

**Year End Reports of  
University Council Committees,  
1992-93**

**Contents**

Admissions & Financial Aid .....	S-2
Bookstore .....	S-3
Communications.....	S-3
Community Relations .....	S-3
Facilities .....	S-4
International Programs .....	S-5
Personnel Benefits .....	S-7
Recreation & Intercollegiate Athletics.....	S-7
Student Affairs .....	S-7

# Year End Reports of University Council Committees, 1992-93

## **Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid Report on Mayor's Scholarships**

*Approved August 3, 1993  
Revised and approved December 15, 1993*

During the 1992-93 Academic Year, the University Council's Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid studied the Mayor's Scholarship Program. In this report, we briefly review the history of the program, the recent agreement between the University and the City of Philadelphia, the selection process, and the suit by the Public Interest Law Center of Philadelphia (PILCOP). We then present several unresolved issues and concerns that are mainly related to the decision by Judge Diaz and the appeal initiated by the PILCOP.

### **History**

In 1882, an ordinance was passed in which land owned by the City was transferred to Penn in exchange for 50 scholarships awarded to students from the Philadelphia public schools. In 1910, a second ordinance transferred additional land to the University in exchange for 75 additional scholarships awarded to students from all of the schools in Philadelphia. In the 1950s, Penn instituted a need-based financial-aid policy. In order to integrate the Mayor's Scholarship Program into this policy, Mayor James Tate and President Harnwell agreed that the University's obligation would be the dollar equivalent of 75 times tuition, rather than 75 full-tuition scholarships. As a result, the amount of individual awards would vary according to the recipients' needs, and the number of students who receive awards could exceed 75.

In 1977, to raise capital funds, the University needed City approval to mortgage property previously received by the University. When the mortgage was granted, the scholarship ordinances were redrafted. The two previous ordinances were coalesced into a single ordinance which specified scholarship aid for Philadelphia students in an amount equal to 125 times tuition (totaled over all four classes, i.e., 125 times \$15,200 [1992-93], which equals \$1.9 million).

### **University-City Agreement**

In 1992, the University and the City entered into an agreement whereby the University agreed to implement a recruitment program with a goal to increase the number of Philadelphia students from 325 to 500 by 1997. The agreement also established a special, loan-free aid package for students selected as Mayor's Scholars, starting with the Class of 1997.

The total value of the awards which the Committee can make to new applicants is the overall obligation under the ordinance (125 times tuition), less the projected amount needed to fund continuing Mayor's Scholars. Needy Philadelphia students not selected as Mayor's Scholars would be aided under normal University policy, except that each would receive \$500 more grant per year, and \$500 less loan, than they would otherwise have received were they not from Philadelphia.

### **Selection Process**

In early February, Mayor's Scholarship applications are mailed to students in the Philadelphia high schools who are residents of Philadelphia and have requested financial aid in their applications to the University of Pennsylvania (in 1992-93, 275 applications were mailed, to be returned by March 22). The Financial Aid Office then prepares a slate of admitted students, who have not yet received acceptance letters, indicating:

- (1) the student's need, as determined by the University of Pennsylvania's Office of Student Financial Services,
- (2) the student's academic credentials, and
- (3) a projected amount of the Mayor's Scholarship, based upon the student's need.

The Mayor's Scholarship Committee (MSC), appointed by the Mayor, meets to select the Mayor's Scholarship (MS) recipients (in 1992-93, it met on March 25 to select the recipients for 1993-94). The MSC sets the criteria for selection with the advice of the University's Director of Financial Aid. This year, the MSC selected the most needy students. Mayor's Scholarships are awarded, taking into account the projected yield of acceptances, until the MSC projects that the equivalent of 125 times full tuition (= \$1.9 million in 1992-93) will be accepted by the awardees. The remaining needy students receive financial aid from the University, but are not Mayor's Scholars. For illustration, consider typical Mayor's Scholarships for students having different needs (dollars/year):

Need	\$23,000	\$12,000
Work-study	1,500	1,500
Outside grant	3,400	
MS	18,100	10,500

The needier student, who typically receives a grant from federal, state, or other agencies, receives a MS in excess of full tuition (\$15,200 in 1992-93). The less needy student receives a MS for less than full tuition. This student may elect to supplement his or her scholarship with a low-interest loan.

### **PILCOP Suit**

PILCOP claimed in its suit that, under the 1977 ordinance, the University agreed to provide 125 full-tuition scholarships to each freshman class, totaling 500 full-tuition scholarships for all four classes (i.e., 500 students times \$15,200 per student, in 1992-93, which equals \$7.6 million, or over 20 percent of Penn's undergraduate financial-aid budget). Both the University and the City, however, agree that there was no change intended in the level of Penn's obligations; that is, students in all four classes were to continue receiving scholarship aid in the amount of 125 times full tuition. The University's position is supported by the following facts in 1977:

- (1) no additional land was transferred to the University,
- (2) no press announcements appeared,
- (3) no communication with the Vice President of Finance (who handled the negotiations with the City), before or after the new ordinance, questioned the impact of *quadrupling* the financial aid to Philadelphia students, and
- (4) the Vice President of Finance shows no record of a step change in our obligations in scholarship aid to Philadelphia students.

Judge Diaz's principal ruling is that PILCOP cannot legally bring suit against the University because "the plaintiffs do not have standing as third party beneficiaries;" i.e., none were Mayor's Scholars who received less than full tuition. In addition, he concluded that:

- (1) "The total number of scholarships the University of Pennsylvania is obligated to provide in any given year to deserving students is 125, four-year, full-tuition scholarships,"
- (2) "The University has underfunded its obligation to provide 125, four-year, full-tuition scholarships,"
- (3) "Mayor's Scholarships may be awarded to graduates of Philadelphia high schools only," and
- (4) "The new agreement between the City and University, is not valid." These decisions give rise to several concerns that are addressed hereafter.

## Unresolved Issues and Concerns

The Admissions and Financial Aid (AFA) Committee has considered several issues that are important to the University as the debate over the Mayor's Scholarships continues:

**Eligibility for Selection.** To date, the MSC has considered only freshman applicants for new awards; transfer students, General Education (GED) Certificate holders, evening students who are degree candidates, College of General Studies (CGS) students, and graduate students have not been considered. The committee recommends that the MSC continue to focus on the freshman applicants, but also consider the eligibility of these other categories of students, especially the transfer students.

**Need-based Awards.** Because Mayor's Scholars have been selected according to need, many Mayor's Scholars have received grants less than full tuition. Judge Diaz suggests that these scholarships are underfunded, but it is not a ruling to which the University is bound. It continues to be the University's position that the language "or the equivalent" in the 1977 ordinance permits the awarding of more or less than full-tuition scholarships based upon need.

**Impact of Agreement Between University and City.** By 1997, the University will seek to increase the number of students from Philadelphia high schools by 175. Assuming no growth in the student body, this represents approximately 2% of the 9000 undergraduate students; i.e., 2% fewer non-Philadelphians. Furthermore, assuming that 75% of these students are needy, 135 more Philadelphians will be aided; and, assuming that 35% of the non-Philadelphians they will replace would have been aided, 60 fewer non-Philadelphians will be aided. The net difference is 75 new aid packages, which at an average grant of \$11,000 per student will require \$825,000. The incremental need can be addressed by: (1) increasing the undergraduate aid budget, or (2) redistributing aid from non-Philadelphia students (at an average of \$200-250 per non-Philadelphia aided student).

## Recommendations

As the University and the City administer the Mayor's Scholarship program, the Admissions and Financial Aid Committee recommends that:

1. The MSC continue to focus on the freshman applicants. It should also consider the eligibility of transfer students, as well as GED certificate holders, evening students, and CGS students.

2. The University continue its efforts to increase the number of applications from Philadelphia students through improved public relations activities. The recently developed flyer is very attractive and appears to be effective in increasing the public awareness of the Mayor's Scholarship Program. In addition, it is recommended that the names of the recipients of Mayor's Scholarships be announced in an article published in the *Philadelphia Inquirer*. This, and similar public relations activities, should be designed to improve the image of the University as a leading institution that is accessible to needy students. It should also help the University to achieve its goal of accommodating 500 Philadelphians in the undergraduate student body by 1997.

3. The University reallocate its resources, as necessary, to meet the agreement between the University and the City. The Admissions and Financial Aid Committee considers that the agreement is not likely to impact significantly the diversity of the student body and the financial-aid program.

— Warren D. Seider, Chair

## Bookstore

The 1992-1993 report of the Bookstore Committee was published in *Almanac* on November 9, 1993, and presented by its chair, Dr. Stephen Gale, for discussion at the University Council on November 10. Deliberations concerned two principal areas: administrative/financial matters, and development of an intellectually supportive environment.

An administrative/financial issue discussed but left unresolved—and to be taken up by the 1993-94 Committee—was the proposed use of a PennCard credit card or declining balance card. The 1992-93 Committee "feels very strongly that the advantages afforded by the use of such a card should be limited to the Bookstore itself and not to the other merchants in the area."

Noting that the Revlon Center will not be in operation for at least three years, and that the Bookstore has "to as great a degree as possible and given its space limitations undertaken a strong effort to develop a vibrant environment for a first-rate package of goods and services for the University," the Committee urged that the Bookstore be enabled to supply one missing element, "a well organized, well integrated, intellectually directed component." The Committee "went on record as voting unanimously for the development of a 'bookstore/coffeehouse' facility which would provide a strong, intellectually based facility in the now-vacant fraternity house on the corner of 37th Street and Locust Walk."

[Editor's Summary]

## Communications

The Committee's report was published in full in *Almanac* December 7, and was presented by its chair, Ira Winston, for discussion at the December 8 Council meeting.

The report noted the adoption of its recommended Policy on Ethical Behavior with Respect to the Electronic Information Environment (*Almanac* "For Comment" April 27, 1993; "Of Record" July 13, 1993).

The Committee reported a TQM team's findings that "once mail is received by a mailroom, and identified as belonging to that mail room, procedures for its distribution are relatively efficient," and its interim recommendations for (1) refinements in the return of misdirected mail to Penn Mail Service and (2) publication of guidelines for mail handlers.

The Committee also looked into the closing of the Houston Hall post office, which has been replaced by a franchise operation.

Begun in the 1992-93 Committee and continued to the 1993-94 Committee is the issue of privacy of electronic information. "There is little consensus at Penn on how much privacy an individual can expect. Nor are there clear guidelines on handling request for information about an individual," the report states. It goes on to say that a subcommittee led by David Millar, the University's Information Security Officer, drafted a policy which was found by Neil Hamburg of the University General Counsel's Office to limit the ability of the University to conduct investigations without exposing itself to significant liability.

The report then advised that a Computer Privacy Task Force would be convened in Fall 1993, led by David Millar and Ira Winston:

- (1) To develop a statement of the problems facing Penn with respect to computer privacy.
- (2) To develop options for resolving the problems.
- (3) To recommend solutions to the problems.

The task force's recommendations "will guide the creation of a University Computer Privacy Policy, which will be developed under the direction of the Communications Committee."

[Editor's Summary]

## Community Relations

The 1992-1993 Community Relations Committee convened during a year of exciting and positive change in the University's relationship with the surrounding community. Much of the year centered around learning about and discussing that change, and how the Committee could best support what was already happening and suggest areas for further exploration.

The establishment of the Center for Community Partnerships and its efforts during the past year under Ira Harkavy have been emblematic of the University's commitment to building stronger ties beyond the immediate Penn boundaries. Since Glenn Bryan's arrival, the Office of Community Relations has been enormously pro-active in monitoring and nurturing the University's image and role with the wider community. The Office of Off-Campus Living's "Commitment to the Area" document represents a major step in that office's efforts to encourage members of the Penn community to consider living nearby. Lastly, the rapid development of the "Penn Faculty and Staff for Neighborhood Issues" group is a new and positive grass-roots effort by people who are committed members of both communities; their goal is to make "the well-being of the communities surrounding the University among the highest priorities of the institution over the next ten years." All of these unprecedented developments have made for a year of discovery and discussion, as well as informal evaluation of how the committee can best fulfill its responsibility to Council.

Independent of these movements, the committee explored issues related to the quality of life in the surrounding community, and formulated a number of suggestions which we have passed on to Council. Ranging from trash and recycling to health care issues, the committee has urged greater coordination among existing organizations and the development of new programs where important needs are not yet addressed.

The Committee feels that all of the developments mentioned above are constructive ones, and would like Council to join us in encouraging the University to continue pursuing the course it has adopted. Former President Sheldon Hackney echoed this sentiment through a part of his response to the Faculty-Staff Group's "Statement of Community Concern" in *Almanac* April 27, 1993: "Your call for making the well-being of the communities surrounding the University among Penn's highest priorities is a position I endorse strongly." With this in mind, the Committee recommended that Council:

- Support the continued efforts of the Center for Community Partnerships and the Director of Community Relations;
- Further the Committee's recommendations on "Quality of Life" issues in West Philadelphia;
- Endorse the Office of Off-Campus Living's "Commitment to the Area" statement, and;
- Endorse the Penn Faculty and Staff for Neighborhood Issues' "Statement of Community Concern."

— David Grossman, Chair

## Facilities

The goal of the Facilities Committee during the 1992-93 academic year was to acquire a long-term view of the facilities planning process in order that its consultative and review roles might be exercised while projects are in their earliest proposal phases as well as during initial implementation. The committee's responsibilities cannot properly be exercised when plans are already an accomplished fact. The committee met six times during the year, and commissioned a subcommittee on parking to review and recommend actions in that arena.

The primary administrative liaison to the Facilities Committee is Arthur T. Gravina, Vice President for Facilities Management. At its meeting on October 20, Mr. Gravina provided the committee with an initial overview of his office's responsibilities, which include the University departments of Physical Plant, Facilities Planning, and Project Management. He is directly responsible to the President and Provost for all physical aspects of University operations, and to the Trustees Committee on Facilities and Long-range Campus Planning. The University Council Committee on Facilities is therefore the campus analog to the Trustees Committee.

Mr. Gravina also provided an update on various construction projects, including the Law School addition, Revlon Center, the Institute for Advanced Science and Technology (IAST), the Biomedical Research Building (BRB), the HUP "swing building," classroom renovations, the parking structure and chiller plant for 38th and Walnut, and the planned Cogeneration Plant. It was expected that the Law School addition and BRB would be completed

in the coming year, that construction of the HUP "swing building" would continue on schedule, and that construction of the parking/chiller plant structure would commence. The Revlon Center was subject to further review and cost assessments and the IAST was subject to further federal review. The Provost committed funds to classroom renovations for the coming summer.

Mr. Gravina agreed to meet with the Committee Chair regarding project proposals and plans for presentation to the committee. The Chair will also serve on the Design Review committee (advisory to the President) in coordination with the Facilities Committee.

At its meeting of November 17, the Committee was briefed by Dr. Gigi Simeone, Director of Residential Living, regarding student housing. She indicated that Penn is unique in the variety of housing provided to students, including the college house systems, low and high-rise buildings ranging from 100 to 550 residents, with single and multiple occupancy rooms and suites of rooms.

Focus group and survey studies of student preferences suggest that single rooms are important to students, and that Residential Living is seeking to accommodate student needs in relation to the wider housing market near campus. Current occupancy rates are 94.7% for undergraduate and 96% for graduate student housing. Planned cosmetic upgrading of student residential facilities is accomplished on a five-year cycle, with physical renovation and painting occurring during the summer months.

In response to questions regarding a capital plan for major renovations, Dr. Simeone estimated that the costs for the high rises alone would be in the range of \$37 million. No current funding plan exists. Questions were also raised regarding hardwiring for computing. The residences are not hardwired for computers with the exception of a pilot program in Kings Court. The Committee suggested that the University administration consider renovation of residences as a high priority, and that within the next year Kim Morrisson, Vice Provost for University Life, discuss with the committee the report titled, "Residential Planning for the 21st Century."

Michael Eleey, Associate Vice Provost for Information Systems and Computing, described for the committee the decentralized campus computing system. He noted that computer labs for students are currently saturated, and that access to additional space was severely constrained. In response to questions regarding the wiring of residences, Mr. Eleey indicated that the Vice Provost's office was actively investigating this area, subject to funding, including negotiations with cable vendors and others who might be involved in a data-video-audio-telephonic packaging. Fiber optics are also being assessed, but at present appear to involve a multi-million dollar expenditure. The phased wiring of residences is being studied. Mr. Eleey estimated that 40-50% of undergraduate students bring their own computers to campus, and a somewhat larger percentage of graduate students. He recommended that the Committee consult further with Daniel Updegrove regarding these issues.

The Chair reported on discussions in the Design Review Committee regarding replacement of the bluestone in Levy Park, and on architectural designs for the HUP "swing building," the Wistar Cafe, and the proposed move of the Othmer Library (for the history of Chemistry) to a new site in a renovated chapel building on the former Divinity School grounds.

The Committee was briefed on the draft campus bicycles policy at its December 15 meeting by James Miller, Director of Fire and Occupational Safety, and Louis Visco, Director of Maintenance and Utilities (Physical Plant). This policy was prepared by the University Police Department and sent to the University Council Committee on Safety and Security, with proposals to provide a sufficient number of bike racks at appropriate locations so that actual bicycle riding on pedestrian ways in the interior of campus can be regulated through education and proper enforcement. The committee supported these efforts.

Daniel Updegrove, Associate Vice Provost for Information Systems and Computing, provided the committee with a detailed overview of University computing structures and needs in the face of a rapidly changing technological environment. He focused particularly on alternatives and implications of hardwiring the high-rises for data-video-audio integrated circuits, under the constraint of one module outlet for every "pillow" in the residence. The project was viewed as requiring four to five summers



to complete. In Committee discussion, suggestions were made that all wiring for any residence be done at the same time, that such provisions would reduce the pressure on campus labs and could enhance academic instruction, and that costs ought to be reflected in tuition or room charges. It was recommended that this presentation be referred to University Council for their consideration, and that Mr. Updegrave be invited to return to the Facilities Committee for a future updating.

The January 19 meeting was a closed presentation of the long-range campus Master Plan by Dr. Robert Zemsky, Director of the Institute for Research on Higher Education, who has been directing involved with the plan's development over the past several years. Since this was a briefing meeting for members of the Committee, no minutes were taken. The subcommittee on Parking, chaired by Dr. George Palladino, was commissioned to discuss with Robert Furniss, Director of Transportation and Parking, the issue of parking rates for the coming year.

The Division of Facilities Management adopted Total Quality Management (TQM) procedures several years ago, and has initiated several projects using TQM teams. At its February 16 meeting, the Committee was briefed by James Wargo, Executive Director of the Department of Physical Plant, regarding these projects and the ways in which TQM has been implemented within the division and department.

Mr. Wargo described the background of TQM in manufacturing and suggested some of the difficulties in transferring issues of measurement into service areas. One of the first TQM teams concerned University trash removal, and Mr. Wargo outlined the team's accomplishments and continuing functions. Similar teams have been assembled for the bluestone problems in Levy Park, physical plant needs in the university's schools, and for overall physical and capital planning under the name of PennSpace. Two issues seemed to emerge from the discussion—one involving who "owns" a particular project in terms of committing funding to it and the other involving a project's customers whose needs must be satisfied.

The Committee received from the parking subcommittee preliminary information regarding the combined budgeting for parking and transportation, and that campus escort and transportation costs have been escalating rapidly as one factor in the budget. The subcommittee agreed to continue its discussions.

At its meeting of April 20, the Committee was briefed by Mr. Arthur Gravina, on the new PennSpace program for Facilities Management. This is an effort to identify systematically and shape a priority listing of campus physical plant projects as these are proposed, and as they move from the Schools and Resource Centers to Capital Council and the Trustees for possible implementation. As a planning process framework, PennSpace is intended to contain costs by identifying current and future projects, their critical paths in relation to funding sources, to existing infrastructure and facilities support, and to other component projects and needs. The key notion is to anticipate and resolve critical issues by review and analysis prior to capital expenditures.

Current projects, and those expected to be initiated in the coming fiscal year, are known as Schedule 1 projects, which require approval by the administration's Capital Council and the Trustees for final implementation. Schedule 2 projects are those on the "drawing board," having School or Resource Center, Capital Council and Trustee support, but needing further study and/or identification of costs and funding sources. Schedule 3 projects are further removed on the time, planning and funding horizon. In discussion, the Committee viewed the PennSpace framework as providing a helpful structuring to University facilities planning, and urged that the committee's role enter this process as early as possible if its work was to be most effective.

The Committee received the report from the Parking subcommittee recommending that there be no increase in parking permit fees for the coming academic year, and that the cost of Escort service and campus transportation be removed from the parking budget. The facilities committee voted unanimously to make this recommendation to University Council and directed the Chair to forward a letter with this recommendation to Mr. Steven Murray, Vice President for Business Services.

In accord with its revised charge, the Facilities Committee of University Council during 1992-93 kept under review the facilities planning

process and sought to develop an understanding of its advisory roles and responsibilities regarding campus physical plant and long-range planning. Implementation of PennSpace should provide an important tool in appraising the committee early in the development process of significant plans that affect the physical facilities of the University, which will make its initiative, appraisal and recommendations more timely and pertinent. The Committee especially wishes to thank Mr. Arthur Gravina for his steady commitment to its work.

— Melvyn Hammarberg, Chair

## International Programs

The Council Committee on International Programs met six times during the 1992-93 Academic Year. As in previous years the Committee concerned itself with a broad range of matters relating to the University's expanding international activities including: the quality of the international environment at Penn; the quality and range of Penn-sponsored student/faculty exchange programs; adequacy of services for international students and scholars; and, Penn's cooperative undertakings with foreign universities and research institutes. The Committee also sought to monitor the University's initial progress in implementing the internationalization objectives outlined in Penn's recently adopted *International Mission Statement* (Almanac March 24, 1992):

- the preparation of its students and faculty to be members of a more cohesive world;
- the generation of knowledge on a more global orientation; and
- the provision of its academic resources, to the extent feasible, to nations and to institutions involved in international activities.

Thus, along with those of the Office for International Programs (OIP), the areas of responsibility and oversight activities of the Committee on International Programs have expanded dramatically over the last several years.

## Penn's International Dimension

### The State of Internationalization at Penn

Various assessments were conducted during the 1992/93 academic year concerning the current state of Penn's internationalization. The results of these surveys were published in two widely disseminated reports:

*Factbook About International Programs at the University of Pennsylvania* (prepared by the OIP and excerpted in *Almanac* March 24, 1992)

*Provost's Report on Penn's International Dimensions* (*Almanac* January 12, 1993)

In addition to these two reports, the recently established Trustees' Committee on Internationalization issued a report that identified the Trustees' priorities concerning the need for further, and more rapid, internationalization of the University (June, 1992). The Student Committee on Undergraduate Education issued also a separate report, *White Paper on International Study* (June 1992), that identified the need for increased Penn-sponsored study abroad opportunities as an urgent priority of undergraduate students. And, the University's Development Office prepared the Penn's first *Strategic Plan for International Development* (June 1993). The Development Office's report identifies various roles that Penn's international alumni can play in helping the University attain its internationalization objectives.

Hence, and with the exception of the very general statistics concerning international students and visiting scholars at Penn that are reported below, the reader is referred to the first two reports for information concerning Penn's current international profile.<sup>1</sup>

### A New International Academic Plan

In June 1993, the broad purposes outlined in the University's *International Mission Statement* were operationalized into nine programmatic goals. Referred to as *A Three Year International Academic Plan, 1993-1996*, the new International Academic Plan reflects the findings, priorities,

<sup>1</sup> Copies of these reports may be obtained from the Office of International Programs. Copies of the Trustees' report and the Development Office strategic plan may be obtained from the Secretary's office.

and recommendations for action contained in the preceding surveys and reports (OIP, 10/13/93). The plan assigns priority to the following programmatic goals:

- Goal 1. implementing internationally-oriented curricula;
- Goal 2. enhancing language instruction across the University;
- Goal 3. promoting area studies and internationally-focused programs;
- Goal 4. enhancing library access to international scholarship;
- Goal 5. promoting undergraduate study abroad;
- Goal 6. providing more opportunities for faculty exchange;
- Goal 7. developing more opportunities for graduate and professional students to be involved in international programs;
- Goal 8. enhancing the integration of international students, scholars and visitors at Penn; and,
- Goal 9. providing more and better services to Penn's international community.

## Penn's International Students

During AY 1992-93 more than 3,000 international students travelled to the United States to begin study at Penn. The most recent annual census of international students conducted by the Institute for International Education, identified Penn as:

- having the sixth largest international student population overall—8% of the undergraduate population and 20% of the graduate and professional student population;
- the fifth largest enrollment of foreign students among four-year institutions; and
- the second largest enrollment of international students among Ivy League institutions, but the largest enrollment of undergraduate international students.

Of particular relevance to the University's internationalization effort is the predominately East- (34%) and South-Asian (8%) origin of students from the ten top feeder countries to Penn (i.e., from Japan, China, Korea, India, Taiwan, and Hong Kong). By comparison, international students from Europe (9%) and Canada (6%) represent only a small percentage of students who matriculated for the first time at Penn during AY 1992/93.

## Penn's International Scholars

During AY 1991-92, 1,146 international scholars traveled from 79 countries to study or work at Penn. As a result, Penn ranks:

- fourth in the Ivy League with respect to the number of visiting scholars;
- fourth in the number of international scholars sponsored through exchange visitor visas (J-1); and
- second in the number of international scholars sponsored on H-1 visas.

## Committee Observations on the Current State of Internationalization at Penn

Based on its review of the various documents made available to the Committee, as well as its meetings with representatives of the central administration, the Committee on International Programs arrived at the following conclusions concerning Penn's current state of internationalization.

1. The University's internationalization is progressing at a rapid pace. Every indication is that, with sustained effort, Penn can succeed in attaining its goal of developing into a truly global campus.
2. Penn has entered into new formal agreements with leading research universities located in Europe, Latin America, and Asia.
3. The internationalization efforts of both central administration and those of individual schools and departments appear to be in keeping with the spirit of Penn's recently adopted *International Mission Statement* and in congruence with Penn's nine international programmatic goals.
4. Though occurring in a major way in selected schools and departments of the University (especially in Wharton, Medicine, Arts & Sciences), increased internationalization has become a major quest of the vast majority of academic and administrative units at Penn.
5. The number of Penn undergraduate students participating in study abroad programs has begun to increase. The expectation is that by 1996 up

to 35% of each graduating class will have participated in a Penn-sponsored study abroad program.

6. Substantial one-time resources have been infused to support the University's international initiatives, especially at the school, inter-school, and departmental levels; however it is not clear that on-going funding can be included in operating budgets.

7. New resources are needed to assist the Library with the enhancement of its international holdings, including the addition of foreign language serials and other regularly issued publications; however, additional international specialists have been added to the Library complement of professional staff.

8. Significant new levels of financial support may eventually be generated from Penn's international alumni.

## Committee Recommendations to University Council

Despite the University's initial successes with implementation of its internationalization efforts, the Council Committee on International Programs does express concern regarding *possible future* duplication of effort between and among the various units that are seeking to promote Penn's internationalization.

More specifically, since 1990 two new University-wide entities have been formed for the purpose of promoting Penn's internationalization: the Provost's Council on International Programs (1990) and the Trustee's Committee on Internationalization (1991). In addition, new international units are now to be found in the School of Arts and Sciences as well as in the Medical, Education, Dental and Wharton schools. Several other academic units on campus also have standing committees that are working on various aspects of their unit's internationalization. Similarly, the offices of the Vice Provost for University Life, the Vice Provost for Graduate Education, and the Office of the Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations all carry major responsibilities for promoting the University's internationalization commitments.

Thus, in order to minimize unwarranted duplication of effort between and among the various units engaged in Penn's internationalization effort, the Committee recommends:

1. that Penn's internationalization efforts be undertaken with a spirit of cooperation between and among all of the administrative and academic units engaged in the effort;
2. that future internationalization efforts of all units of the University reflect the priorities and goals of both the new *International Mission Statement* and the new *Three Year International Academic Plan, 1993-1996* and;
3. that the University ensure strong leadership at the center in promoting integration of all aspects of the University's far-reaching internationalization efforts.

Further, the Committee:

4. *judges* that the Office of International Programs (OIP) is the unit on campus most suited to providing continued leadership in the University's internationalization efforts.
  5. *urges* that the resource base of the OIP be significantly enhanced, especially with respect to OIP's ability to provide the support services needed by the University's growing numbers of international students and scholars;
  6. *urges* that additional professional and support staff be added to the OIP consistent with its expanded functions and responsibilities;
  7. *urges* that additional resources be allocated to the OIP to promote inter-professional and inter-disciplinary internationalization efforts between and among the University's various academic and administrative units
- Finally, the Committee continues to note that:
8. the office space assigned to the OIP is grossly inadequate relative to the numbers of persons utilizing the space and the varied functions that are performed by the Office. At a minimum, relocation of the Office is needed to a more central spot on campus.
  9. the OIP urgently needs space adjoining its offices for at least occasional meeting space for the various international student clubs and organizations that meet on campus.

— Richard J. Estes, Chair

## Personnel Benefits

The Personnel Benefits Committee began the 1992-1993 academic year with work flowing directly from the previous year. The Committee was updated on the issues of FAS 106 and recommended that the following features be considered in alternative plan designs: no addition of spouses and dependents to coverage after retirement; continuous service; use of a cost sharing mechanism; use of a transition window; testing eligibility changes.

Other issues reviewed by the Committee included immunization coverage under the Blue Cross Plans, benefits cost containment in 1993-1994 and Pennflex communications from the Benefits Office. The issue of immunization coverage arose from a law passed by the state of Pennsylvania requiring insurers to provide immunizations for children. While, the University of Pennsylvania was not required to comply with the law, the Benefits Office sought consultation with the Personnel Benefits Committee. The Committee recommended adding immunization coverage to the Blue Cross Plans due to the critical impact the coverage has on the families of University employees. No action was needed with the University's HMO plans since they already offered coverage for immunizations. Immunization coverage under Blue Cross was implemented effective November 21, 1992, the earliest date possible.

As in the previous year, the Committee addressed the issue of benefits cost containment within the framework of benefits as a part of total compensation. The Committee examined the current flexible benefits package and reviewed strategies to control premium costs to the University, faculty and staff within the current package. The Committee recommended the following: an increase in the family deductible for the Blue Cross/Blue Shield 100 Plan from \$300.00 aggregate to \$400.00 aggregate; an increase in the co-pay under Keystone HMO and US Health Care for physicians' office visits from \$2.00 to \$5.00 and a pre-certification clause for the Blue Cross plans. The Benefits Office implemented these recommendations for Pennflex 1993-1994 limiting the premium increase for the Blue Cross plans to 11% and reducing the expected increase in premiums for Keystone and US Health Care.

The Committee also provided the Benefits Office with feedback on the open enrollment process including written communications published by the Benefits Office and the service provided to the community during the enrollment period. The Benefits Office plans to incorporate many of the Committee's suggestions in the upcoming year.

The Committee reviewed two issues which have been forwarded to the agenda for next year: in-service cashability for TIAA-CREF and a review of tuition benefits for employees to outside schools. Analysis of in-service cashability for TIAA-CREF accounts will continue next year as more information becomes available. The issue of tuition benefits for employees to outside schools remains on the Committee's agenda pending final results of a survey conducted by Sandy Smith. Ongoing discussions concerning overall design of benefits including part-time benefits, long term care and disability insurance will continue into the next year.

I would like to thank the members of the Committee for their efforts this year; particularly for the thoughtful dialogue they brought to the table on important issues with significant impact to the community. I would like to extend a special thank you to Sandy Smith for his efforts as a one-man sub-committee on the issue of tuition benefits for employees to outside schools. His efforts in the creation, distribution and analysis of an employee survey will provide the Committee with valuable information next year. I also personally thank Mary Simkins for excellent minutes and Adrienne Riley and Dennis Mahoney for staff support and a high quality of work.

— Elsa Ramsden, Chair

## Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics

The Committee's report, submitted by its chair, Dr. Howard Brody, appeared in full in *Almanac* December 7, 1993, and was presented to the University Council at the meeting of November 10, 1993. Topics of the year were:

- a.) The renovation of athletic (recreational, intramural, and intercollegiate) facilities and the possibility for expanded recreational facilities.
- b.) The impact of spring practice on varsity sports and the dropping of freshman football.
- c.) Parking for faculty/staff with parking stickers who want to park off-hours at recreational facilities.
- d.) Sources of financial support for recreational and possibly expanded hours; priorities for use of athletic and recreational facilities and PENNcard access. It appears that some of the future support of recreation will be coming from the employee benefits pool and the data generated by the PENNcards will determine the amount.
- e.) Committee input on matters of intercollegiate athletics. Two resolutions were passed by the Committee:
  - (1) Whenever possible, the President's Office shall provide the members of the Council Committee on Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics (CCRIA) with the agenda of the Ivy Group Presidents' meeting on athletics before that meeting, so that items that may be of concern to the CCRIA can be discussed. Whenever possible, the President's Office shall provide the members of the CCRIA with any items that were approved at the Ivy Group Presidents' meeting.
  - (2) That one representative of the president be added to the Council Committee on Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics as an *ex officio* member. (*Resolution adopted by University Council November 10.*)
- f.) Adopt-A-Team update (see also notice asking for volunteers, *Almanac* March 23, 1993).
- g.) The Athletic Department's goals and achievements in fundraising.

## Safety and Security

The report of the Council Committee on Safety and Security is expected to be released shortly for publication.

## Student Affairs

The Committee on Student Affairs developed two objectives for the academic year 1992-1993. Each is relatively broad based and encompasses a variety of sub-topics which are reflected in this Report. It should be noted at the onset, however, that the Committee began its discussions with the intention of "unraveling" what appeared to be two relatively complicated questions which were seen to be of general concern on campus and "triggers" for a wide variety of individual task force efforts, institutional research, and informal discussions amongst students, faculty, administrators, and staff. The net result of the Committee's deliberations, we believe, is not so much a definitive statement on programs or initiatives to be implemented, but rather a "statement of purpose" which can be used to help support subsequent analyses and reviews.

**The State of Academic Values.** Perhaps the most compelling concern to all of the members on the Committee might be called "the intellectual environment of the University of Pennsylvania." As it was expressed throughout our deliberations, there was a view that the University of Pennsylvania had either lost—or perhaps not matured into—a fully developed intellectual community worthy of the intellectual standards of a great university. Although many indicators were cited, perhaps the most significant are those of the student members of the Committee. Some of these remarks are paraphrased below:

- Although Penn seems to hold high academic standards, the academic life of students is often compromised by a widely felt need for an expanded *intellectual social life* and the only social experiences Penn seems to offer are those associated with parties and specific club activities.
- The sense of academic community which we had been led to believe was part of the experience to be gained from the University of Pennsylvania seems to be absent, at least in part because the student/faculty interactions have fallen short of our expectations.
- The essential quality of developing a pattern of discourse on campus based on intellectual curiosity, does not seem to be stimulated either



through the direct interaction with faculty or through the general environment provided by the University. Individual students, on the other hand, are rarely prepared, in the absence of faculty involvement, to initiate and expand the level of discourse.

- Aside from selected examples such as freshman seminars and interdisciplinary and independent majors, the University course structure does not appear to be aimed at the stimulation of curiosity, per se, but rather emphasizes training in disciplines. In fact, it feels as if the real aim of many of the programs of the University is not directed at developing an overall sense of intellectual curiosity and having “fun” with one’s mind, but in preparation for specific graduate schools and/or professional education.

- While the professional school/SAS interaction can be used to distinct advantage by the University in developing very important areas of diverse and yet linked discourse, the almost proprietary sense of the schools and departments does not lend itself to the reinforcement of an atmosphere of discourse and curiosity. Indeed, it feels almost as if it is solely up to the students to create such an atmosphere.

- The role of graduate students in the process of creating the sense of discourse and curiosity on campus seems to be hampered at once by their bonding to specific schools and by the arms length manner in which graduate programs are related to undergraduate studies. And while the graduate students on the Committee are clearly in favor of supporting a broader, more interactive role between undergraduates and graduates and the development of an improved intellectual atmosphere at the University, they also feel strong limitations in their ability to create the foundations for such initiatives in the absence of faculty leadership.

Distilling any definitive position from such comments is obviously unfair since all of the remarks were anecdotal in nature. At the same time, the Committee’s students are “representatives” and do provide a basis for trying to make some tentative inferences. The *first* is that the students, both undergraduate and graduate, seem to be looking for leadership from the University—and in particular from the faculty—to provide guidance on the creation of an atmosphere of discourse and curiosity on the University campus which would support the development of a truly intellectual environment. *Second*, it seems to be clear that some degree of intellectual activity outside of the coursework which fulfills the requirements for a major or which satisfies graduate and/or professional school entrance requirements is needed in order to make any real change self-sustaining. *Third*, the apparent strengths to be gained from the intellectual breadth associated with the wide variety of programs at the University do not seem to translate directly into the general intellectual life of the University; that is, where the relationship between the professional schools and the School of Arts and Sciences could and should serve as Penn’s source of greatest strength, it currently seems to be only a source of increasing divisions which do not support their mutual reinforcement as intellectual resources. And, *fourth*, the vital interactions between undergraduate and graduate students, which on many campuses is the cornerstone upon which the most vigorous intellectual efforts are set, appear to be minimal and need to be strengthened.

In a related discussion concerning the academic atmosphere at the University, the Committee also examined the role which the current intellectual community plays in supporting academic integrity. It should be noted that, in its deliberations, the Committee specifically chose to focus not on the judicial issues concerning academic integrity, but rather on the relationships between the development of the University’s intellectual atmosphere and its role in setting the standards for academic integrity. As was pointed out by both the Committee’s students and faculty, academic integrity does not spring from a set of rules, but rather is a commitment to a set of intellectual ideals and standards which must be reinforced by members of the community and maintained on a continuing basis in order for it to have any meaning. Numerous incidents of cheating were cited by the Committee’s undergraduate student members and, not surprisingly, there was support in this observation by both the graduate students and the faculty.

As the Committee sees it, the issue of academic integrity is one which should be dealt with not principally by the development of rules and the adjudication of those found violating the rules, but of establishing a set of closely held, common academic values—based on the desire to respect discourse and curiosity—and to reinforce these values throughout every aspect of the University’s programs. It was observed that this could not be accomplished until the major elements of the Committee’s general conclusions concerning the development of a strong intellectual community had been carefully articulated, developed, and implemented throughout the University community. Anything short of that, it was felt, was simply a matter of providing judicial procedures for those that were caught and not an atmosphere in which integrity was the standard for behavior.

In short, the Committee’s recommendations with respect to the development of an “intellectual atmosphere at the University” was viewed as central to the entire framework, growth and development, and ultimately success of the University as a whole. In this regard, the Committee recommends that Council determine what specific activities and initiatives ought to be undertaken, within the next academic year, which will put into practice specific programs which are supportive of the four-point summary recommendations outlined above. No specific programmatic recommendations were made concerning the issue of academic integrity, except in so far as the observation that it is the Committee’s general belief that the same programs will be required in the development of such standards, independent of whatever judicial procedures are enacted.

A review of the distribution and disbursement of the University general fee. Following several general comments by the student members of the Committee, it was decided to review several aspects of the University’s policies regarding the general fee and, in particular, its general pattern of distribution and disbursement. After considering several detailed matters concerning the disbursement of specific fund accounts, such as UA procedures (where it was felt that any review by the Committee was inappropriate), the Committee chose to review and discuss two specific issues:

- The Committee raised the general question as to what the purpose of the general fee was, given the fact that the categories of disbursement seemed to be directed toward funding a variety of overhead categories. The students on the Committee, in particular, were concerned that there was apparently an imbalance in the distribution of funds collected, i.e., between the categories of students from whom the fee is collected and the proportion of its distribution. In addition, questions were raised concerning the overall philosophy behind collecting an amount, on top of tuition, called a “general fee” since the disbursement is largely allocated to expenses directly controlled by the University rather than for use by individual groups.
- A related question was raised concerning the historical justification of the division between funds collected as tuition and those collected as the general fee.

Although a variety of information was collected with respect to these issues, there was very little direct evidence that would support any claim that there was an inequitable transfer of resources from one group to another other than what might be expected from a normal collection/allocation process. Several small exceptions were noted, but on the whole it was felt that these should be brought to Council’s attention only where a specific issue was of direct concern to some group. The second question, in many ways, was of greater concern to the Committee since it raised a variety of questions concerning the ways in which the members of the University community could develop independent initiatives and promote specific programs. However, very little direct information was available on the rationale for collecting the University’s funds in two different forms and the Committee decided to postpone its discussion of this topic until more information was available.

— Stephen Gale, Chair