide money for the co-sponsorship of events that would promote interaction among different groups on campus, as well as providing support for student-sponsored activities celebrating cultural differences. In addition, general University social activities that would bring together faculty, students and staff, should be continued and broadened.*

There is a tradition of student initiative at the University, and that tradition should be encouraged. Students should be urged to do things that promote critical examination of student issues and that build community across the University. Those activities should open up the University environment to all who work and study here as well as improve relations with our neighbors. Affinity groups have formed here in response to needs that are not met by University resources. The University should indeed support the formation of these groups. However, they should then take the further step to encourage students to reach out to be inclusive as possible, so that these groups become support groups, not isolation groups. In general, the President and Provost should increase financial and academic support for student-sponsored programs designed to raise awareness of and celebrate different cultures. Senior-level administrators should seek visible and public participation in student-sponsored events organized by University student minority groups and coalitions, especially when invited by the event organizers.

Students are concerned that campus social life has splintered into small groups that have little to do with each other. They may also feel that many students come to Penn expecting to have their horizons broadened, but leave without getting to know anyone unlike themselves. In addition, they have requested a greater variety of campus social events that are not dominated by the Greek system or alcohol-related, while many people have also praised recent general University events, such as the pre-game picnic in the fall. Many different groups have wanted to co-sponsor events, which would provide for casual interaction and mutual education, and such co-sponsorship of events has already proven quite successful in the past. However, funds are limited for events like these, because groups tend to allocate funds for serving their own constituencies. Thus, special resources should be provided for such events that bring many different groups together, across the lines that usually separate us.

E.5. *Issues regarding public safety should be reevaluated. As part of that process we urge consideration of the following:*

- a) The Executive Vice President should place all campus safety under the supervision of the Division of Public Safety.*
- b) The Executive Vice President and Division of Public Safety should integrate the University Police officers more into the University community through non-emergency contact with students, faculty and other staff by*

- 1) involving the Division of Public Safety when administrative decisions are made on any issues relating to the safety of students and laws regulating student behavior;*

- 2) developing programs that will foster better relationships with students, beginning in the first year;*

- 3) emphasizing the positive contributions of police officers to the University community*

- c) The Division of Public Safety should direct the training of police officers in handling situations affected by cultural difference and the unique character of a university community, and should recruit more female and minority officers.*

- d) The Executive Vice President should form a Police Advisory Board.*

(continued next page)

e) The Offices of Transportation and Physical Plant should pay continuing attention to the upgrading of lighting on campus and to the consistent provision of reliable transportation services.

We believe that a sense of safety is instrumental to free and civil interaction among the members of a diverse community. When people feel insecure or threatened, they are most likely to fear those that they see as different from themselves. People's sense of belonging to a community is also linked to whether they feel equally free, whatever their race, ethnicity, religion, gender, age, physical ability, or sexual orientation, to go when and where they need for their work and social life. It is important that new faculty, students and staff not be unduly frightened by extreme negative information about the dangers of living at Penn. However, in an urban community, everyone needs to be equally informed of sensible precautions to take against crime.

The Offices of Transportation and the Physical Plant and the Division of Public Safety should be commended for their efforts in improving the safety of the physical environment, providing transport from work to home, and responding when crimes do take place. However, faculty, students and staff report that further improvement could be made in all of these areas. Campus areas should be consistently well-lit, to increase our sense of safety. Further, the various services provided by the Office of Transportation, and especially the Escort Service, need to be carefully monitored to ensure that the service is consistent, prompt, and courteous.

The Division of Public Safety has made substantial progress in diversifying its officer pool and sensitizing them to the special concerns associated with overseeing public safety in a University community. More can be done, however, to increase the officers' involvement and identification with the community. With this involvement, the Public Safety officers can play an important role in defusing conflict and keeping trouble from happening. In-depth training in dealing with cultural differences and psychological/sociological training in policing an academic community are crucial; however, after that training, uniformed officers should also be involved in non-emergency settings with students. Since many students' first encounters with public safety officers occur when the officers are called to handle a problem, they may see each other as adversaries. If uniformed officers offer more informational and student training programs, particularly in the first year, they will be familiar faces to the students, who may then be more likely to trust them.

The University also needs to affirm that the Division of Public Safety is a community police force and part of the educational and social experience at Penn. In affirming this, the administration should also involve the police when making any policies regarding safety and laws regarding student behavior, since Public Safety will be involved in carrying out these policies.

Finally, since the police not only patrol the University campus, but more often are the first called when trouble arises in the neighboring communities, a Police Advisory Board should be formed, consisting of representatives of the internal and external community, to work with Public Safety in collective problem-solving.

E.6. *The Division of Public Safety should enforce a consistent police response to alcohol abuse on campus.*

The police have guidelines for dealing with alcohol abuses on Penn's campus. The policy is to assess the situation as a possible medical emergency as a first priority, then to shut down activities if illegal drinking is occurring, and finally, to react to any criminal behavior that is taking place. It has been reported that this policy is not always enforced consistently and its application varies from officer to officer.

E.7. *The Executive Vice President should ensure that all offices offering community resources are located in wheelchair-accessible locations. The relative wheelchair accessibility of meeting and social areas should be clearly indicated in Penn publications such as Almanac, The Compass and the Facilities for Student Activities handbook produced by the Office of the Vice Provost for University Life. All people responsible for building information should be instructed how people with disabilities may enter and travel within those buildings. In addition, all transportation vehicles should be wheelchair-accessible.*

The University has made substantial effort in improving the accessibility of its facilities, but it is ironic that the accessibility ranges from poor to none in some of those facilities, such as the office of the Coordination of Programs for People with Disabilities, the African American Resource Center, the office of the Program for Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Community, offices currently housed in the Greenfield Intercultural Center, the Christian Association, and

the Castle. When students wish to hold meeting or social events in areas that are wheelchair-accessible, the University can help inform them of a location's accessibility. No person should be prevented from taking part in the life of the community because of a mere physical barrier.

F. Communication

Some barriers that separate us cannot be readily seen: these are the obstacles to open and helpful communication. Some hindrances to communication may indeed be physical; as we suggested in our recommendation on establishing a campus center, it is often awkward for different members of the community simply to find a place to have a good conversation. Sometimes the problem with communication on campus is more a matter of handling the sheer excess of information: the University generates a plethora of statements about policies, procedures, resources, and activities, but it is often difficult for any one person—even an administrator—to get full, focused and accurate access to that information.

Other obstacles to the kind of communication that strengthens a community are more subtle yet invidious: these are the misunderstandings that come from ignorance of others' experiences and viewpoints. We may not fully appreciate the impact that our words have, or may misinterpret what others say to us, because we do not fully understand their perspectives, cultural backgrounds, or even their accents. While such errors are endemic to human speech, in a university we should be able to take the time to listen more carefully and learn from each other, before we speak heedlessly. In this sense, many other recommendations in this report are directed to improving our communication with each other, by making it easier to meet and to learn more about each other. The following recommendations more narrowly address problems and solutions concerning access to and management of information.

Recommendations

F.1. *The Provost's Office should oversee the publication of a complete student resource guide, which would contain procedures and policies, and information about student resources and opportunities for scholarships and financial aid, as soon as possible (and by September of 1994 at the latest). Each student should be provided with a copy of the handbook, and should sign a form indicating he or she has received it. This guide should be provided electronically as well as in a handbook format. A Central Resource Hotline, possibly an extension of the "R.A.P. Line," is highly desirable.*

The current student publication, *The Practical Penn*, provides a highly useful service in listing many of the offices that help students. Similarly, we commend the telephone "R.A.P." (Reach-a-Peer) line for connecting students in need with the appropriate resource offices. However, a comprehensive student resource guide, which brings together official policies and procedures with a full list of the resources available to students (including hours of service, weekend resources, and the availability of confidential counseling), would centralize this important information and assure its accuracy. Electronic accessibility would also help with updating of information. If we improve access to information in this way, then the University can expect students to be aware of important policies and to be responsive for compliance with them.

F.2. *We urge The Daily Pennsylvanian to carry a student information bulletin board that lists student resources free, and on a rotating basis, so that all resources are not listed in every edition, but would appear periodically.*

As a supplement to the student resource handbook mentioned above, *The Daily Pennsylvanian* could provide an important service to the community by periodically listing updated information on student resources. Almost all students read *The Daily Pennsylvanian* regularly, and would thus be likely to see it there.

F.3. *The Executive Vice President and the Office of Human Resources should ensure that an employee handbook is in the hands of every University employee within one month of this report, and after that the handbook should be provided to each employee at the time of hiring. The handbook should be appropriate for the employee's classification and cover all rights, privileges, benefits, and obligations of the employee.*

All employees should have easy and complete access to the information that affects their work lives. We understand that Human Resources is currently preparing such a handbook, and we urge that it be made available to all employees as soon as possible.

(continued next page)

F.4. *The Provost should ensure that a centralized, updated listing of ongoing student activities is easily available on the campus.*

Many students have told us that they would attend more events held by different kinds of groups if they were aware that they were occurring, but currently information about such events is distributed unevenly. In addition, a centralized listing might help with the scheduling of events, so that groups could avoid scheduling conflicts.

F.5. *The President, the Provost, and the Executive Vice President should consult and communicate clearly and openly about any University policies or plans that can have an impact on the Philadelphia community.*

Many University policies, especially those regarding housing, physical plant and public safety, can have a significant impact on our neighbors in West Philadelphia and beyond. We understand that many people in that external community think that the University is insensitive to their concerns, and feel that we would rather turn inward than reach out. Yet the University already does a great deal to serve the Philadelphia community, and more people should know about it. In the future, the University administration should also consider how any changes it makes in internal policy would affect the outside community, and it should consult with and fully inform that community about any such important decisions.

F.6. *We urge The Daily Pennsylvanian to consider making use of the services of an ombudsman, which is a common journalistic practice.*

Many major newspapers have an ombudsman who receives and attempts to adjust complaints, and we urge *The Daily Pennsylvanian* to follow this example.

G. Quality of Work Life

University staff members play a valuable part in its educational mission, whether by maintaining the environment, ensuring our safety, providing information and services, or providing technical and clerical support for academic pursuits. At the same time, staff members need to recognize that through their job duties and their interaction with people, they profoundly affect the University's mission and atmosphere.

We recognize that Penn has a well-developed Human Resources Management program with established policies and initiatives. However, our conversations with staff at all levels have led us to believe that the communication and administration of the University's human resource policy need to be strengthened and made consistent in several areas. Effective human resource policies not only strengthen the staff members' ties to the University, but also make the staff equally sensitive to the special character of work in a university.

We believe that accurate job descriptions, control of the quality of supervision, adequate training and significant performance feedback help improve the quality of work life. In many cases we do have adequate human resource policies and programs in these areas, but they do not always work well because not everyone is aware of them or because the policies are implemented haphazardly. The following recommendations are made to improve staff morale, personnel policies, and the effectiveness of interactions between staff and other members of the University community.

Recommendations

Note: To implement the following recommendations, the Executive Vice President and Provost must clarify the roles of Human Resources and the Schools and Centers regarding human resource policies and procedures. All should recognize that this is a shared responsibility, in which Human Resources is accountable for program and policy design and dissemination, consulting support, and progress reports, while the schools and centers are responsible for ensuring the outcomes for each staff member in their units. Human Resources should work with the schools and centers to outline an implementation plan and timetable.

G.1. *A position description must exist for every staff position, and each staff member must have a copy of his or her position description. Supervisors must regularly review position descriptions and revise them as needed.*

A clear position description is basic to successful job performance since it clarifies expectations. These descriptions are the basis for conducting job orientation, for determining training requirements and for assessing job performance. Regular review of position descriptions ensures that the description and classification match the duties performed by the staff member.

G.2. *Every staff member must receive a written performance evaluation annually. Consideration should be given to down-up evaluations so that supervisors can also receive feedback from those they supervise.*

Clear communication about job performance is essential. In current practice, not all staff members receive performance reviews. This should be consistently enforced. Human Resources should increase the offerings in performance management training and continue its current practice of auditing compliance with the policy and reporting the results to schools, centers, the Provost and the Executive Vice President.

G.3. *All supervisors must support training as an important part of every regular employee's role and must assure that staff members receive the necessary orientation and training for their jobs and for the responsibilities of belonging to the University community. Human Resources is responsible for designing and offering relevant training programs and for making these programs accessible.*

G.3.a. *Individual job orientation is essential. Each department must assure that staff members attend the University's New Employee Orientation and that each staff member is oriented to his or her position.*

Orientation to the job and to the University are essential so that the employee can understand his or her job and its role in the University. Orientation should also include introductions to those key people with whom the employee must consult for his or her work.

G.3.b. *Supervisory training should be mandatory for all supervisors. Departments are responsible for ensuring that all their supervisors attend, both when they first assume a University supervisory role and periodically during that person's tenure as a supervisor, so they may stay informed of changes in University policies and procedures.*

Managing people is a primary function of supervision. Any supervisor who does not participate in the training should be moved out of a supervisory position, because the staff who report to this position may suffer from the supervisor's lack of adequate management skills and knowledge of University policies. A supervisory program is available, offered by Human Resources. The Commission recognizes that large numbers of faculty directly supervise staff members, and addresses that in recommendation B. 3.

G.3.c. *Training about how to work with people of different genders, ages, races, religions, ethnicities, sexual orientations and physical disabilities is relevant for all staff. This training should be mandatory for supervisors and incorporated into supervisory training. Aspects of this training should be integrated into the new employee orientation. Additional separate training programs with more depth in this subject are also appropriate. Departments should ensure that their staff members attend. The Office of Affirmative Action and the Office of Human Resources should collaborate on the design of these programs and make sure that they are offered on a regular basis and are available to staff.*

In the rest of this report we have insisted that faculty and students should increase their awareness of the experience, perspectives, and needs of people with a wide range of backgrounds and ways of life. All employees, and particularly supervisors, also need this understanding. We believe that a special area of concern is teaching supervisors effective ways to work with those with physical disabilities.

G.3.d. *Staff members who are in positions that bring them in contact with students, staff, faculty and visitors must be provided with customer service training and updated information about the University. Department heads must make sure that their staff have access to the information needed to do their jobs. Human Resources should work with the Provost and Executive Vice President to identify the units which need this training and then work with the units to develop the training.*

Staff in these roles are key to making the University system work by providing courteous and informed service. To do this staff need training in customer service and they need access to the information requested by the customer, which will help to expedite service. This is particularly crucial in such areas as Student Aid, Housing, and Financial Services. Electronic information will also facilitate such delivery of service.

G.4. *Human Resources should develop a career planning service that clarifies career paths and needed skills, while underscoring the mutual responsibility of University and staff members. This service should be available to interested staff members.*

The development and growth of staff is mutually beneficial to the University and the individual. In this career planning effort, Human Resources provides information and counseling about career paths and needed skills, and staff members take initiative to develop skills and manage their own personal growth/careers. Career paths and information regarding needed skills should be clarified and publicized.

G.5. *Human Resources should remind units of the difference between regular employment status and temporary employment status. Units are responsible for accurately informing staff regarding the person's employment status.*

Giving inaccurate information to temporary employees is misleading. It creates false expectations on the part of the employee and ill will for the University. The conditions of employment should be clearly communicated at the time of employment, and opportunities for conversion to regular status should be clearly defined for temporary employees who wish to pursue regular positions.

G.6. *The results of the Pay Equity Study should be made public in the Spring of 1994, and action should be taken to address problem areas.*

The study is underway. Human Resources should integrate the results with the salary management program which has existed since 1988.

G.7 *All University employees should be referred to by their employment status, not their pay categories.*

It is current practice to refer to groups of University employees as "A-1's" and "A-3's," names that designate pay status rather than the category of work that people do. Many community members have told us that they find such names demeaning, and there is no reason to continue such a practice.

G.8. *The Executive Vice President should provide a mediation process for staff, so that when a person feels aggrieved by a superior the two may talk with a neutral third party about the grievance to seek some resolution.*

Elsewhere in this report we recommend the institution of less formal procedures for the resolution of conflicts concerning student conduct. A similar process should be available for staff, in which a complainant and respondent can work through a conflict in a confidential and non-adversarial setting. This process may serve to keep complaints out of the formal grievance procedures.

Minority Position on Recommendation D.1. Regarding Assigned Residential Living

The recommendation to "Assign all first-year students to designated houses/colleges..." concerns me. My reservations rest on two implicit assumptions, one matter of principle and two potential substantive outcomes.

Assumption 1. By increasing residential interaction opportunities, relations between members of diverse groups will be improved. It is correct to say that the better the relations between individuals and groups the more likely they will be to interact. The proposition is not, however, transitive. Enforced interaction will not necessarily produce more empathy and attachment.

There is a hidden assumption that group tensions can or should be reduced by reducing the differences between groups. This assimilation or "melting pot" approach encounters a value issue in that, while it works, it reduces diversity. An alternative approach would be to sustain diversity while seeking ways to achieve respect and tolerance for differences. This is our true moral challenge.

Assumption 2. The University is duty bound to guide social relational learning of the students. My more narrow view is that the University is primarily concerned with classroom teaching of the various disciplines and is concerned with creating conditions of student living which facilitate learning and protect the health, safety and peace of mind of the learners.

The Principle: Assigned housing is a reversal of the traditional civil rights concern with the right to live where one chooses. This has been a basis for opposing neighborhood restrictions. The power to direct residence, though used today to integrate, may be used by a future administration to segregate.

Substantive Issue 1. The policy as written calls upon the Residential Living office to assign students to designated housing without specifying the rules of assignment or of designation. Does the word "all first-year" in the policy mean to exclude Philadelphia

residents from living at home or students with disabilities from locating near their classes? Presumably, the notion is that a rule of random assignment is what is intended. If so,

- Why is gender not mentioned? Could men and women be coerced into sharing suites?
- Would this not spread the minorities very thinly among residential units? Since but 8% of the students are black could this mean that we would have one or two blacks to a house? Would we also isolate the international students from companionship of those with common language and culture? I believe other Commission members agree that this might increase the stress on the minorities but believe that learning to cope in this way is part of growing up and contributes to community. Maybe so. But, personal stress could also translate into more interpersonal tension—not to speak of its effect on classroom performance.
- What of personality incompatibilities, smokers and non-smokers, lovers of loud music and lovers of tranquillity? And what of cultural differences? Would a devout Muslim or Jew find pork in the kitchenette or is the expectation that these are just the sort of differences we should be training our students to live with?

Substantive Issue 2. Would we be taking sides in intragroup ideological debates such as that between black integrationists and black nationalists?

D.1.c., regarding an examination of integrated residential living at peer institutions, is a good idea. Such an exploration should precede design of our policy.

In sum, the policy will present the Office of Residential Living with a first-class headache in trying to deal with appeals for exceptions.

— Signed by Samuel Z. Klausner, Professor of Sociology

Recommendations in Order of Anticipated Completion

A. Recommendations to Be Acted on Immediately

A.1. The following recommendations should serve as guidelines to the committees responsible for the replacement of the Racial Harassment Policy and the revision of student judicial procedures.

A.1.a. Student speech, as such, should not be the basis of disciplinary action.

A.1.b. Student speech may be the subject of discipline under general rules of conduct.

A.1.c. The University has a duty to educate for community. In particular, this duty encompasses fostering those values of tolerance and mutual respect that lie at the heart of the academic enterprise. Fidelity to those values is crucial if the paramount mission of a secular academic institution—the shared adventure of seeking knowledge—is to be accomplished.

A.1.d. There should be a level of discipline for minor offenses that is not reported outside the University (e.g., to graduate schools or prospective employers) and a mechanism for diverting appropriate cases to a process that is empowered to impose discipline only at that level.

A.1.e. The process or processes used to resolve allegations of minor student misconduct should be less formal and more expeditious than the process used to resolve allegations of serious student misconduct.

A.1.f. Attention should be given to the development and full utilization of residential disciplinary processes.

A.1.g. The University should consider the establishment and support of a dispute resolution service, to be available when both a complainant and respondent choose it instead of formal processes and also upon referral from the JIO.

A.1.h. Faculty members should continue to play an important role in student disciplinary processes.

A.2. The University administration should ensure that the Charter and Code of Academic Integrity, as recently revised, are faithfully implemented.

A.3. The University administration should ensure that adequate resources are available for the number and quality of personnel required to resolve student conduct issues fairly and efficiently.

A.4. The University administration should reconsider the reporting relationship appropriate for the JIO. A clear line of responsibility for reporting should be defined.

A.5. The President and Provost should designate a crisis team, composed of the President, senior administrative and academic officers, campus security, faculty and student representatives to assess incidents and mobilize the campus to respond to crisis incidents of intolerant behavior. A hotline should be set up to allow reporting of incidents, and to provide accurate information to the campus community regarding incidents and to dispel rumors.

C.1. The Provost should convene an *ad hoc* committee immediately to reassess the quality of, and the role of faculty members in, advising across the schools. Its report should be completed within a year.

C.4. Clear norms of civility, honesty, academic integrity, and responsibility for being an effective member of the community should be articulated to students during orientation, and regularly and consistently thereafter. Orientation should not be confined to the first week of the year, but should continue over the entire year. This orientation should address codes of conduct and academic integrity, as well as the Guidelines on Open Expression (and thus require the leadership of the faculty and deans of the schools).

C.5. The President and Provost should promote community service programs both inside and outside the established curriculum.

D.4. The Provost should carefully evaluate the quality of off-campus housing. No substandard housing should be listed by the University, and the Executive Vice President should work with the Philadelphia Department of Licenses and Inspections to ensure that any housing offered for rent in the University vicinity meets at least minimum housing regulations.

In addition, the University needs to increase its commitment to working with its neighbors for the improvement of the neighboring communities.

D.5. The Provost should make a particular effort to ease the transition of international graduate students into University life.

E.4. A fund should be established that would provide money for the co-sponsorship of events that would promote interaction among different groups on campus, as well as providing support for student-sponsored activities celebrating cultural differences. In addition, general University social activities that would bring together faculty, students and staff, should be continued and broadened.

E.5. Issues regarding public safety should be reevaluated. As part of that process we urge consideration of the following:

a) The Executive Vice President should place all campus safety under the supervision of the Division of Public Safety.

b) The Executive Vice President and Division of Public Safety should integrate the University Police officers more into the University community through non-emergency contact with students, faculty and other staff by

1) involving the Division of Public Safety when administrative decisions are made on any issues relating to the safety of students and laws regulating student behavior;

2) developing programs that will foster better relationships with students, beginning in the first year;

3) emphasizing the positive contributions of police officers to the University community.

c) The Division of Public Safety should direct the training of police officers in handling situations affected by cultural difference and the unique character of a university community, and should recruit more female and minority officers.

d) The Executive Vice President should form a Police Advisory Board.

e) The Offices of Transportation and Physical Plant should pay continuing attention to the upgrading of lighting on campus and to the consistent provision of reliable transportation services.

E.6. The Division of Public Safety should enforce a consistent police response to alcohol abuse on campus.

F.1. The Provost should oversee the publication of a complete student resource guide, which would contain procedures and policies, and information about student resources and opportunities for scholarships and financial aid, as soon as possible (and by September of 1994 at the latest). Each student should be provided with a copy of the handbook, and should sign a form indicating he or she has received it. This guide should be provided electronically as well as in a handbook format. A central resource hotline, possibly an extension of the "R.A.P. Line," is highly desirable.

F.2. We urge *The Daily Pennsylvanian* to carry a student information bulletin board that lists student resources free, and on a rotating basis, so that all resources are not listed in every edition, but would appear periodically.

F.3. The Executive Vice President and the Office of Human Resources should ensure that an employee handbook is in the hands of every University employee within one month of this report, and after that the handbook should be provided to each employee at the time of hiring. The handbook should be appropriate for the employee's classification and cover all rights, privileges, benefits, and obligations of the employee.

F.4. The Provost should ensure that a centralized, updated listing of ongoing student activities is easily available on the campus.

F.5. The President, the Provost, and the Executive Vice President should consult and communicate clearly and openly about any University policies or plans that can have an impact on the Philadelphia community.

F.6. We urge *The Daily Pennsylvanian* to consider making use of the services of an ombudsman, which is a common journalistic practice.

(continued next page)

G.1. A position description must exist for every staff position and each staff member must have a copy of his or her position description. Supervisors must regularly review position descriptions and revise them as needed.

G.2. Every staff member must receive a written performance evaluation annually. Consideration should be given to down-up evaluations so that supervisors can also receive feedback from those they supervise.

G.4. Human Resources should develop a career planning service that clarifies career paths and needed skills, while underscoring the mutual responsibility of University and staff members. This service should be available to interested staff members.

G.5. Human Resources should remind units of the difference between regular employment status and temporary employment status. Units are responsible for accurately informing staff regarding their employment status.

G.6. The results of the Pay Equity Study should be made public in the Spring of 1994, and action should be taken to address problem areas.

G.7. All University employees should be referred to by their employment status, not their pay categories.

G.8. The Executive Vice President should provide a mediation process for staff, so that when a person feels aggrieved by a superior the two may talk with a neutral third party about the grievance to seek some resolution.

B. Recommendations to Be Acted on Within One Year

B.1. The Provost should convene an *ad hoc* faculty committee on faculty roles and responsibilities. The Committee should address: 1) the defining of University values, including the standards of faculty conduct; and 2) the ways in which the faculty's traditional teaching and research responsibilities are related to constructive engagement in the life of the University community, and the wider community of which the University is a part. This discussion should produce a clear statement of expectations regarding faculty roles and responsibilities within one year.

B.2. The Provost and deans of schools should take steps to encourage faculty members to take a more active part in the life of the campus, particularly in activities that are conducive to building community, respect, and cooperation. In addition to teaching and research, this aspect of faculty performance should be considered in all salary and promotion decisions.

B.3. The President, Provost and Deans should ensure that faculty members appointed to significant administrative and supervisory positions are provided with a suitable orientation in order to fulfill their budgetary, supervisory and other responsibilities.

B.4. Senior administrators, faculty members, teaching assistants, and other academic supervisors should periodically be informed about issues concerning harassment on the basis of race, gender, ethnicity, age, religion, disabilities, and sexual orientation. Deans and department chairs in particular should be informed of the processes for receiving, forwarding, and resolving complaints of harassment.

B.5. The President, Provost, Executive Vice President, deans, and departments should strengthen their efforts to increase the number of women and minority graduate students, faculty, staff, and administrators.

C.2. The Provost and Undergraduate Deans of the appropriate Schools should call for the development of courses that would address: 1) the variety of cultures, races, religions and ethnic groups; 2) the history of cooperation and conflict among these groups; and 3) the social practices of stereotyping. Such courses should be well-advertised, capable of satisfying distributional requirements of the different undergraduate schools, and easily available and attractive to all students. In addition, the curriculum committees of the schools should consider whether these or similar courses already existing should be required.

C.3. The Provost and Undergraduate Deans should expand the number of courses taught in residences.

D.1. The University must provide the structure and resources to ensure that the undergraduate first-year on-campus living experience reflects the rich variety of the Penn community. To fulfill this aim, the Provost should:

- a) Assign all first-year students to designated houses/colleges for a trial period (academic year 1995-1996 to 2000-2001);
- b) With a committee of faculty and students, consider a variety of models for assigning students to first-year houses;
- c) Design and execute a study that measures the quality of student life and the outcomes of undergraduate living experiences during this period;

- d) Appoint a task force to explore our peer institutions' approaches that facilitate integrated residential living;
- f) Direct the Penn fraternities and sororities to delay their rush period until the first semester of the second year.

D.2. The Provost should implement the University of Pennsylvania version of a College House system as soon as possible. Existing dormitories and other buildings should be used to the fullest extent to allow the prompt establishment of at least part of a house system. The planning necessary for full implementation of a living/learning environment should begin immediately.

D.3. The Provost and Executive Vice President should oversee the renovation and reorganization of the High Rises to create smaller community groups within each building.

E.1. A barrier-free coffee house and gathering place should be established on Locust Walk. This space should be accessible to all members of the University Community and should be open late in the evening. We also recommend that the Bookstore have extended hours and consider adding a coffee and browsing area.

E.3. We strongly endorse the recommendation that Locust Walk be made as representative of the total community as soon as possible.

E.7. The Executive Vice President should ensure that all offices offering community resources are located in wheelchair-accessible locations. The relative wheelchair accessibility of meeting and social areas should be clearly indicated in Penn publications such as *Almanac*, *The Compass* and the *Facilities for Student Activities* handbook produced by the Office of the Vice Provost for University Life. All people responsible for building information should be instructed how people with disabilities may enter and travel within those buildings. In addition, all transportation vehicles should be wheelchair-accessible.

G.3. All supervisors must support training as an important part of every regular employee's role and must assure that staff members receive the necessary orientation and training for their jobs and for the responsibilities of belonging to the University community. Human Resources is responsible for designing and offering relevant training programs and for making these programs accessible.

G.3.a. Individual job orientation is essential. Each department must assure that staff members attend the University's New Employee Orientation and that each staff member is oriented to his or her position.

G.3.b. Supervisory training should be mandatory for all supervisors. Departments are responsible for ensuring that all their supervisors attend, both when they first assume a University supervisory role and periodically during that person's tenure as a supervisor, so they may stay informed of changes in University policies and procedures.

G.3.c. Training about how to work with people of different genders, ages, races, religions, ethnicities, sexual orientations and physical disabilities is relevant for all staff. This training should be mandatory for supervisors and incorporated into supervisory training. Aspects of this training should be integrated into the new employee orientation. Additional separate training programs with more depth in this subject are also appropriate. Departments should ensure that their staff members attend. The Office of Affirmative Action and the Office of Human Resources should collaborate on the design of these programs and make sure that they are offered on a regular basis and are available to staff.

G.3.d. Staff members who are in positions that bring them in contact with students, staff, faculty and visitors must be provided with customer service training and updated information about the University. Department heads must make sure that their staff have access to the information needed to do their jobs. Human Resources should work with the Provost and Executive Vice President to identify the units which need this training and then work with the units to develop the training.

C. Long-term Recommendations

D.1.e. In conjunction with the recommendations regarding first-year housing, decide by the year 2000 on the residential model that would be the best fit for students in a pluralistic Penn community in the next century.

E.2. A new barrier-free student center, which will house meeting and performance spaces, socializing areas, and a common calendar advertising all campus events of interest to students, should be built as soon as possible. The timetable for its construction should be determined and made public as soon as possible.

Commission on Strengthening the University Community

Janice Bellace
Vice Dean and Director
Wharton Undergraduate Division

Mary Frances Berry
Geraldine R. Segal Professor of History

Christopher H. Browne (C'69)
University Trustee

Stephen B. Burbank
Robert G. Fuller, Jr., Professor of Law

Rebecca W. Bushnell
Director of the Commission
Associate Professor of English and Graduate Chair

Gloria Twine Chisum (Gr'60)
Chair of the Commission
University Trustee

Murray Friedman
Regional Director, American Jewish Committee

Rev. William H. Gray, III
President and CEO, United Negro College Fund

Allen J. Green
Associate Director of the Commission
Director of the African American Resource Center
Assistant to the Provost

A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr.
Of Counsel, Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton and Garrison
University Trustee

Norma P. Killebrew (CW'61)
University Trustee

Samuel Z. Klausner
Professor of Sociology

Amy L. McQuiston
Assistant to the Commission

The Hon. Louis H. Pollak
United States District Court

Patricia Reid
Administrative Assistant, Chemistry Department

Adrienne Riley
Assistant Vice President, Human Resources

Mita Sanghavi
Undergraduate Representative

Jorge Santiago-Aviles
Associate Professor and Undergraduate Chair,
Electrical Engineering

Benjamin S. Shen
Reese Flower Professor of Astronomy and Astrophysics

Jan Van der Spiegel
Associate Professor of Electrical Engineering

Peter Vaughan
Associate Professor of Social Work

M.J. Warrender
Graduate Representative

Susan Watkins
Associate Professor of Sociology

Rosalyn J. Watts
Associate Professor of Nursing

Jacqueline Wexler
University Trustee Emeritus

Working Group Members of the Commission

Ron Acker, Jr.
Office Administrative Assistant
International Programs

Cathy DiBonaventura
Administrative Assistant
Data Communications and Computing Services

Ancil George
Head, Rosengarten Reserve Room

Beth Hirschfelder
Undergraduate Student

Ashley Magids
Undergraduate Student

David Mestre
Graduate Student

Michael Nadel
Undergraduate Student

Andrew Nestler
Graduate Student

Joanna Paul
Undergraduate Student

Donna Samuel
Manager, Executive Master of Science in Engineering Program

Karen Schiff
Graduate Student

Barry Stupine
Associate Dean, Veterinary Medicine
Director, Veterinary Hospital

Michele Taylor
Administrative Assistant
Biochemistry / Dental Medicine

**Preliminary Report of the Commission on
Strengthening the University Community**
100 College Hall • Philadelphia PA 19104 / 6303