

UNIVERSITY of PENNSYLVANIA *Almanac*

Tuesday,
April 21, 1998
Volume 44 Number 30

The Lindback Awards: Invitation to a Celebration of Teaching

Interim Provost Michael Wachter cordially invites the University community to a reception in honor of the 1998 winners of the Lindback Award for Distinguished Teaching and the Provost's Award for Distinguished Teaching, to begin at 4:40 p.m. on Thursday, April 23, in the Rare Book Room of Van Pelt Library. The 1997-98 winners are shown below; for brief profiles, see the back page.

Lindback Winners in Non-Health Schools



Peter Davies of SAS, Lorin Hitt of Wharton, Dean Kathleen Jamieson of Annenberg, Seth Kreimer of Law

Lindback Winners in Health Schools



Sarah Kagan of Nursing, and Gary Lichtenstein, Karin McGowan, and Steven Spitalnik of Medicine

Provosts' Awards: Non Health and Health



Lorene Cary of SAS and Patricia Dunphy of Nursing

IN THIS ISSUE

- 2 News In Brief; Vending Update, Other News
- DEATHS: VP Steven Murray; Professors Jameson and Wolfgang
- 4 Council Agenda Notes; SEC Actions 4/15; Merger: IP Fund and Research Foundation; OF RECORD: English Fluency Revisions; Rules Governing Final Exams
- 5 SENATE: COA Report w/ Subcommittees on Strategic Planning, University Service, and Evaluation of Teaching
- 8 Teaching Awards in Medicine
- 10 COUNCIL: Year-End Reports on Pluralism, Recreation & Intercollegiate Athletics, and Safety & Security
- 13 OPPORTUNITIES; New Salary Scales
- 14 Call for House Master; Vending Items
- 15 Update, Crimestats
- 16 What They Say About the Lindback Teachers
- Pullout: Report of the Provost's Committee on Distributed Learning**



Steven D. Murray

On Wednesday, April 15, the University's vice president for business services, Steven Murray, died at the age of 51. A message from the senior officers of the University, on [page 2](#), speaks of this loss to the Penn community. Information on services and his family's plans for a memorial foundation are on the web at www.upenn.edu/almanac.

From the Koo Family: \$10 Million for Wharton's New Facility

The Wharton School has announced a \$10 million gift from Taiwan's "founding father of business," Dr. Chen Fu Koo, and his sons Chester Koo, W '79 and Leslie Koo, W '81, toward the new educational facility to be built on 38th Street at the present Book Store site.

Their new gift will support planning and construction of the new 300,000-square-foot, state-of-the-art academic facility that will "help Wharton create a new global learning environment, incorporating the latest in educational and communications technology," said Thomas P. Gerrity, dean of the Wharton School. "We are extremely grateful for the continuing commitment and support the entire Koo family has given to Wharton over the years."

The strongly Penn-related family (both sons took their MBAs at Wharton, and Dr. Koo received the honorary doctor of laws degree here in 1992 as well as the Wharton Dean's Medal) has endowed two professorships at the School, and has supported the development of Wharton executive education programs in Taiwan. Each year, the family also provides three \$25,000 scholarships to Taiwanese students to attend the Wharton School.

News in Brief

Update on Vending

Thursday, April 23, is the scheduled date for the final reading at Philadelphia City Council of the proposed ordinance to regulate street and sidewalk vending in University City. The City Council's Committee of the Whole last week accepted nine amendments and a letter to the Council President filed by Vice President Carol Scheman. (See page 14 for the amendments and the text of the letter.) Some amendments resulted from testimonies of City Council or City agency origin, according to the Office of Community and City Relations. A summary of three:

- Based on Licenses & Inspection testimony that only the Mayor can officially create and appoint an Advisory Board, references to a "Vending Advisory Board" have been deleted.
- The Whole Council, through facilitation of President John Street and at the urging of L&I, "promulgated regulations devising procedures to choose among applicants for particular locations" with preference that may be based on, but is not limited to, seniority.
- After the Parking Authority's testimony on potential loss of meter revenue, the Whole Council agreed to impose an annual fee of \$2750 per street vendor, to be deposited into the City's general fund.

Campus Deliberations: The University Council's regular meeting at 4 p.m. Wednesday, April 22, includes a discussion item on the University Council's role in the vending ordinance; and a special meeting is scheduled to begin at 5:45 p.m.

Leaving College House: Dr. Filreis

With the announcement that Dr. Alan Filreis and his family will move to a home of their own in University City to coincide with the start of Dr. Filreis's sabbatical, the Provost's Office has issued a call for nominations for a new Faculty Master for Gregory House (page 14).

Dr. Filreis, professor of English and Director of the Writing Program, became a Faculty Master three years ago, moving to Van Pelt College House with his wife Dr. Susan Albertine, the former assistant to the provost for the 21st Century Project who is now Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies at Temple, and their children Ben and Hannah, now 6 and 3. He has also served as Chair of the Residential Faculty Council, the committee of all Faculty Masters.

The first buyers of a home in University City under the new incentive program announced last month, the family will move to a 1923 twin on the 4600 block of Osage Avenue. Dr. Filreis will use his sabbatical to work on a book about the American 1950s, and will continue as head of the Kelly Writers House during his leave.

English Fluency: Revisions Made

On page 4, the Interim Provost outlines changes made in Penn's evaluation procedures for English fluency of instructional personnel.

NEH Award: Dr. Bushnell

Dr. Rebecca Bushnell, professor of English, is co-recipient of one of the National Endowment for the Humanities awards announced last week, but her name was inadvertently omitted from the NEH announcement on the web. Dr. Bushnell will collaborate with Special Collections Director Michael T. Ryan of the Library on *The English Renaissance in Historical Context: Teaching Shakespeare with the World Wide Web*.

Deaths

To the University Community, on the Death of Steven Murray

It is with deep regret and great sadness that we write to inform you of the death of Steve Murray after a long illness. Steve was a gifted colleague, but most importantly, a wonderful friend. He was completely devoted to Penn and his long and tireless efforts on behalf of the University will continue to benefit generations of students, members of the faculty and the staff. We will miss him.

Steve came to the University in 1974 as Director of Transportation and Communications. He was promoted to Director of Business Services in 1982, Associate Vice President in 1987 and Vice President for Business Services in 1992. Under his marvelous leadership and guidance, the Division of Business Services experienced continuous growth, establishing itself as an effective and innovative organization that provided high-quality service to the campus community.

No one in the University administration was more admired and respected by his colleagues. He continually demonstrated a unique ability to accept responsibility for areas in financial and organizational distress and make them successful, in spirit as well as in a fiduciary sense. That is precisely why the Division of Business Services now encompasses the University of Pennsylvania Book Store, Computer Connection, Dining Services, Housing Services, the Ice Rink, Mail Services, the Morris Arboretum, Penn's Children Center, PennTrex, PennCard Center, Publication Services, the Sheraton University City Hotel, Telecommunications, Transportation and Parking, and Voicemail. Clearly, we and so many others had an extraordinary level of confidence in him and his many and varied skills. We have all benefited from his counsel, and we came to depend on him time and again. He never, ever let us down.

His accomplishments at Penn were many. Among the most recent are the new Food Services model that will dramatically enhance our food service programs and facilities; the Residential Operations Department that will oversee the implementation of the College House Program; and the development of the University of Pennsylvania Bookstore and The Inn at Penn at Sansom Common.

Steve was a 1968 graduate of the University of New Hampshire, where he received a bachelor's degree in political science. He received a master's degree through Wharton's Executive M.B.A. program in 1982.

Our thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Barbara, and son, Craig.

Judith Rodin
President

Michael Wachter
Interim Provost

John Fry
Executive Vice President

Dorothea Jameson, Pioneer in Color Perception

Dorothea Jameson, the University Professor of Psychology who was one of the world's foremost theorists of color and vision, died on April 12 at the age of 77, in New York City where she and her colleague and husband of some 50 years, Dr. Leo M. Hurvich, had lived since retirement from Penn.

A 1942 alumna of Wellesley College, Professor Jameson began work on sensory processes during her second year in college and, graduating into the World War II research environment, continued to work on perception as a research assistant at Harvard, where one of her main projects was aimed to improve the accuracy of visual rangefinders. There she met Leo Hurvich, and they began the collaboration that would take them to Eastman Kodak in Rochester, to the psychology department of NYU, 1957-62, and to their longtime academic home in Penn's department of psychology and Institute of Neurological Sciences.

Beginning as a research associate during a time when Penn had a nepotism rule, Dorothea Jameson was named full professor upon the rule's discontinuation, and in 1975 she was awarded an endowed chair as University Professor of Psychology. She also held visiting positions at Rochester and Columbia Universities.

A member of the National Academy of Sciences, she served on many of its committees and boards, chairing the psychology section in 1983-86 and the NAS-NRC Commission on Human Resources' Committee on Fellowships and Associateships in 1979-80. Among her many other professional and scholarly roles were her service on the visiting committees of MIT, Maryland, and Harvard; on the U.S. National Committee for the International Union of Psychological Science; and on the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute Corporation Board.

Professor Jameson won the 1971 Warren Medal of the Society of Experimental Psychologists; the 1972 Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award of the American Psychological Association, and the 1973 Godlove Award for Research in Color Vision of the Inter-Society Color Council. The following year she received the Wellesley College Alumnae Achievement Award for Scientific Research. She also won the Edgar Tillyer Award of the Optical Society of America in 1982; the Deane B. Judd Award of the Association Internationale de Couleur in 1985, and the Hermann von Helmholtz Award of the Cognitive Neuroscience Institute in 1987. The State University of New York conferred upon her the honorary degree Doctor of Science in 1989.

During her career Professor Jameson published some 95 papers in her field, writing frequently with Leo Hurvich, in a collaboration that Columbia Professor David H. Krantz, who took his Ph.D. with Professors Jameson and Hurvich 35 years ago, described as "remarkable for quality, length, and equality of contribution." As they moved to Eastman Kodak in 1947 and married in 1948 to begin their pioneering and profound study of color perception, Dr. Krantz's memoir continues,

"The dominant scientific orthodoxy of that time decreed that subjective appearance could not be studied scientifically at all, and that mechanisms of color perception could not be bidirectional, since the visual responses depend merely on the count of light photons captured by each visual pigment in the retina. Jameson and Hurvich were the first to use subjective appearance of colors as a guide



Dorothea Jameson

to rigorous, quantitative experimentation.

"In the 19th century, the physiologist Ewald Hering had emphasized the bidirectionality of color attributes: any single color might appear either reddish to some degree or greenish to some degree or neither, but never both at once, and likewise for yellowness/blueness. Jameson and Hurvich recognized that bidirectionality could be used as the basis of a measurement method. The redness of a light could be measured by the intensity of a standard green light that must be mixed with it to cancel exactly the reddish appearance; similarly, the yellowness could be measured by the intensity of a standard blue needed to cancel exactly the yellowish appearance. Using such measurements, they proceeded to construct a quantitative model, opponent-color theory, that embraced all the known facts of color vision: facts about color matching, color discrimination, contrast, adaptation and color weakness or color blindness, as well as the subjective appearance of colors. Theirs was the first truly comprehensive quantitative model. For a time it was controversial and widely misunderstood; today, bidirectional color responses have been much studied physiologically, in part because the functional importance of bidirectionality could be understood from the opponent-color theory. Despite much additional physiological information, there is still no comprehensive model with the scope of their original theory.

"The projects that she undertook independently of Leo tended to focus either on visual physiology or on modern art. On the physiological side, she paid close attention to advances in visual physiology and on their implications for perception. The discovery of bidirectional processes in fish retina led her to undertake her own studies of color vision in fish. Another main interest was the function of retinal nerve cells that integrate inputs over different-sized areas and their role in perceptual averaging of colors versus perceptual contrast. She was an art lover who also had strong intellectual interests both in the history of art and in the relationships of visual effects found in art works to the physiology of vision. To mention one example, she pointed out how the differences in area of integration between peripheral and central retina contributed to the aesthetic effects obtained by impressionist painters.

"Jameson's students, colleagues and friends will greatly miss her gentle manner, her luminous, probing intelligence, her scientific wisdom and her love for truth."

Professor Jameson's survivors, in addition to her husband, are two brothers, Robert and Richard; a sister, Marie Cooper; and her nephews and nieces.

Susan Coslett Memorial: April 23 on the Green

Friends and colleagues are invited to gather on Thursday, April 23 at 5 p.m. to pay tribute to Graduate School of Fine Arts Assistant Dean Susan Coslett, who passed away on March 29. The commemoration will begin on the Green between Meyerson Hall and Van Pelt Library, where a flowering tree will be planted in Susan's memory. A reception will follow in the Reading Room of Fisher Fine Arts Library. All are welcome to attend and share memories of Susan. The GSFA has established a traveling fellowship in her name. It will be presented for the first time at the GSFA award ceremony on May 17. The School hopes to make this fellowship an annual award which will provide support for a student to visit gardens and landscapes, as Susan loved to do.

Marvin Wolfgang, World Leader in Criminology

Dr. Marvin E. Wolfgang, the world-renowned criminologist who was professor of criminology, legal studies and law at the Wharton School, died of pancreatic cancer on April 12 at the age of 73. A member of the University for almost 50 years, starting with his enrollment as a graduate student, he was the founding director of the Sellin Criminology Center, president of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, and one of the world's most cited authors in his field.

As a pioneer of quantitative and theoretical criminology, Dr. Wolfgang defined the boundaries of the sociology of crime. In 1994, the British *Journal of Criminology* acknowledged Dr. Wolfgang as "the most influential criminologist in the English-speaking world." His research and critical commentaries appear in more than 30 books and 150 articles. Three books among his classic and most influential work:

The Measurement of Delinquency (1964), co-authored with his mentor Thorsten Sellin, is an authoritative analysis of the importance of criminal statistics and the development of scientifically precise methods by which the severity of crimes can be measured and studied. The *Subculture of Violence* (1968), with his noted Italian colleague and friend Franco Ferracuti, is a theoretical treatise on the causes and correlates of violent behavior, which remains—30 years after it was published—the definitive exposition of society's responsibility for breeding violent criminal behaviors. *Delinquency in a Birth Cohort* (1972), with Thorsten Sellin and Robert Figlio, is considered Dr. Wolfgang's greatest scholarly accomplishment. It details the juvenile careers of a group of boys born in 1945, who spent their youth in Philadelphia. His conclusion that a small number of chronic offending juveniles account for a disproportionate amount of crime has influenced legislative bodies, law reform commissions, and criminal justice policy makers around the world.

Until his death, he was engaged in a ten-year longitudinal study of juvenile delinquency in the People's Republic of China, based on his birth cohort studies in Philadelphia and San Juan.

Professor Wolfgang supervised more than 100 doctoral students, many of whom are now deans, chairs and professors at universities and institutions throughout the world.

Academics and practitioners from many disciplines acknowledged his contributions by electing him president of the American Society of Criminology and to membership in the American Philosophical Society. He was also the asso-



Marvin Wolfgang

ciate secretary general of the International Society of Criminology, a consultant to the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, a member of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare's Panel on Social Indicators, the director of research for the Presidential Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, a member of the Advisory Committee on Reform of the Federal Criminal Law and a member of the National Commission on Obscenity and Pornography. A strong opponent of the death penalty, he was gratified, his family recall, that his research findings were used in the landmark U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Furman v. Georgia* (1972), which held that the death penalty as then applied was unconstitutional.

A recipient of two Guggenheim Fellowships and a Fulbright Scholarship, Dr. Wolfgang also received the Dennis Carrol Prize from the International Society of Criminology, the Roscoe Pound Award of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency for distinguished contribution to the field of criminal justice; the Hans von Hentig Award of the World Society of Criminology; the Edwin Sutherland Award of the American Society of Criminology; and the Beccaria Gold Medal for outstanding contribution to criminology from the German, Austrian and Swiss Society of Criminology.

He also received the honorary doctor of law degrees of the City University of New York and the Academia Mexicana de Derecho Internacional. In 1993, Dr. Wolfgang was the first recipient of an award established in his name by Guardmark, Inc. for distinguished achievement in criminology.

Marvin E. Wolfgang was born November 14, 1924, in Millersburg, PA. After serving in the U.S. Army in Italy during World War II he took his B.A. from Dickinson College in 1948, and began his teaching career at Lebanon Valley College in Annville, PA. Meanwhile, he enrolled as a graduate student at Penn, taking his M.A. in 1950 and his Ph.D. in 1955. He joined the faculty in 1952, where he continued teaching until his recent illness, occasionally taking visiting professorships such as those of the University of Cambridge, the State University of New York at Albany, Rutgers University and Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

Dr. Wolfgang is survived by his wife, Dr. Lenora D. Wolfgang, a professor at Lehigh University; his daughters, Karen W. Swanson and Nina V. Wolfgang, two grandchildren, Kirk and Kyle Swanson; and a sister, Patricia W. Mignogna of Lynchburg, Virginia.

Documents at Council April 22

For the agenda of the regular meeting (4 to 5:45 p.m.) on Wednesday, April 22, four written reports are scheduled for discussion.

One, the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Consultation, appeared in *Almanac* April 14 and is on the web at www.upenn.edu/almanac/v44/n29/consult.html

Three are year-end reports of Council standing committees, and all three are published in this issue:

Recreation & Intercollegiate Athletics, p. 11

Pluralism, p. 10

Safety & Security, p. 12.

As background to the items on vending that were listed on the agenda as published April 14, please see in this issue a story on page 2, announcing that City Council as a Committee of the Whole has amended the Bill; and see page 14 for the text of the amendments and a letter filed by Vice President Scheman. —Ed.

SENATE From the Senate Office

Actions Taken by the Senate Executive Committee

Wednesday, April 15, 1998

A special meeting was called to discuss three Faculty Senate Committee reports.

1. Committee on the Faculty Chair William Harris summarized the work of the committee and its subcommittees on intellectual property and non-standing faculty. He noted that the subcommittee on retirement and benefits would complete its work next year. Professor Harris proposed six recommendations that were moved, seconded and accepted by SEC. The full text of the report will appear in a future *Almanac*.

2. Committee on Students and Educational Policy Chair David Williams presented the annual committee report incorporating reports of the subcommittee on education, management and reward; the subcommittee on education practices; and the subcommittee on distance learning. Discussion was carried over to the next meeting.

3. A report from the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility was deferred to the April 21 meeting.

4. The chair reminded SEC members of the special meeting on Tuesday, April 21, 1998. The agenda will include continued discussion on the Committee on Students report as well as draft recommendations from the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty. The final meeting of the academic year is scheduled for Wednesday, May 6, 1998.

Merger of Internal Research Funding Sources: International Programs Fund, Research Foundation

The International Programs Fund is being incorporated into Penn's Research Foundation, as Type C international grants. Review criteria remain unchanged. Type C proposals will be reviewed by the Research Foundation panels, alongside Type A and B applications in the fall and spring of each academic year, effective fall 1998. The next application deadlines are November 1, 1998 and March 15, 1999. Type C international grants provide support in the range of \$5,001 to \$15,000. A Type C grant may be combined with either Type A or B, but the maximum total award is \$50,000. Further details will be included in the fall 1998 Research Foundation announcement (which will appear in *Almanac* and on the World Wide Web: <http://www.upenn.edu/VPR/RF.html>).

—Joyce A. Randolph, Director, Office of International Programs

—Ralph D. Amado, Vice Provost for Research

About the IPF Grants: The University of Pennsylvania's endowment fund for international programs provides support for research in area and international studies within the context of Penn's *Agenda for Excellence*. The fund is used as seed money, with priority given to multi-school initiatives (within Penn) as well as collaborative research with colleagues abroad, especially at institutions with which Penn has formal cooperative agreements. Awards are normally in the range of \$5,000-15,000.

Awards in Spring 1998: The faculty recipients of the spring 1998 International Programs Fund grants are:

- Aileen B. Rothbard (Social Work), "Serving People with Serious Mental Illness" (Italy);
- Donald Silberberg, Sandra Barnes and Antonio McDaniel (Medicine, Arts and Sciences), "The Study of Childhood Disabilities in Africa Using Medical, Anthropological and Demographic Approaches";
- Stuart Weiss and Albert T. Cheung (Medicine), "Russian-United States Cooperative Study on Perfusionless Deep Hypothermic Circulatory Arrest for Open Chamber Cardiac Operations."

OF RECORD

Revision in the Procedures for the Evaluation and Certification of the English Fluency of Undergraduate Instructional Personnel

Last year several revisions were made in our Procedures for the Evaluation and Certification of the English Fluency of Undergraduate Instructional Personnel. Among these changes were revised scoring standards necessitated by the new Test of Spoken English (TSE) introduced in 1996 by the Educational Testing Service. These new standards, which required students to attain a score of 60 in order to be certified as fluent, were recommended by our office of English Language Programs on the basis of a sample population test.

As the result of over a year's experience, the office of English Language Programs has concluded that the score of 60 is too high and recommends lowering it. After consulting with the Council of Undergraduate Deans, I have accepted this recommendation. Effective immediately, a score *above 55* qualifies for automatic certification, while anyone presenting a score of *55 or below* must take the Interactive Performance Test.

Copies of the revised policy and new certification form have been sent to all the Academic Deans, Department Chairs, and Graduate Group Chairs. Any questions about the new scoring standard or the new certification form should be directed to Mary Ann Julian in the office of English Language Programs.

—Michael L. Wachter, Interim Provost

OF RECORD

Rules Governing Final Examinations

1. No instructor may hold a final examination except during the period in which final examinations are scheduled; when necessary, exceptions to this policy may be granted for postponed examinations (see 3 and 4 below). No final examinations may be scheduled during the last week of classes or on reading days.

2. No student may be required to take more than two final examinations on any calendar day during the period in which final examinations are scheduled. If more than two are scheduled, the student may postpone the middle exam.

3. Examinations that are postponed because of conflicts with other examinations, or because more than two examinations are scheduled in the same day, may be taken at another time during the final examinations period if the faculty member and student can agree on that time. Otherwise, they must be taken during the official period for postponed examinations.

4. Examinations that are postponed because of illness, a death in the family, or some other unusual event, may be taken only during the official periods: the first week of the spring and fall semesters. Students must obtain permission from their dean's office to take a postponed exam. Instructors in all courses must be willing to offer a make-up examination to all students who are excused from the final examination.

5. No instructor may change the time or date of a final exam without permission from the appropriate dean.

6. No instructor may increase the time allowed for a final exam beyond the scheduled two hours without permission from the appropriate dean.

7. No classes (excluding review sessions) may be held during the reading period.

8. All students must be allowed to see their final examination. Exams should be available as soon as possible after being graded with access ensured for a period of at least one regular semester after the exam has been given.

In all matters relating to final exams, students with questions should first consult with their dean's offices. Faculty wishing to seek exceptions to the rules also should consult with their dean's offices. Finally, the Council of Undergraduate Deans and SCUE urge instructors to see that all examinations are actively proctored.

—Michael L. Wachter, Interim Provost

Report of the Faculty Senate Committee on Administration

April 17, 1998

A. Preface

The committee addressed four issues which were deemed to be important for the position and mission of the faculty. These were: the relation between budgetary policy and strategic issues, the adequacy of faculty consultation in the preparation of strategic plans in the schools, the appropriate recognition of faculty service to the University, and the teaching evaluation processes. Four subcommittees were therefore formed whose findings are presented below.

B. Subcommittee on Cost Containment

The major conclusion of this subcommittee report was that there has been a substantial relative shift over the past eighteen years away from the direct support of education and scholarship to other activities. The report was extensive and has been published separately in the March 24, 1998 issue of *Almanac*.

C. Subcommittee on Strategic Planning

The consultative process is an important vehicle by which faculty contributes to University decision making on strategic, policy and administrative matters. The Faculty Senate therefore needs to be aware of the degree to which this process succeeds in insuring adequate faculty participation in these matters. In particular, strategic planning can, and has, had serious consequences for departments and programs. The Subcommittee on Strategic Planning was therefore asked to examine the process by which each of the schools included faculty consultation in developing their strategic plans as requested by President Rodin in connection with the University's *Agenda for Excellence* (*Almanac* January 21, 1997). It did this by interviewing selected faculty members in the schools.

The difficulties in assessing the adequacy of consultation are great. The subcommittee realized that it had neither the time nor resources to address this issue for the School of Medicine so it was omitted from this study. Also, because of its size and diversity, it was not possible to obtain a comprehensive picture of the planning process in each department of the School of Arts and Sciences. In all schools, a relatively small fraction of the faculty was interviewed and it is possible that a larger sample would have uncovered problems of which the subcommittee is not now aware. The conclusions presented here must therefore be regarded as tentative and impressionistic. A description of the process in individual schools is:

1. School of Arts and Sciences

The School of Arts and Sciences is vital to the overall quality and reputation of the University and its strategic planning is critically important because the school is faced with serious and controversial problems. Financial stringency forces SAS to make difficult decisions on the growth, decrease or elimination of departments and programs. Some of these decisions were made prior to the formulation of the *Agenda for Excellence* and others are reflected in the strategic plan. The subcommittee's overall conclusions are twofold: First, the consultative process afforded faculty members in most departments the opportunity to communicate their views to the dean and her principle advisors if they wished to do so. Second, the process did not give the faculty the opportunity to review and comment on successive drafts of the plan.

The SAS plan was developed by deans in consultation with a committee of 20 faculty members (The Planning and Priorities Committee). The members of this committee were selected by the dean and represented most, but not all departments. In addition to advice from this committee, the dean attached considerable weight to past external and internal reviews, the departmental responses to these reviews and to self evaluations requested by the dean in connection with the strategic planning effort.

While communication from faculty to the school administration and Planning Committee was adequate, their seemed to be little reciprocal communication in the other direction. Members of the Planning Commit-

tee reportedly treated their deliberations as confidential and interested faculty members were unable to carry on a dialogue with the planners. Indeed, the faculty as a whole did not see the strategic plan, or any draft of it, before its submission to the President.

Faculty members from departments that were not favored in the plan were doubtful that their views were taken seriously even though they were formally considered. Some faculty members from other departments reported that they knew nothing of the planning process. However, letters of criticism to the President about specific features of the plan from other faculty members resulted in adoption of some of the changes recommended in the letters.

2. Law School

In preparing a draft strategic plan, the dean first met individually with each of the 30 faculty members and each of the major committees in the school. The draft was then submitted to the faculty for comments and an all-day retreat was held to discuss the draft and extensive reports by several departmental standing committees. The resulting revised draft was submitted to the faculty for approval before being sent to the President and Provost. This extensive faculty participation was possible, in part, because of the small size of the school, an absence of departmental structure and a long tradition of self-governance.

3. Annenberg School for Communication

An initial draft of the plan, prepared by the dean, was reviewed by the school's Executive Committee, which is elected by the faculty. The draft was then reviewed by the full faculty before being revised and sent to College Hall. Generally, faculty felt that they had been given full access to information and had ample opportunity to present and discuss their views.

4. Wharton School

By 1994, the Wharton School had already prepared a planning document as part of an ongoing process of planning and self-evaluation. Wharton drew heavily on this document in constructing its strategic plan for the *Agenda for Excellence*. The first draft was prepared by the dean and circulated to department chairs and the dean's Advisory Committee, a committee of senior faculty members. The resulting revision was circulated to the full faculty and discussed at a faculty meeting. The document went through nine revisions before being sent to College Hall.

It was clear to the subcommittee that the planning process in Wharton is highly consultative and participatory which includes the faculty and, on occasion, students, staff, alumni and even major recruiting organizations.

5. School of Veterinary Medicine

The School of Veterinary Medicine had a planning process in place which resulted in two planning documents before President Rodin's request with respect to the *Agenda for Excellence*. The first addressed the available options in response to the state-funding crisis of the early 90's and a later document dealt with fundamental institutional issues. These were the basis of the response to the President's request.

The planning process was led by a task force headed by a faculty member with representation from the school's four departments. While faculty members not on the task force did not contribute much to the final document, they clearly did so in the earlier stages over a period of five years.

6. School of Dental Medicine

The School of Dental Medicine also adapted a previously prepared planning document for the response to the *Agenda for Excellence*. This was done by an open and participatory process involving frequent faculty meetings. A unique feature in this school is a system for implementation of the strategic plan. For each of the goals specified in the plan, a committee of faculty, students and staff is responsible for monitoring and reporting on the progress of implementation. An oversight committee

coordinates these reports and circulates them to the school faculty members which can then make comments on the progress or recommend changes to the strategic plan. The faculty is enthusiastic about this process.

7. School of Nursing

Formal strategic planning in Nursing dates back to at least 1993 when it was decided to expand the school's mission to include clinical practice. Several other retreats were held soon after and a Long-Range Planning Committee was formed. The Nursing faculty has met as a whole to determine which of the priorities in the *Agenda for Excellence* it could actively support. The Long-Range Planning Committee continues to meet monthly and retreats are held semi-annually to discuss planning issues. The standing faculty of the School of Nursing has been and continues to be heavily involved in strategic planning.

8. School of Engineering and Applied Science

The planning document in SEAS was prepared by an officer of the school's Development Office, was discussed with the seven departmental chairs and then brought to departmental faculties by the chairs. A revised document was then reviewed by the Faculty Council (elected by the faculty) who presented it for discussion at two faculty meetings.

9. Graduate School of Education

The GSE planning process was highly consultative. The dean held one hour meetings with each faculty member and drafted a first version of the plan. After discussion with the Executive Committee of the school, it was circulated to all faculty members for comments. The resulting revisions were discussed in faculty meetings and the final draft incorporated most of the faculty suggestions.

10. School of Social Work

The first draft of the planning document was prepared by the dean in consultation with some senior faculty members and reflected, in part, ideas contained in an accreditation self-evaluation study done in 1991-92. This draft was discussed at a faculty retreat, revised and then presented at later faculty meetings. Some faculty concur with the dean's statement that the planning process is "extraordinary in terms of faculty input and involvement."

11. Graduate School of Fine Arts

This school prepared its strategic plan under an interim dean. The interim dean circulated guidelines from an earlier planning document to the four department chairs and then prepared a draft strategic plan from their responses. This went through several stages of interactions between the interim dean and the chairs until a penultimate draft emerged. The present dean refined this document and sent it to College Hall. It is not clear to what extent the faculty, formally or individually, took part in this exercise. However, the major differences in the school follow departmental lines and the individual departments were well represented. It is probable that the dissatisfaction expressed by some city planners reflected issues of substance rather than process.

Generally, it appears that, with some reservations expressed below, faculty members had the opportunity to participate in the strategic planning process. No instances were noted in which faculty members who wished to participate were prevented from doing so by procedural obstacles.

In at least four schools, Wharton, Veterinary Medicine, Dental Medicine and Nursing, the *Agenda for Excellence* was the most recent phase in an ongoing planning process.

The planning process in the School of Arts and sciences did not give faculty members an opportunity to react to drafts of the planning document. Indeed, few faculty members, other than the 20 senior professors on the planning committee, even saw the strategic plan prior to its submission to the central administration.

The subcommittee received comments to the effect that the existence of a satisfactory consultative procedure does not guarantee that dissenting views will be taken seriously. The subcommittee could not determine whether this reflects a defect in the process or a disagreement with substantive decisions.

It is recommended that the faculty have the opportunity, collectively and individually, for input at all stages of strategic plan development. This should include the opportunity to review and react to interim drafts as well as the final version.

It is important to note that strategic planning is a continuing process and that plans are often modified as their implementation evolves. Mechanisms to monitor the processes of implementation should be encouraged.

D. Subcommittee on Service to the University

Increased pressures on the faculty to assume greater responsibilities, such as increasing outside support for research, is discouraging their service to the University. Although service to the University is recognized in various policy documents as a criterion for promotions, these are scattered among the schools and in different places in the *Handbook on the Faculty and Academic Administrators*. Significant differences obtain among the schools in both policy and practice on service to the University, ranging from positive affirmation to slight acknowledgment. At present it is generally regarded as a third, somewhat ambiguous consideration in evaluating faculty performance after research and teaching.

At the same time, the Faculty Senate continues to have a central responsibility to represent the faculty and contribute a faculty voice to University governance. As the University becomes more complex and claims on its resources multiply, and as the University reaches out to more constituents locally, nationally, and globally, this responsibility becomes more urgent.

The Faculty Senate has responded to these pressures by expanding volunteer efforts from individual faculty and seeking more information from the University administration. Although individuals have given much to the Senate and to its committees, it is clear that reasons for declining specific assignments are becoming more compelling while the need for them is increasing.

Because of the above considerations, the Senate Committee on Administration appointed a subcommittee to look into these issues. The subcommittee concluded that some initiatives should be taken to respond to the conflicting pressures of the need for more involvement by the faculty and the ever increasing demands on faculty time and recommended that the Faculty Senate take the following two steps to address this problem:

First, assemble existing policies on recognition of faculty service to the University into a single, consolidated statement in order to give it easy accessibility, consistency and the prominence it deserves. Second, appoint a subcommittee to identify an independent source of funds for the Faculty Senate that would provide the means and rewards for faculty involvement in the Senate as the main vehicle for the faculty to meet its obligation of service to the University.

E. Subcommittee on Teaching Evaluations

In response to the concern of many faculty as to the value and impact of the current course evaluation process, the objectives of this Subcommittee were to evaluate the current course and faculty teaching evaluation process, define the parameters for an "ideal" system, and develop conclusions and recommendations.

1. Concerns with the Current System

Evaluating the current system uncovered a number of concerns. While most of the faculty we discussed it with recognize the importance of course/faculty teaching evaluation, many did not like the current process. It was concluded that any system will have to address the following issues:

- Who is the process for (faculty, administration, students)? Can a single instrument be used both to inform the students, serve as feedback to the faculty and for faculty promotion decisions?
- Are students, at the time of taking the course, qualified to judge content?
- Does the process have any negative effects on the rigor of education or on grade inflation?
- How can the student ratings of quality be separated from the compounded effect of other variables such as showmanship, charisma, difficulty of material, grading policy, age, gender, reputation, etc.?
- Should student evaluation be anonymous? (Will identifiable respondents lead to more responsible and consistent responses? Can identifiable responses lead to faculty retaliation?)
- How complete or representative are the returns?
- How to solve the problem that the current system "distances" the student from the "co-production" model of education by having "non-accountable evaluators"?
- How to avoid the problem that reporting only averages can be misleading?
- How can numerical scores be combined with constructive comment for self/course improvement?
- When should the evaluation be conducted (mid-term, ongoing, end of term, end of program, a number of years after graduation)?

(continued next page)

- k. Should different processes be used for small classes?
- l. Should the results be publicized? (Asymmetry—rights of faculty vs. rights of students.)
- m. What is the value added of the Penn undergraduate course review guide?

2. Parameters of an Ideal System

The overall objective of a teaching and course evaluation system is to enhance the quality, appropriateness, effective delivery and learning of the course content. It should be feasible (cost effective and easy to administer) and the measures used should be reliable and valid. The system should meet the needs of three audiences: faculty, students and academic administration.

For faculty, the objective is to provide meaningful feedback for self and course improvement.

For students the objective is to provide an opportunity for engaging in constructive and reflective dialogue with the faculty, as well as appropriate input for improvement and selection of courses.

For the departments, schools and University academic administrators, the objective is to provide valid feedback on faculty teaching effectiveness and course quality.

A variety of options were considered for satisfying the above objectives ranging from keeping the status quo (which was rejected) through various modifications of the current system, to radical solutions including the option of eliminating all faculty evaluations and withdrawing the University's involvement with the undergraduate course review guide. Some of the more moderate options considered included:

- Using an evaluation form focusing on open-ended questions that request constructive feedback for improvements of both faculty teaching and student learning;
- Instituting a peer review of course delivery including evaluation of course materials;
- Using outcome measures such as before/after testing, and correlation with career choice and success.

3. Conclusions

We found that there is no conclusive empirical evidence on the contribution of different course evaluation methods to enhanced learning. Yet, students have the right to reliable and valid information on the content, delivery, quality, and value of the courses offered.

Similarly, both faculty and the University administration can benefit from reliable and valid course evaluation feedback. Taking into consideration that course/faculty teaching evaluation processes have three different audiences—students, faculty, and the University—it should be of great concern that the current course evaluation system does not meet the needs of these groups.

We conclude that no single evaluation process can meet the needs of the three audiences and therefore recommend that separate (but interrelated) processes should be developed to address the needs of the three audiences.

Given differences among schools, the evaluation processes in different schools and departments are different. Each school is therefore encouraged to develop their own processes for evaluation, ideally guided by the principles outlined here and by the experiences of other schools.

4. Recommendations

We recommend that:

- a. The Provost establish a committee representing the twelve schools to evaluate the current course/faculty teaching evaluation process.

This committee should issue a report considering the issues presented above.

- b. A University “clearinghouse” be created to accumulate, analyze and disseminate the experiences of the various schools and departments in various teaching/course evaluation processes. (This clearinghouse can be linked to a Senate committee for ongoing evaluation of the teaching evaluation process.)
- c. The needs of the three audience groups be addressed in future evaluation systems.
- d. We recommend that each school or department examine the possible establishment of a peer mentoring system that includes evaluation of course materials and measures of students' performance, i.e., the actual learning. This system can either be voluntary or required for faculty whose performance is deemed to be unsatisfactory.
- e. Develop a Website with information about all course offerings.
- f. Additional mechanisms for providing feedback to the faculty be considered such as periodic feedback for each class, and direct interactions with students similar to “Quality Circles” regarding the course and ways of improving it.

We believe that, if adopted, these recommendations will advance development of more reliable and valid measures of faculty teaching and their courses. This will be of value to students, faculty, and administration. It will further enhance a culture where students take responsibility for and, together with the faculty, are accountable for the quality of learning.

Submitted by the Faculty Senate Committee on Administration

Louis A. Girifalco (materials sci & engr), Chair

Frank Goodman (law)

Abba M. Krieger (statistics)

Joan Mollman (neurology/med)

Cynthia Scalzi (nursing)

Henry Teune (political science)

Jerry Wind (marketing)

ex officio:

Senate Chair Vivian C. Seltzer (social work)

Senate Chair-elect John C. Keene (city & reg plng)

Subcommittees

Subcommittee on Cost Containment

Solomon R. Pollack (bioengr), Chair

Abba M. Krieger (statistics)

Louis A. Girifalco (materials sci & engr)

Subcommittee on Strategic Planning

Frank Goodman (law), Chair

Gregory S. Kopf (ob-gyn)

Cynthia Scalzi (nursing)

Neil Shubin (biology)

Subcommittee on Service to the University

Henry Teune (political science), Chair

Peter J. Freyd (mathematics)

Gino C. Segrè (physics)

Subcommittee on Teaching Evaluations

Jerry Wind (marketing), Chair

Martin Pring (physiology/med)

Christopher Looby (English)

The School of Medicine's 1997-98 Teaching Awards

Full-time University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine faculty members in the tenure and clinician-educator tracks are eligible for the awards described below. Nominations for teaching awards are solicited annually from faculty, housestaff and students. The dossiers of all nominees are reviewed by the Faculty Teaching Awards Committee which determines the recipient(s) for each award.

The Leonard Berwick Memorial Teaching Award:

Established in 1980-81 as a memorial to Leonard Berwick by his family and the Department of Pathology, the Leonard Berwick Memorial Teaching Award recognizes a member of the medical faculty who in his or her teaching most effectively fuses basic science and clinical medicine. The recipient of the Berwick Memorial Teaching Award for 1997-98 is *Scott Manaker, M.D., Ph.D.*, Assistant Professor of Medicine in Pulmonary Care. Dr. John Hansen-Flaschen, Chief of the Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine describes Dr. Manaker as "one of the most active and effective teachers in the Medical Intensive Care Unit at HUP. He has been exceptionally successful in teaching the physiological basis for modern management of respiratory failure and circulatory shock. His enthusiasm for clinical problem-solving has been instrumental in attracting residents into our fellowship training program." Students praise Dr. Manaker as a faculty member who "treats them as colleagues rather than just students" and who "is full of good humor and [is] a pleasure to work with." Dr. Manaker's ability to integrate concepts in basic science and clinical medicine fosters a deeper level of understanding of disease processes and management issues in students and residents. He is truly a talented teacher who exemplifies the commitment to the highest standards of medical education at Penn.

The Blockley-Osler Award: Created in 1987 by the Blockley Section of the Philadelphia College of Physicians, this award is presented annually to a member of the faculty at an affiliated hospital for excellence in teaching modern clinical medicine in the bedside tradition of Dr. William Osler. The 1997-98 Blockley-Osler Award is given to *Paul M. Weinberg, M.D.*, Associate Professor of Pediatrics and Radiology at The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia. Under Dr. Weinberg's leadership, one of the highest caliber training programs in pediatric cardiology in the country has been developed at CHOP. Dr. Victoria Vetter, a colleague of Dr. Weinberg in the Department of Pediatrics, commends his commitment to medical education, saying, "Paul provides direction and leadership to the educational program; his enthusiasm and structured didactic methods captivate his audience immediately." Students echo Dr. Vetter's praise, commenting that "His enthusiasm is contagious." A former fellow emphasizes Dr.

Weinberg's talent as "a mentor" and "a source for numerous research topics." Dr. Weinberg is clearly an esteemed teacher and colleague, valued by fellow faculty members, post-graduate trainees and students for his proactive commitment to excellence in medical education at all levels.

The Robert Dunning Dripps Award for Excellence in Graduate Medical Education:

Established in 1983 by the Department of Anesthesia, the Robert Dunning Dripps Award recognizes a faculty member who exemplifies excellence in the education of residents and fellows in the areas of clinical care, research, teaching and/or administration. The 1997-98 Dripps Memorial Award for Excellence in Graduate Medical Education is presented to *Alan Cohen, M.D.*, Professor of Pediatrics and Chief of the Division of Hematology at The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia. Since joining the faculty in 1978, Dr. Cohen has distinguished himself as an outstanding teacher who serves as a role model for residents and fellows as an educator, a teacher and an administrator. Dr. Cohen's adeptness in linking academic and research aspects of hematology with fundamental pediatric practice methods imparts both essential and complex aspects of pediatric hematology. His teaching methodology inspires trainees to think critically and to make decisions carefully, essential attributes which a consummate clinician like Dr. Cohen exemplify. Colleagues revere him as "a teacher whose standard of excellence causes his students and those he mentors to develop high standards of their own." Residents describe Dr. Cohen as "a role model with an infectious enthusiasm for hematology. Dr. Cohen possesses an impressive breadth of knowledge which he is excited to share." Dr. Alan Cohen's enthusiasm for the field of hematology and for teaching as well as his high standards of clinical practice make him a superb role model for future pediatric hematologists and physicians in other specialties alike.

The Dean's Awards for Excellence in . . .

... Clinical Teaching at an Affiliated Hospital: This award was established in 1987 to honor commitment to medical education and excellence in clinical teaching by recognizing outstanding faculty members from affiliated hospitals. The 1997-98 Dean's Award for Excellence in Clinical Teaching at an Affiliated Hospital recognizes *Henry R. Bleier, M.D., M.B.A.*, Clinical Professor of Psychiatry at the Veterans Ad-

ministration Medical Center. Chief of Consultation-Liaison Psychiatry, Dr. Bleier has been a member of the faculty since completing his residency at HUP in 1977. He is a consummate clinical educator, making teaching a primary focus of his professional life. "In his various roles as an inpatient attending, resident director and medical/psychiatry chief, he consistently brings a truly original mind to the venerable art of bedside clinical teaching," states Dr. Anthony Rostain, Director of Medical Student Education for the Department of Psychiatry. One student describes Dr. Bleier as "quite unique among the clinical teachers I've encountered; he manages to focus complete attention on the individual patient and, at the same time, expands the discussion to encompass the larger medical and social issues...His incisive questions challenge the student to go beyond what he/she has thought before." Echoing this accolade, a resident regards Dr. Bleier's "unique approach [as] an indispensable part of my training. His 'leave no stone unturned' philosophy of care provides the gold-standard for consultation-liaison psychiatry." Dr. Henry Bleier is highly esteemed as an educator and as an inspiring physician by his peers, resident trainees and students.

... Basic Science Teaching: Established in 1987, this award honors exemplary teaching and commitment to medical education specifically in the basic sciences. *David Goldhamer, Ph.D.*, Assistant Professor of Cell and Developmental Biology, is the recipient of the 1997-98 Dean's Award for Excellence in Basic Science Teaching. In the five years since joining the faculty at Penn, Dr. Goldhamer has demonstrated a strong commitment to quality medical education through his significant contributions to the teaching of the courses in embryology and histology. A first-rate scholar, Dr. Goldhamer exhibits an extraordinary talent for conveying complex concepts in a way that is easily understandable. One student praises Dr. Goldhamer's teaching in the histology course commenting, "Dr. Goldhamer is fantastic. He's knowledgeable, cares about our learning, and does a good job of mixing in humor." A second student describes Dr. Goldhamer as "one of the best lecturers I have ever had" and as "exuding a warmth and love of his subject." Dr. David Goldhamer's unfailing commitment to upholding the highest standards in medical education is admired and deeply appreciated by student and colleagues alike.

awards continue past insert



Scott Manaker



Paul Weinberg



Alan Cohen



Henry Bleier



David Goldhamer

A photo was not available of Herbert Mosher of the Rehoboth McKinley Medical Center in Gallup, New Mexico.

... **Graduate Student Training:** Established in academic year 1992-93, this award recognizes excellence in graduate education. The 1997-98 Dean's Award for Excellence in Graduate Student Training honors *Judith Meinkoth, Ph.D.*, Assistant Professor of Pharmacology. Dr. Meinkoth's exquisite knowledge base and eclectic teaching methodologies not only benefit students in terms of concept understanding, but also provides them with interesting and memorable learning experiences. Since arriving at Penn in 1994, Dr. Meinkoth has been one of the most sought after faculty mentors for students of the biomedical sciences. Additionally, she is active in several academic committees and, on a national level, in a number of professional societies. Dr. Meinkoth is regarded by students and colleagues alike as "an outstanding teacher, role model and mentor."

... **Medical Student Teaching by an Allied Health Professional:** Created during the 1996-97 academic year, this award honors outstanding teaching by allied health professionals, for example, nurse, physician assistants and administrators. The 1997-98 Dean's Award for Excellence in Medical Student Teaching by an Allied Health Professional is presented to *Herbert Mosher*, Director of the Development Office at Rehoboth McKinley Christian Hospital and head of the Western Health Foundation in Gallup, New Mexico. Through the coordination of elective experiences in rural primary care, Mr. Mosher has significantly enriched the primary care curriculum for medical students and residents at Penn. Prior to assuming the position as Director of Development at Rehoboth McKinley, Mr. Mosher worked as an aide to Dr. Menninger of the Menninger Clinic and in the administration of Senator Robert Dole. His move to Rehoboth McKinley was precipitated by a meeting with Mother Theresa who suggested that he relocate to Gallup as, in her words, "they need you here." Under Mr. Mosher's leadership, the local health system has attracted private and government funding and has expanded the scope of its rural health programs, including the development of innovative programs for the prevention and treatment of alcoholism and the initiation of a branch of the "Reach Out and Read", a literacy enhancement program for young children and their families. A student highlights the significance of Mr. Mosher's contribution to his/her medical education saying, "his knowledge of Navajo culture and dedication to teaching health care management and primary care in rural settings made us think about which direction medicine should go." Dr. William Schwartz, Professor of Pediatrics and Penn's liaison with the Gallup program, best sums up Mr. Mosher's commitment and contributions to medical edu-

cation: "Herb has set an example for all faculty in the Penn system to assure a stimulating learning environment for teaching culture, diversity and life."

Special Dean's Awards: The Special Dean's Awards, established during the 1989-90 academic year, honor special achievements by Penn faculty members, particularly in the development of new and innovative educational programs. The Vice Dean for Education, in consultation with the Teaching Awards Selection Committee, identifies faculty members who have made unique contributions to medical education at Penn during the previous year. Three distinguished faculty members are being recognized with Special Dean's Awards for the academic year 1997-98.

Jack Ende, M.D., Professor of Medicine and Chief of Medicine at Presbyterian Medical Center, is being honored by the Special Dean's Award in recognition of his many contributions to educating medical students and residents in general internal medicine and his commitment to excellence in emphasizing bedside diagnosis skills and patient-centered care. Dr. Ende's involvement in medical education began with his first faculty appointment at the Boston University School of Medicine where he first served as Director of Medical Student Education and then as Residency Training Program Director for the Department of Internal Medicine. Dr. Ende joined the faculty of the University of Pennsylvania in 1989 as an Associate Professor of Medicine and Director of Ambulatory Care Education for the Department of Medicine. In 1995, he was promoted to Associate Dean for Network and Primary Care Education and in this capacity developed systems for training medical students and residents in the outpatient sites within the University of Pennsylvania Health System network of physician practices. Dr. Ende was appointed Chief of Medicine at the Presbyterian Medical Center in 1997. Dr. Ende has also been very active in medical education efforts at the national level, including serving as President of the Association of Program Directors in Internal Medicine from 1994 through 1995. The 1997-98 Special Dean's Award appropriately recognizes Dr. Ende's significant contributions to continuous improvement of medical education at Penn, particularly in the training of students and residents in general internal medicine and ambulatory care.

Marilyn Hess, M.S., M.S.Ed., Ph.D., Professor Emerita of Pharmacology, is being honored with a 1997-98 Special Dean's Award for her tireless service and earnest commitment to the missions of the School of Medicine. Dr. Hess's dedication and expertise as the Director and as a principal instructor in the Pharmacology course

has resulted in numerous awards recognizing her distinguished teaching including the prestigious Lindback Award and the Dean's Award for Excellence in Basic Science Teaching. Her prowess as a teacher is demonstrated by the success of Penn students taking the U.S.M.L.E. examinations; last year students scored higher on the pharmacology component than on any other portion of the exam. Additionally, Dr. Hess's commitment to excellence as well as her superior mentorship abilities have influenced the professional development and career path choices of many medical students. Students, administrators and colleagues alike hold Dr. Marilyn Hess in the highest regard for the wisdom and experience she brings to medical education at Penn and for her enthusiasm and tireless energy.

Bruce Tempest, M.D., Chief of Internal Medicine at Rehoboth McKinley Medical Center in Gallup, New Mexico and an Infectious Disease Consultant at the Gallup Indian Medical Center, is being recognized with a 1997-98 Special Dean's Award for his work in developing and teaching a rural primary care elective for Penn medical students in the Desert Southwest. The elective experience and Dr. Tempest's teaching are exemplary in that they address not only the provision of quality health care in a rural setting, but they also emphasize cultural and diversity issues relating to Zuni, Navajo, Acoma and Hispanic traditions as key considerations in the delivery of medical treatment. Students respect Dr. Tempest for his ability to "teach in a compassionate, non-threatening way." One student describes his/her experience under Dr. Tempest's preceptorship saying, "Dr. Tempest taught about medical issues ranging from post coma recovery to antibiotic choice for treatment of cellulitis...he is an outstanding compendium of medical insight and information...he is an excellent communicator as well." Another student comments, "I learned so much from him; I wished the trip would never end. What an exceptional person!" Dr. Tempest is being honored not only for his excellence as a teacher and clinician but for his ability to instill in students the desire to achieve professional success by making a difference in people's lives.

Awards Given by Students

The Medical Student Government Teaching Awards are selected by nomination by the graduating class for faculty who have demonstrated excellence in teaching medical school classes. One recipient is selected from the basic sciences and one from clinical medicine. This year's recipients are *Helen C. Davies, Ph.D.*, Professor of Microbiology, from basic sciences and *Rosalind H. Troupin, M.D.*, Professor of Radiology, from clinical medicine.



Bruce Tempest



Judith Meinkoth



Jack Ende



Marilyn Hess



Helen Davies



Rosalind Troupin

The three reports that appear on pages 10-12 are on the University Council's April 22 agenda for discussion. The meeting begins at 4 p.m. in McClelland Lounge, The Quad, and is open to observers who register in advance their interest in attending, by calling the Office of the Secretary at 898-7005.

Pluralism

The charge to the Committee on Pluralism for 1998 was to "Work with the Student Affairs Committee to develop concrete ways to broaden the understanding of the experience of Asian American students, faculty, and staff at the University; use the Committee's final report of 1996-97 as the basis for direction, discussion, and recommendations."

The Student Affairs Committee was pursuing a separate and unrelated agenda, and so the Pluralism Committee worked on its own. It held three meetings: January 30, March 18, and April 1 (the last to discuss this report).

At the first meeting, responding to the report of 1996-97 (particularly to Asian American student requests contained in that report), the Committee agreed that developing a strong Asian American Studies Program was at the center of effectively addressing Asian American issues on campus. And at the center of developing such a Program was the need to hire more standing faculty across the University in Asian American studies. At present there are only three standing faculty members in the Asian American Studies Program: Professors Rosane Rocher (South Asian studies), Mark Chiang (English), and Grace Kao (Sociology). Professors Rocher and Kao must split their teaching time between their departmental disciplines and Asian American Studies, so that Professor Chiang is the only standing faculty member who is devoting full-time to teaching in the Program, which, with the help of adjunct faculty, will offer eight courses in the fall of 1998.

Recognizing that this situation needs to be strengthened, if Penn is to take the leadership role it could and should take in Asian American Studies on the East Coast, the Committee authorized the Chair to draft a letter to the Provost urging him in cooperation with the deans of the schools to continue the hiring initiative in Asian American studies with the goal of increasing the standing faculty by five in the next five years. After consulting through its Chair with the standing faculty in Asian American Studies, the Committee recommended in the letter that three of these appointments be made in SAS, with one specifically designated in History; and that the remaining two appointments be made in the schools of Social Work and Education because these schools work in the community-at-large, where there is an urgent need to provide services to immigrant Asian communities. But the Committee also noted that expanding Asian American studies to Wharton and Annenberg is an important part of the agenda.

The Chair of the Committee drafted the letter, which was approved by the Committee and sent to the Provost on March 31 (see attachment). As directed by the Committee, the Chair also sent copies of the letter to the dean of SAS and to Vice Provost Janice Madden, who is currently the chair of the President's task force on Asian American issues on campus, a task force that was instituted in response to the 1996-97 report of the Committee on Pluralism.

The Committee invited Dr. Madden to its second meeting, where she presented a summary of the work of the Task Force. Of particular concern to the Committee is the fact, presented by Dr. Madden, that while 25% of Penn students are Asian American, there are only 15 Asian Americans in administrative areas that deal with students; and it is unclear to the Committee at this point how many of these people work directly in counseling and advising Asian American students.

In addition, Dr. Alvin Alvarez and Belinda Huang, both of whom were crucial in the counseling of Asian American students, have left the University. While Ms. Huang has been replaced, it does not appear that she has been replaced by someone with expertise in dealing specifically with Asian American issues; and at this point to our knowledge, Dr. Alvarez's position has not been filled. In respect to this situation and the

figures cited above in Dr. Madden's report, the Committee wants to emphasize that there is a need for the University to hire people in counseling and advising with expertise in Asian American issues. Currently, the Committee understands that there is a decided lack of such expertise in Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS); and this lack, clearly, can only have a negative impact on the development and sustaining of outreach programs for Asian American students.

As regards the provision of essential services to the Asian American community within and immediately beyond Penn, the Committee notes that there is no Asian American Resource Center on campus. While the Greenfield Intercultural Center in collaboration with Student Activities offers support for a number of Asian American student groups, the GIC's mission is a broad one so that all the minority groups served by the GIC share limited resources. There is currently one twenty-hours-a-week graduate assistantship designed to support Asian American groups, which is not adequate given the needs of the student groups.

An Asian American Resource Center, situated in a visible location, would be able to coordinate and centralize resources for the campus (including counseling and advising services) and the surrounding community. What kinds of activities such a center should house in addition to counseling and advising needs to be defined by Asian American faculty, students, and staff.

Finally, the Committee wants to note two further concerns: the need for full-time support staff in the Asian American Studies Program, which currently has no such staff; was brought to our attention by Andrea Cherng, representing the Asian American Studies Undergraduate Advisory Board; and the issue of the possible underrepresentation of certain segments of the Asian American student population at Penn, both in terms of enrollment and of voice on campus, was brought to our attention by Seung Lee on behalf of the Asian Pacific Student Coalition. In regard to the issue of underrepresentation, Mr. Lee mentioned the situation of South East Asian American students as one of particular concern.

In sum, then, the Committee recommends the following actions:

- The hiring over the next five years of five standing-faculty members in Asian American studies (three in SAS, one specifically in History; 1 in the School of Social Work, and one in the School of Education) in order to strengthen and expand the current program across the university.
- The hiring of personnel with expertise in Asian American issues in the area of counseling and advising, so that coherent outreach programs for Asian American students can be developed and sustained in this area.
- The planning and development by the Asian American community at Penn of an Asian American Resource Center.
- The hiring of full-time support staff for the Asian American Studies program.
- The exploration of the issue of under representation in segments of the Asian American student community at Penn.

The Committee feels that an ongoing part of its charge should be the continued monitoring, through discussions with concerned faculty, students, and staff, of the University's commitment to developing the crucial Asian American positions and programs on campus noted in this report. The Committee looks forward to the report of Dr. Madden's committee on Asian American issues and plans to comment on it.

In addition to these Asian American issues, the Committee touched on the following items as issues that might become part of its agenda in

succeeding years: the strengthening of gay/lesbian institutions on campus; the exploration of issues concerning the Latino community at Penn; and the articulation of issues that concern the African American community at Penn.

— Eric Cheyfitz, Chair
March 27, 1998

1997-98 Pluralism Committee

Chair: Eric Cheyfitz (English); *Faculty:* Jorge Santiago-Aviles (elec engr), Mary Berry (history), Jill E. Jacobs (radiology/med), Stephen N. Dunning (religious studies), Alan Heston (economics), Stephen Gale (political science); *Graduate/professional students:* John P. Williams (Medicine), Isabel Molina Guzman (Annenberg); *Undergraduate students:* Snigdha Bollempally, two to be named; *PPSA:* Christopher Cataldo (mgr, admin & fin GSFA), Lynn Seng (dir. special projects, Medical School); *A-3:* Stephanie Knox (Dental Restoration), John Hogan (Biddle Law Library), Loretta Miller (Student Info & Systems); *Ex officio:* Elena DiLapi (director, Penn Women's Center), Tope Kledoye (chair, United Minorities Council), Scott Reikofski (director, fraternity/sorority affairs), Joyce Randolph (director, international programs), Jeanne Arnold (director, African American Resource Center), Valerie deCruz (director, VPUL Greenfield Intercultural Center), Donna M. Arthur (chair, A-3 Assembly), Terri White (director, academic support programs), James Bean (chair, PPSA)

Addendum— Final Report of the Pluralism Committee, 1997-98

[Letter addressed to Dr. Michael Wachter, Office of the Provost]

Dear Dr. Wachter:

I am writing you in my capacity as chair of the Pluralism Committee of the University Council as directed by the Committee.

The Committee's charge for the last year has been to look into the situation of Asian Americans—students, faculty, and staff—at Penn. In the *Almanac Supplement for September 23, 1997*, the Committee, then under its Acting Chair, Professor Herman Beavers, published a report on this situation. The report summarizes the understanding of student leaders from the Asian Pacific Student Coalition (APSC) of this situation, which is clearly one that requires a great deal of strengthening in a range of areas from curriculum to counseling.

In particular, the students felt that there was a critical lack of faculty engaged in Asian American research and teaching to adequately represent their intellectual, career, and cultural interests. While noting that the “arrival of Mark Chiang, in English, and Grace Kao in Sociology represents a beginning [in building an Asian American Studies Program],” the students also noted that “there is still only a minor” in this area. The Program is currently being directed by Professor Rosane Rocher, who has worked extraordinarily hard over the last few years to generate an Asian American Studies Program at Penn. Professor Rocher, who is internationally known in the field of South Asian Regional Studies, is currently devoting half of her teaching time to Asian American Studies. Professor Kao, as well, must split her teaching time between Asian American courses and other interests. Professor Chiang, then, is the only one of Penn's three Asian Americanists whose primary area of research and teaching is Asian American Studies.

For the fall of 1998, there are only eight course offerings in Asian American Studies of which four will be taught by Professors Rocher, Chiang, and Kao. Two of the remaining four courses are being offered in

CGS, and taught by lecturers. Both of the remaining two courses are in SAS, but only one of these is being taught by a standing faculty member, Julia Paley from Anthropology, whose primary field is not Asian American studies. There are no course offerings in Asian American Studies in any of the other schools of the University.

While acknowledging the essential contributions of professors Rocher and Kao, the Committee wishes to emphasize, in regard to the current curriculum in Asian American Studies, that there is only one member of the standing faculty at Penn whose primary area of research and teaching is Asian American Studies. Without an expanded core of such standing faculty, not only in SAS but across the schools of the University, it is clearly impossible to build an Asian American Studies Program that can present a major in the field. It is the understanding of the Committee that such a program is required to adequately represent the interests of Asian American students on campus, not only in the area of curriculum but in other social and cultural areas as well. For a strong Asian American Studies Program, which supposes a community of senior and junior scholars actively engaged across the University in Asian American issues, is the necessary foundation for building other institutional structures both within Penn and between Penn and the community that can extend agency to the Asian American community of faculty, students, and staff at the University.

The Committee also feels that such an Asian American Studies Program is crucial to the intellectual life of the University in general, with its commitment to a diverse, multicultural, interdisciplinary curriculum for all its students and faculty.

The Committee on Pluralism urges you, then, in conjunction with the deans of the schools to begin a vigorous recruitment initiative aimed at bringing to Penn as members of the standing faculty scholars committed to building an Asian American Studies Program. The Committee recommends that the University try to hire five such scholars within the next five years: three in SAS, with one of those having an appointment in History, and the other two in disciplines that would expand the current offerings in order to build a major. The remaining two appointments should be made in other schools of the University in order to begin to build an Asian American Studies Program on a university-wide basis. We would urge in the first instance that you consider making these appointments in the schools of Social Work and Education because these schools work in the community-at-large, where there is an urgent need to provide services to immigrant Asian communities. But it is also clear to the Committee that expanding Asian American studies to Wharton and Annenberg is an important agenda. One of the three scholars hired for SAS would also assume the directorship of the Program, if such an appointment could be made at the senior level.

The Committee on Pluralism understands that such a strong faculty base is the necessary link with students and staff to build the kind of structures that the 1997 report of the Committee recommends. The Committee appreciates your attention to this matter and urges action on it.

Sincerely,

Eric Cheyfitz

Professor of English and Comparative Literature
and Chair of the Committee on Pluralism

cc: Dr. Samuel Preston
Dr. Janice Madden

Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics

The University Council Committee on Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics (CRIA) met three times during the 1997-98 academic year. It was charged by University Council to: (1) review and discuss the consultant's report on recreational facilities at Penn, (2) act as an institutional resource for University community input to Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics as plans for facilities evolve, and (3) keep in touch with action items related to the NCAA's recertification process.

CRIA focused on the Brailsford and Dunlavey Consulting Firm's report, which was commissioned as part of the University's *Agenda for Excellence*, on the status of Penn's recreational facilities as they relate to intramural sports, sports clubs, instructional classes, wellness/fitness,

informal/drop-in events, special events, and office/storage space for support services.

Mike Diorka, director of recreation, presented the findings of the Brailsford and Dunlavey report, which was validated through significant input from a number of campus focus groups, administrative discussions, e-mail student surveys, and mail surveys of faculty and staff. The survey results revealed recreational areas that the campus population would like to see enhanced and also indicated that Penn's recreational facilities are generally inadequate to handle the recreational demands of a university of our size.

Brailsford and Dunlavey recommended that the recreational facilities

facilities at Hutchinson Gym, for structured intramural/team activities. The self-directed recreational component would be the first area to be addressed. The survey also revealed: (1) that students were dissatisfied with the appearance and cleanliness of the facilities and (2) a willingness to pay for recreation were the facilities improved significantly.

Recognizing the importance of modern recreational facilities in the increasingly competitive recruitment and retention of quality students, faculty, and staff CRIA voted unanimously to draft a letter to President Rodin strongly supporting Brailsford and Dunlavey's recommended improvements to Penn's recreational facilities. A letter was sent on April 9, 1998.

CRIA was updated on some of the NCAA certification action items identified by Penn for improvement of its Intercollegiate Athletic program. Associate Athletic Director, D. Elton Cochran-Fikes, is preparing a document outlining NCAA rules and how Penn's policies will permit compliance with these rules. The policies covered by this document will be reviewed by a steering committee and reported to CRIA when approved.

In addition, the Division of Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics (DRIA), with student-athlete input, will continue to address gender equity issues by making an effort to aggressively recruit qualified women and minorities for head coaching positions. Concerning student-athlete gender equity issues at Penn, the athletic participation rate is approximately 38% women and 62% men, while the student body is almost 50% women and 50% men. This participation rate is comparable with other Ivy League institutions. An athletic interest and abilities survey is being conducted this spring to assist the DRIA in its decisions regarding gender equity issues, for example the disparity of the percentage of women participating in athletics versus that of women in the student body as they relate to squad sizes in intercollegiate, club, and intramural sports and the possibility of the addition of new women's teams. The examination of squad size is not only a gender issue, but also an important operational and budgetary one for DRIA. DRIA will report the survey findings to CRIA.

Lastly, CRIA discussed the drug-testing policy at Penn. It was informed by D. Elton Cochran-Fikes that: (1) all student-athletes are required to complete Ivy League and NCAA forms, including the NCAA Drug-Testing Consent form, to be eligible for intercollegiate participation; (2) Neither Penn nor the Ivy League test student-athletes for drug use, however, they may be tested as a result of participation in an NCAA championship, a national governing body championship, or as part of the NCAA year-round drug testing program; (3) Penn has received grant funding for drug-alcohol programs for student-athletes; and (4) approximately ten years ago, the Ivy League investigated drug testing as a league in consultation with team doctors, but found that such testing was not necessary.

It is recommended that during the coming academic year, CRIA continue to:

- (1) review and discuss plans to improve Penn's recreational facilities,
- (2) act as an institutional resource for University community input to Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics as plans for facilities evolve, and
- (3) keep in touch with action items associated with the NCAA's re-certification process.

— Peter Hand, Chair

1997-98 Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics Committee

Chair: Peter Hand (animal biology/vet) *Faculty:* Steven Galetta (neurology/med); Stephen Gluckman (infectious diseases/med); Hendrik Hamka (chemistry); Peter Hand (animal biology/vet) (chair); Alan Heston (economics); Edward Lally (pathology/dental); Cynthia Scalzi (nursing); Raymond Sweeney (clinical studies, New Bolton Center/vet). *Graduate/Professional Students:* Jennifer Giordano, Heather Kelly; *Undergraduate Students:* Marc Edelman, Jeremy Moneta; *PPSA:* Erika Gross, Jennifer Wolman; *A-3:* None appointed. *Ex Officio:* Steve Bilsky (director, division of recreation and intercollegiate athletics); Larry Moneta (associate vice-president campus services); Willis Stetson (dean of admissions); Michael Burton (representative of President's office).

Safety and Security

The Safety and Security Committee has met six times during the 1997-98 year and has one scheduled meeting remaining. Topics addressed during the year included the following:

Bicycle Safety

We reconstituted the bicycle safety subcommittee with a focus on supporting the University's perceived desire for bike lanes on Walnut Street. One meeting was attended by Philadelphia Streets Department engineers Charles Denny and John Devine, who presented maps and a detailed explanation of city bike lane plans for the University City area. We debated the positive and negative effects of bike lanes to assure all views on subject were considered. Issues considered included safety of bike riders and pedestrians, frequency of accidents in bike lanes, effect of any removal of parking spaces, effect on regular deliveries and special events such as Quad move-in, ambulance parking at HUP, sidewalk bike lanes, and advantages/disadvantages of southside or northside bike lanes. We concluded that in balance it is in the University's best interest to support bike lanes. Ex-officio member Tom Seamon prepared for John Fry's signature a letter to the Philadelphia Streets Department in support of bike lanes.

Video Monitoring

We discussed the need for a video monitoring policy. Development of a draft policy followed when it became evident such a policy is needed. Extensive discussions of the specifics of such a policy. One meeting, attended by representatives and the chair of the Committee on Open Expression, was largely devoted to this subject and to COE's recommendations and concerns with the draft policy. Issues considered included privacy, liability, crime reduction, physical control of the cameras and tapes, video monitoring versus video surveillance, operations of the video monitoring panel, general proposed camera locations and possible prohibited locations, legal versus moral questions of use, and how the policy interacts and/or conflicts with the guidelines on open expression. We concluded that, although the draft policy is a good framework, certain details will need to be addressed by a wider-scope body, i.e. University Council. These include possibly modifying the guidelines on open expres-

sion, especially section V-E, and composition of the video monitoring panel.

We constituted an education subcommittee to lead the development of methods to send safety information to students with continuity over their four years. Issues and methods considered included more effectively reaching students during New Student Orientation, training RA's to advise students of the availability of safety information, use of "Penn life sketches," assignment of a public safety representative to each college house, use of the "college house wheel" for ongoing presentations, use of "University 101," online safety information, "peer educators/safety advisors—students advising students" and/or University employees advising students, and interactive video sessions. There was also consultation with the Student Affairs Committee.

Other action items, agenda topics, and areas of recommendations to ex-officio members of the committee: satellite vehicle tracking system for Penn Transit Service, certain incidents reported to public safety, city fire code changes concerning smoke detectors.

— Sean Kennedy, Chair

1997-98 Safety and Security Committee

Chair: Sean Kennedy (anesthesia/med); *Faculty:* John Lepore (civil systems), Jerry Prince (Romance lang), Alvin Rubinstein (political sci), Karen Winey (materials sci), Gail Yarnell (restorative dentistry), Ponzy Lu (chemistry), Marilyn V. Howarth (emergency med); *Graduate/professional students* (two to be named); *Undergraduate students:* Ben Cohen, Emily Pollack, Scott Cohen; *PPSA:* Valerie Pena (Dir. Health Science Lib.), David Valentine (Office of Int'l Programs); *A-3:* John Hogan (Biddle Law Library); *Ex officio:* Barbara Cassel (associate vice provost), Elena DiLapi (director, Penn Women's Center), Robert Furniss (director, transportation and parking), Thomas Seamon (managing director of public safety), James Miller (director, fire & occupational safety), Scott Reikofski (director, fraternity/sorority affairs), Maureen Rush (director, police operations), Jeanne Arnold (director, African American Resource Center), James Wargo (director, physical plant), Robert Furniss (director, transportation and parking).

OPPORTUNITIES at PENN

Where to Find the Job Opportunities—Here and Elsewhere

Listed below are the new job opportunities at the University of Pennsylvania. Where the qualifications are described in terms of formal education or training, prior experience in the same field may be substituted.

How to Apply:

Current Employees can call 898-7284 to obtain the name of the hiring officer for the available position, (please provide your social security number for verification and the position reference number). Internal applications should forward a cover letter and resume directly to the hiring officer. A transfer application is no longer needed!

External Applicants should come to the Application Center to complete an application. Applicants interested in secretarial, administrative assistant, or other office support positions, will have an appointment scheduled for a technology assessment as part of the application process.

There are many additional openings for examination at the Job Application Center, Funderburg Information Center, 3401 Walnut Street. (215-898-7284). Hours of operation are Monday through Friday, 9 a.m.-1 p.m. New openings are also posted at the following locations: Blockley Hall, the Wharton School and the Dental School.

A full listing of job opportunities is also on the Human Resource Services website: www.upenn.edu/hr/. Current employees needing access to the web may go to the Computer Resource Center at 3732 Locust Walk with your PENNCARD to obtain a list of computer labs on campus available for your use. In addition, almost every public library in the Delaware Valley now provides web access.

The University of Pennsylvania is an equal opportunity employer and does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, sex, sexual orientation, age, religion, national or ethnic origin, disability or veteran status.

Please note: Faculty positions and positions at the Hospital and Health Systems are not included in these listings. For Hospital and Health System openings, contact 662-2999.

New Jobs for the week of April 13-17, 1998

ANNENBERG SCHOOL

RESEARCH ANALYSIS MANAGER (040570AB) (040571AB) 12 month re-appointments for 3 years; end date 12-31-2000. **GRADE:** 29; 4-16-98 Annenberg School

SCHOOL OF ARTS & SCIENCES

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT A (040563AM) **GRADE:** 23; 4-16-98 English Language Program
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT A, PART-TIME (17.5 HRS) (040562AM) **GRADE:** 23; 4-16-98 English/Theater Arts

RESEARCH SPECIALIST A (040564AM) **GRADE:** 24; -16-98 Psychology

TECH AUDIO VISUAL B (040546AM) **GRADE:** 24; 4-15-98 SAS Computing

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

ACCOUNTANT A (040541SH) **GRADE:** 24; 4-14-98 Comptroller's Office

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT B (N/E) (040589SH) **GRADE:** 24; 4-20-98 Executive Vice President

ASSISTANT COMPLIANCE OFFICER (071110SH) **GRADE:** 28; 4-20-98 Audit & Compliance

INTERNAL AUDIT SPECIALIST (101670SH) **GRADE:** 29; 4-17-98 Audit & Compliance

MANAGING DIRECTOR DINING SERVICES (040583 SH) **GRADE:** 32; 4-20-98 Business Services

MEDICAL SCHOOL

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT A (040544AM) **GRADE:** 23; 4-14-98 School of Medicine Business Office

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT A (40 HRS) (040560 AM) **GRADE:** 23; 4-15-98 Center for Experimental Therapeutics

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT A (40 HRS) (040567 AM) **GRADE:** 23; 4-17-98 Venture & Industry Relationships

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT B (40 HRS) (040521 AM) **GRADE:** 24; 4-14-98 Cancer Center

COORDINATOR A (40 HRS) (040545AM) **GRADE:** 25; 4-14-98 School of Medicine Business Office

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY (NE) (40 HRS) (040543AM) **GRADE:** 25; 4-14-98 Government Relations

RESEARCH LAB TECH C (040576LW) **GRADE:** 23; 4-16-98 Pathology

RESEARCH SPECIALIST A (040522LW) **GRADE:** 24; 4-15-98 Pathology

RESEARCH SPECIALIST A (40 HRS) (040554LW) **GRADE:** 24; 4-15-98 Institute for Human Gene Therapy

RESEARCH SPECIALIST A (040556LW) (040557 LW) **GRADE:** 24; 4-15-98 Institute for Medicine & Engineering

RESEARCH SPECIALIST A (040558LW) **GRADE:** 24; 4-15-98 Pathology

RESEARCH SPECIALIST B (040523LW) **GRADE:** 25; 4-15-98 Pathology

RESEARCH SPECIALIST B (40 HRS) (040524LW) **GRADE:** 25; 4-15-98 Surgery/Urology

RESEARCH SPECIALIST B (040523LW) **GRADE:** 25; 4-15-98 Pathology

RESEARCH SPECIALIST B (40 HRS) (040524LW) **GRADE:** 25; 4-15-98 Surgery/Urology

TECH PSYCHOLOGY (40 HRS) (040550LW) (040551 LW) (040552LW) (040553LW) **GRADE:** 23; 4-15-98 Psychiatry/Addictions

PROVOST

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT A (030430AB) **GRADE:** 23; 3-30-98 Office of Student Conduct

COORDINATOR A (030350SH) **GRADE:** 25; 4-20-98 University Press

MANAGER C (040549SH) **GRADE:** 27; 4-17-98 Center for Greater Philadelphia

SR LIBRARY CLERK (040572SH) **GRADE:** UNION; 4-16-98 Dental School Library

SYSTEMS ANALYST SR/IT PROJECT LEADER SR (040565SH) (040566SH) **GRADE:** E; 4-16-98 ISC/AIT

VETERINARY SCHOOL

TECH VET (40 HRS) (040548LW) **GRADE:** 22; 4-15-98 VHUP - Wards

WHARTON SCHOOL

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT A (040532AB) **GRADE:** 23; 4-14-98 Aresty Institute

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT B, PART-TIME (28 HRS) (040536AB) **GRADE:** 24; **Range:** \$11.20-19.06; 4-13-98 Marketing

COORDINATOR A (040537AB) **GRADE:** 25; 4-14-98 Aresty Institute

DIRECTOR C (030502AB) **GRADE:** 29; 4-13-98 External Affairs

IT SUPPORT SPECIALIST SR (071053AB) **GRADE:** C; 4-17-98 WCIT

STAFF WRITER A (040547AB) **GRADE:** 24; 4-15-98 External Affairs

Symposium for Women

Penn Health for Women, part of the Health System, hosts a symposium, on April 25, entitled *Designer Aging?* to help women "Design a Future that is Strong, Satisfying, and Healthy." Speakers from Penn Health for Women will address topics from hormone replacement and cosmetic surgery to memory, aging and brain function.

The symposium will be held at the Radnor Hotel, on 591 E. Lancaster Avenue in St. Davids, PA. Registration and prepayment is required. The \$10 fee includes continental breakfast. Plan to arrive at 8:15 a.m. for check in and refreshments. The presentations are from 9 a.m.-noon. For more information call PENNHealth at 1-800-789-PENN.

Health Fair at Radnor: April 25

The Penn Health System brings free health screenings for men, women, and children, physician lectures, children's activities and nutritious snacks to Penn Medicine at Radnor, 250 King of Prussia Road, in Radnor, 11 a.m.- 3 p.m. on Saturday, April 25.

Staff Salary Structure

Effective April 1, 1998, Penn instituted a new salary structure.

Listed below are the salary ranges for corresponding job grades for positions at Penn. Salary offers will fall within the salary range of the advertised position's grade. The determination of salary for a new hire is based on several factors that relate both to the candidate's qualifications (education, experience and overall competency level) as well as to Penn's current needs.

Grade	Minimum	Top of 1st Third	Top of 2nd Third	Maximum
32	81,200	104,207	127,214	150,220
31	66,025	84,738	103,453	122,165
30	56,700	71,833	86,968	102,100
29	48,650	61,617	74,584	87,550
28	39,700	50,292	60,884	71,475
27	34,100	42,625	51,150	59,567
26	28,600	35,750	42,900	50,050
25	24,000	30,000	36,000	42,000
24	20,400	25,167	29,934	34,700
23	17,900	22,075	26,251	30,425
22	16,000	19,467	22,935	26,400
21	14,025	17,067	20,110	23,150

Note: Non-exempt (weekly-paid) staff members' hourly rates can be determined by dividing the annual salary in the above scale by 1820 (example: \$20,400 divided by 1820 = \$11.209 hourly). Next, to calculate the annual salary for varying work schedules, follow the formula below:

Annual Salary Calculation Example

40 hr schedule 2080 x hrly rate (2080 x 11.209 = 23,315)
37.5 hr schedule 1950 x hrly rate (1950 x 11.209 = 21,858)
35 hr schedule 1820 x hrly rate (1820 x 11.209 = 20,400)

Information Technology

Broadband Salary Structure

Grade	Minimum	Top of 1st Third	Top of 2nd Third	Maximum
H	81,200	104,207	127,214	150,200
G	66,025	94,090	122,155	150,220
F	56,700	80,205	103,710	127,214
E	48,650	73,155	97,660	122,165
D	39,700	60,500	81,300	102,100
C	39,700	51,917	69,734	87,550
B	28,600	42,892	57,184	71,475
A	24,000	35,892	47,784	59,675

The Information Technology (IT) broadband salary structure was instituted in order to respond to current market pressures and will be monitored carefully. The Compensation Office will regularly measure the external market value for comparable jobs and adjust the salary structure accordingly.

Call for Nominations: Master of Gregory House

Candidates for Faculty Master of Gregory College House are being solicited by the Provost. The Faculty Master is expected to provide intellectual leadership, help develop the College House as an educational resource for the university, promote academic programs in the residence, and build strong and supportive house communities. Appointment is for three years (renewable) and candidates must be tenured members of the standing faculty. The Faculty Master receives an unfurnished apartment with modern conveniences, including cable and high speed data connections; parking; moving expenses; and evening dining in the College House dining rooms. At the conclusion of a term, the faculty master receives a scholarly leave of one term at full base pay, which may be converted to a research fund equal to one-half of base pay.

Application deadline is May 4. Candidates should send a current c.v. and letter describing their interest to: Dr. Christopher Dennis, Director, Academic Programs and Residence Life, 3901 Locust Walk, Suite 112/6180. A more detailed description of the job and its responsibilities can be obtained from Dr. Dennis. Gregory College House is at 3909 Spruce Street; for a description of the House, with pictures, see

www.upenn.edu/resliv/chguide/gregory.html.

— Office of the Provost

Kellogg Conference April 29:

'Linking Intellectual Resources and Community Needs'

The second annual W.K. Kellogg Program Conference entitled "Linking Intellectual Resources and Community Needs" will be held on Monday, April 2 as part of a three-year, \$500,000 grant to the University of Pennsylvania to link intellectual resources and community needs through three project areas: Culture and Community Studies, Environment and Health and Nutrition and Health.

- Morning Session: *Academically-Based Community Service: and Strengthening Undergraduate Education*; 9 a.m. -12:15 p.m. [Lunch: 12:15- 1:30 p.m.] Faculty Club
Keynote: *Academically-Based Community Service: Reflections of a Converted Skeptic* Dr. Richard Beeman, dean, College of Arts and Sciences and deputy dean, SAS.

Faculty Panel chaired by: Francis Johnston, professor of anthropology

Panelists: William Labov, John H. and Margaret B. Fassitt Professor of Linguistics
Rebecca Maynard, Trustee Professor of Education and Social Policy
Ralph Rosen, associate professor and chair of Classical Studies
Ingrid Waldron, undergraduate chair and professor of biology

- Afternoon Session: *Linking Intellectual Resources and Community Needs: University-Community Collaborative Research Projects*; 2-4 p.m. at University City High School, Rm. 12, 36th and Filbert Sts.

Moderator: University City High School Principal Dr. James Lytle. In discussion of issues related to University-Community Collaborative Research Projects, discussants will highlight the work of Penn undergraduates and public school students involved in collaborative research projects.

For more detailed information on the Kellogg Conference Agenda: Penny Gordon-Larsen at 898-4704, pglarsen@pobox.upenn.edu, or the website www.upenn.edu/ccp.

Penn Press Open House

The director and staff of the University of Pennsylvania Press invite members of the Penn community to an open house at the Press's new offices, at 4200 Pine Street, 3-6 p.m., on Wednesday, April 29. — Eric Halpern, Director

Penn Relays: April 23-25

This year marks the 104th running of America's "greatest track and field meet". During competitions on Thursday, Friday and Saturday, over 350 races will be run, an average of one race every five minutes. In its 103-year history, the Carnival has provided competition for more athletes than any other track meet in the world. During the past ten years more than 100,000 young men and women—ranging from under ten to over 80 in age—from high schools, colleges, clubs, the armed services, preparatory schools, junior high schools, middle schools, parochial schools and elementary schools have competed in the Carnival.

Last year's Penn Relays had a record-breaking attendance with some 18,000 competitors and nearly 90,000 spectators came to Franklin Field. Thousands more followed "the Penns" via the Web and their web site, www.upenn.edu/relays, had more than 100,000 hits a day during last year's Relays. Tickets and information are available via the Franklin Field Ticket Office (215) 898-6151, or Ticket Master at (215) 336-2000.



Tee Time for Women's Sports

As an annual fund-raiser for Women's Field Hockey and Lacrosse, Penn alumnae and friends play—of course—golf. At the Wyncote Country Club in Oxford, PA, rated by *Golf Digest* as "the best public course in Pennsylvania."

The Quaker Golf Classic is not until May 6, but to sign up for the tournament, the deadline is Friday, April 24. Forms for players (and information for spectators) are available from Val Cloud at 899-6308, for a Red & Blue Playing spot (\$175; for post-1980 Young Alumni, \$150) or for a Ben Franklin Foursome (\$1000; Young Alumni \$550). The fee for foursomes includes an 11 a.m. private clinic before the 12 noon "shotgun start". All fees cover golf carts, the post-tournament barbecue and silent auction, and other gifts.

As noted on page 2, nine amendments were made by the Committee of the Whole at Philadelphia City Council last week. Following are the verbatim texts, and a letter submitted to City Council by the University. For the originals referred to in these amendments, please see www.upenn.edu/foodplaza.

Amendments to Vending Bill

1. Delete all text in §9-206(1)(i), and mark that subsection "Reserved."

2. In §9-206(5)(b), delete the phrase "and subject to the recommendations of the Vending Advisory Board, if any, for the affected Neighborhood Business District."

3. In §9-206(8)(a), delete the phrase "in consultation with the Vending Advisory board if any, of the relevant Neighborhood Business District."

4. In §9-206(10)(b)(.1), in the first paragraph following subsection (T), delete the phrase "as well as the recommendations of the University City Vending Advisory Board."

5. Delete all text in §9-206(10)(b)(.2)(A), and mark that subsection "Reserved."

6. Revise the first sentence of §9-206(10)(b)(.2)(B) to read in its entirety: "the Department shall promulgate regulations devising procedures to choose among applications for a particular block face or location, including, but not limited to, preference based on seniority."

7. In §9-206(10)(b)(.2)(C), delete in the first sentence the phrase "after review by and comment by the University City Vending Advisory Board" and delete in the fourth sentence the phrase "after review and comment by the University City Vending Advisory Board."

8. Delete all text in §9-206(10)(b)(.2)(J), and substitute the following text: "(J) To reimburse the City for the loss of parking meter revenue, street vendors assigned to locations in the University City District shall pay in addition to the license and renewal fee imposed under subsection 9-203(5), an annual fee of two thousand seven hundred fifty dollars (\$2,750)."

9. Revise Section 3 of the Bill to read in its entirety: "Section 3. Effective Date. This Ordinance shall take effect ninety (90) days after it becomes law."

Letter Sent to The Hon. John Street

April 15, 1998

Dear Council President Street:

In light of the concerns expressed by the Department of Licenses and Inspections regarding the inclusion of language in Bill No. 980022 establishing a Vending Advisory Board, we would like to express once again our willingness to participate in any forum City Council and the Department would consider appropriate to ensure the smooth implementation of the Vending Ordinance and to address issues that may arise in the future as vending in University City continues to evolve. We anticipate that our neighbor institutions, such as the University City Science Center and the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia would also participate in this forum.

Assuming that such an arrangement would be acceptable to City Council and the Department of Licenses & Inspections, we will promptly begin working with you, Councilwoman Blackwell, Commissioner Egan, and all other necessary parties to establish such a body as quickly as possible.

Sincerely,

Carol R. Scheman, Vice President for Government, Community and Public Affairs

CONFERENCE

24 *Representations of Deity in Israel and The Ancient*; 1-7:15 p.m.; Rainey Auditorium, University Museum (SAS; CJS).

28 *Cult and Ritual in Israel and the Ancient Near East*; 9:30 a.m.-7 p.m.; Rainey Auditorium, University Museum (SAS; CJS).

FITNESS/LEARNING

The Department of Recreation is offering free yoga classes at Hutch Studio during reading days and finals. For info visit www.upenn.edu/recreation or call the Info Hotline: 898-6100.

27 *Intro Yoga*, 12:30-1:30 p.m.; also May 4.

28 *Yoga*, 12:30-1:30 p.m.; also May 5.

29 *Guided Relaxation*, 12:30-1:30 p.m.; also

May 6.

30 *Yoga*, 12:30-1:30 p.m.;
Intro Yoga, 4-5 p.m.

TALKS

24 *Rule 1, Optimality Theory and Child Language*; Arild Hestvik, University of Bergen, Norway; 4-5:30 p.m.; Suite 400A, 3401 Walnut (Provost's Interdisciplinary Seminar Fund; IRCS).

27 *Gene therapy for the muscular dystrophies: Are we ready for clinical trials?*; Hansell Stedman, surgery; 2 p.m.; Physiology Conference Room, 4th fl. Richards Bldg. (Pennsylvania Muscle Institute).

29 *Theology: Monotheism*; 9 a.m.; Rainey Auditorium (SAS;CJS).

Deadlines: The deadline for the Summer at Penn calendar is May 12. The deadline for the weekly update is the Monday preceding the week of publication.

Houston Hall's Last Hurrah

Say farewell to Houston Hall on Tuesday, April 28, and ring in the new Perleman Quad. Join fellow members of the University community on the Houston Hall patio from 2 to 5 p.m. for free food, games and music; rain location: Houston Hall's Bodek Lounge.

—Office of Student Life Activities and Facilities

Wheelchair Accessible Garden

On Thursday, May 14 from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. the Institute on Aging at the University of Pennsylvania Health Systems will sponsor the opening of its Wheelchair Accessible Garden. Announcing the completion of phase I of the garden, Health Systems hopes that the garden will bring great satisfaction to those who are physically challenged and will enhance the quality of life and health of those who use it. The garden is located on the grounds of the Ralston House and funded by the Ralston House and the McLean Contributionship. RSVP by May 8 to Bev Agard, 573-5789. *Raindate Friday, May 15, 2-4 p.m.*

—Bev Agard, Institute on Aging

The University of Pennsylvania Police Department Community Crime Report

About the Crime Report: Below are all Crimes Against Persons and Crimes Against Society from the campus report for **April 6, 1998 through April 12, 1998**. Also reported were **Crimes Against Property: 30 total thefts & attempts (including 7 thefts from auto, 4 incidents of criminal mischief & vandalism, 3 incidents of burglaries & attempts, 2 thefts of bicycles and parts, 2 incidents of trespassing & loitering, 1 theft of auto & attempt, and 1 incident of forgery & fraud)**. Full crime reports are in this issue of *Almanac* on the Web (www.upenn.edu/almanac/v44/n30/crimes.html). —Ed.

This summary is prepared by the Division of Public Safety and includes all criminal incidents reported and made known to the University Police Department between the dates of **April 6, 1998 through April 12, 1998**. The University Police actively patrols from Market Street to Baltimore Avenue and from the Schuylkill River to 43rd Street in conjunction with the Philadelphia Police. In this effort to provide you with a thorough and accurate report on public safety concerns, we hope that your increased awareness will lessen the opportunity for crime. For any concerns or suggestions regarding this report, please call the Division of Public Safety at 898-4482.

Crimes Against Persons

34th to 38th/Market to Civic Center: Threats & Harassment—3

04/06/98	2:47 PM	English House	Complainant harassed by unknown male
04/09/98	11:02 AM	Williams Hall	Harassing calls received
04/09/98	2:03 PM	Stouffer Dining	Complainant received verbal threat

38th to 41st/Market to Baltimore: Threats & Harassment—2

04/06/98	7:21 PM	3925 Walnut St.	Unwanted calls received
04/08/98	4:15 PM	Evans Bldg.	Unwanted messages left on answering machine

41st to 43rd/Market to Baltimore: Aggravated Assaults—1; Threats & Harassment—1

04/06/98	12:38 AM	216 S. St. Marks Sq.	Complainant struck with pistol/taken to HUP
04/11/98	3:51 AM	326 S. 42nd St.	Harassing phone calls received

30th to 34th/Market to University: Robberies (& Attempts)—1; Aggravated Assaults—1; Threats & Harassment—1

04/07/98	11:08 AM	Franklin Field	Officer assaulted by suspect/arrest
04/08/98	11:05 PM	Hill House	Complainant receiving unwanted calls/e-mails
04/11/98	12:44 AM	33rd & Walnut	Complainant robbed by unknown suspects

Outside 30th to 43rd/Market to Baltimore: Threats & Harassment—3

04/07/98	7:34 PM	3604 Hamilton St.	Complainant reports being harassed
04/08/98	7:23 PM	4331 Pine St.	Unwanted calls received
04/09/98	8:56 PM	517 S. 42nd St.	Unknown person spraying insecticide in apartment

Crimes Against Society

38th to 41st/Market to Baltimore: Disorderly Conduct—1; Alcohol & Drug Offenses—1

04/08/98	3:00 PM	3925 Walnut St.	Males fighting/2 juveniles arrested
04/10/98	8:40 PM	4000 Blk. Pine	Vehicle accident/drunk driver/Arrest

18th District Crimes Against Persons

10 Incidents and 1 Arrest were reported between **April 6, 1998 and April 12, 1998**, by the 18th District, covering the Schuylkill River to 49th Street and Market Street to Woodland Avenue.

04/06/98	3:15 PM	300 Hanson	Robbery
04/06/98	12:30 AM	216 St. Marks	Robbery
04/07/98	1:05 AM	220 50th	Robbery
04/10/98	11:35 AM	500 45th	Robbery
04/11/98	6:50 AM	5100 Walnut	Aggravated Assault
04/11/98	1:45 AM	5100 Ranstead	Robbery
04/11/98	7:15 AM	4800 Pine	Robbery
04/11/98	1:20 AM	4500 Market	Robbery/Arrest
04/11/98	12:01 AM	3700 Market	Robbery
04/11/98	12:35 AM	3400 Walnut	Robbery

Classified

FOR SALE

Penn Ph.D. hood and gown; length 51", chest 41". \$80. (610) 265-6355.

HOUSE FOR SALE

University Mews; modern townhouse; 3 bedrooms; furnished; garden; near University; \$850 plus utilities; starting date flexible; (215) 471-5343.

SEEKING

Center City furnished housing (3 bedrooms) from summer 1998 to summer 1999. Contact: Lois Ginsberg, call 898-9185 or e-mail ginsberg@grad.upenn.edu

To place classifieds: (215) 898-5274.



Almanac

Suite 211 Nichols House
3600 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6106
Phone: (215) 898-5274 or 5275 FAX: 898-9137
E-Mail: almanac@pobox.upenn.edu
URL: www.upenn.edu/almanac/

The University of Pennsylvania's journal of record, opinion and news is published Tuesdays during the academic year, and as needed during summer and holiday breaks. Its electronic editions on the Internet (accessible through the PennWeb) include HTML and Acrobat versions of the print edition, and interim information may be posted in electronic-only form. Guidelines for readers and contributors are available on request.

EDITOR	Karen C. Gaines
ASSOCIATE EDITOR	Marguerite F. Miller
ASSISTANT EDITOR	Tina Bejian
WORK-STUDY STUDENTS	Lateef Jones, Gregory Krykewycz, Tony Louie, Meghan M. Sinnott

ALMANAC ADVISORY BOARD: *For the Faculty Senate*, Martin Pring (Chair), Harold Bershady, Helen C. Davies, Peter Freyd, Ann E. Mayer, Vivian Seltzer. *For the Administration*, Ken Wildes. *For the Staff Assemblies*, PPSA, Michele Taylor; A-3 Assembly to be named; David Azzolina for Librarians Assembly.

The University of Pennsylvania values diversity and seeks talented students, faculty and staff from diverse backgrounds. The University of Pennsylvania does not discriminate on the basis of race, sex, sexual orientation, religion, color, national or ethnic origin, age, disability, or status as a Vietnam Era Veteran or disabled veteran in the administration of educational policies, programs or activities; admissions policies; scholarship and loan awards; athletic, or other University administered programs or employment. Questions or complaints regarding this policy should be directed to Valerie Hayes, Executive Director, Office of Affirmative Action, 3600 Chestnut Street, 2nd floor, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6106 or (215) 898-6993 (Voice) or (215) 898-7803 (TDD).

What They Say About the 1998 Lindback and Provost's Award Winners

Some excerpts from the dossiers that led to the selection of ten who will be honored Thursday. See their photographs, and the Interim Provost's invitation to the celebration, on page 1.

In Non-Health Schools

Dr. Peter Davies, a member of the Engineering faculty for 15 years and sometime graduate group chair of Materials Science: Dozens of students attesting to his remarkable work in designing the new curriculum for Chemistry 101 for engineering students, and in leading the way in introducing a multimedia component into lectures to highlight concepts difficult to express on the blackboard. In addition to his highly rated work with undergraduates, Professor Davies has supervised numerous dissertations and receives equally high praise from graduate students, many of whom have gone on to pursue research careers: "By encouraging me to write papers and present my work at conferences, Peter helped me prepare for a career in the 'real' scientific world," writes one; another says "Dr. Davies' personal commitment to helping each of his students achieve their highest potential enriched my graduate education and has permanently influenced my life." A colleague concludes that "Peter Davies is a highly creative scholar and outstanding teacher . . ."

Dr. Lorin Hitt, who joined the Wharton faculty in 1996 after receiving his Ph.D. from MIT: A colleague calls him "an indispensable member of the undergraduate teaching team" who rapidly turned *Information: Strategy, Systems, and Economics* from a low-level technology to high-level strategy course and tripled demand for it." A student predicts "I know that when I reflect on my years at Penn, I will feel fortunate to have stumbled upon the classroom of Dr. Hitt. When we are all established in our respective fields and students are studying or creating business plans in Hitt Hall, Justice will be served." Other words of praise: "exceptional teacher in the classroom...a true mentor...the most accessible professor I have had in Wharton... 'unmatched in his ability to teach, to advise, and to lead students.'"

Dr. Kathleen Jamieson, who joined the the Annenberg School in 1989 as Dean and is now involved in the establishment of a Public Policy Center. Outstanding SCUE evaluations and support from students is "legendary." Students frequently mention a lasting influence on their professional choices, some changing majors and direction because of her. "Dean Jamieson is brilliant, but, more importantly, she has found a way through her teaching and mentoring to make that knowledge meaningful to her students." She involves undergraduate and graduate students in her research. A colleague notes: "By my conservative estimate, at least 66 undergraduates and 106 graduates students have participated in sponsored research for which she has been the principal investigator." A student writes: "If you have ever wanted to hear the sound of a pin dropping in a room of 150 people, I recommend you sit in on one of Kathleen Hall Jamieson's classes. If the standard of what the Lindback Award represents includes a gift for teaching, a personal commitment to education, and support of Penn students beyond what occurs in the classroom, then the Committee could ask for no finer nominee than Kathleen Hall Jamieson."

Seth Kreimer, appointed to the Law School faculty in 1981, and voted overwhelming to receive the Harvey Levin Teaching Prize last

year. One colleague writes of life-long commitment to the public good in his teaching and public service activities, his with a devotion to the rigorous and demanding instruction of students. Another speaks of a legendary "Kreimer's Con Lit" that students say is "the defining experience of their legal education." Student and alumni voices concur: "...taught me how intellectually demanding and rigorous the proper practice of law must be, particularly for those who may seek to protect constitutional rights," and "It has been 16 years...but it remains one of the highlights of my legal education."

Provost's Award (Non-Health)

Lorene Cary, author of a prize-winning memoir, *Black Ice*, and two novels, *The Price of a Child* and *Pride*; a Penn alumna and Thouron Scholar (to Sussex) who returned to teach in the Writing Program in 1995. a Penn alumna and Thouron Fellow (Sussex), honorary degree-holder from Colby College. . She joined the English department in 1995, teaching in the Writing Program. Students' letters call her a genius at shedding light on the process of writing...a talented and dynamic professor.. whose influence on my writing ability and writing career will last the rest of my life." Colleagues describe her as "magical", "brilliant", "devoted to the image of the writer as incessant teacher-citizen." And: "Faculty members benefit when they teach students who have been taught by Lorene. They emerge from her class as more thoughtful writers and more astute observers of the world around them."

In the Health Schools

Dr. Sarah Kagan, who joined the Nursing School in 1994 after receiving her Ph.D. from UC/San Francisco, and received the Nursing Excellence Award from HUP in 1996. Noted as "a gifted teacher who is intellectually challenging as well as demanding," with impact on both classroom and clinical pedagogy, she has completely revamped Nursing 270 to make it contemporary and educate students about the field of gerontology. She is held in high esteem by students and peers alike: A colleaguesays she is able to connect with her students in a manner that is everlasting. A student writes, "I have never met an instructor so receptive to student feedback. Sarah was also able to motivate me more than any other professor at Penn," and another says, "Sarah is energetic, a trendsetter, a Renaissance nurse."

Dr. Gary Lichtenstein, who came to Pennas a Fellow in gastroenterology in 1987; became Assistant Professor in 1990 and was recently promoted to Associate Professor. Students wrote of his dedication to teaching especially beyond the walls of the classroom: spontaneous teaching moments on e-mail, in the office, on the wards and most importantly, by personal example: A medical student says, "The amount of material that Dr. Lichtenstein has synthesized in the course of his career and is able to impart during rounds, a lecture, or an informal conversation is truly amazing. In his interactions with patients, I was able to see a model of what I desire to be as a physician." [He has] "struck a tremendous balance between research, clinical care and education that has led him to become

the paragon on an academician." Another medical student notes: "At a great institution known for its teaching, Dr. Lichtenstein stands at the top." A colleague adds, "Gary not only deserves the Lindback Award, he represents all that this award stands for. He is this award."

Dr. Karin McGowan, who joined the School of Medicine in 1986 and has received numerous awards including the Commendation for Outstanding Teaching in both 1991 and 1993, and the Louis R. Dinon Award for excellence in teaching in 1995. Some 70 students wrote letters of support for Dr. McGowan; some describe her as "inspiring, thought-provoking, and dedicated" ... "the most dynamic, creative and engaging professor I have ever had..." Of her extraordinary teaching evaluations, one colleague said: "No one else with whom I have taught for the past 36 years has been able to maintain this type of teaching record. For the past 11 years, Karin has taught in the Medical School interdepartmental course *Mechanisms of Infection*, and in this highly rated course she has had the highest ranking in the student evaluations that anyone has had since the inception of the course 29 years ago." Students enjoy her excitement, patience and "no frills" approach to teaching, and one concludes: "In other words, she is great, concise, captivating, enthusiastic, knows her stuff, and she deserves the Lindback. The class of 2001 greatly appreciated all her efforts and the amount of time she devoted to teaching us."

Dr. Steven Spitalnik, who received his M.D. from Chicago in 1974, joined PennMed in 1985, and has won, along with the Young Investigator Award and other research awards, the Dean's Award for Excellence in Basic Science Teaching and the Peter C. Nowell Teaching Award. "Among our most gifted teachers," says a colleague in Pathology and Laboratory Medicine. Students remark on his effective use of the Socratic method: "He constantly pushed students to problem-solve, providing a resource or pointing the way to the solution, but allowing the student to come to his or her own conclusion." "Gifted...accessible...intellectually demanding... a model educator" whose "teaching has permanent effects."

Provost's Award (Health School)

Patricia Dunphy joined the faculty of the Nursing School in 1993 and has been awarded the Nursing Excellence Award from the University of Pennsylvania Medical Center. She is also listed in *Who's Who in American Nursing*. Faculty colleagues cite her excellent teaching abilities, her high standards and exceptional clinical knowledge: "...embodies that which is best in nursing and humankind, [has] integrity, sincerity, intellect, and courage that enable her to be a gifted teacher to her students, her colleagues and to those in the community." She integrates practice, education, and research, "effectively moving graduate students beyond traditional views of nursing and assisting them in articulating emergent roles and leading the way." Trish serves as "student advocate, our mentor and outstanding role model arranging for students to participate in conferences, special seminars and in-services" and, one student says, "has modeled nursing behavior and skills that I hope to put into action."

To the University Community

Last winter, a subcommittee of the Academic Planning and Budget Committee, expanded to include faculty and staff possessing particular expertise in information technology, was established to consider the rapidly growing area of distributed learning and the role that Penn should play as a premier teaching and research university. The report that follows describes the potential for distributed learning to revolutionize higher education and the issues that need to be addressed as part of Penn's involvement. It also provides a set of recommendations that will enable Penn to best participate in this dynamic area in a manner that supports our strategic goals as outlined in the [Agenda for Excellence](#).

— Michael L. Wachter, Interim Provost

Report of the Provost's Committee on Distributed Learning

Executive Summary

We have entered one of the most challenging and creative periods in Penn's intellectual history, due in large part to the dramatic advances in information technology. The electronic revolution offers bold opportunities for academic institutions. Nowhere is this more evident than in the rapidly growing area of distance or distributed learning—the delivery of educational programs over the Internet, including the world-wide web and video conferencing.

Penn has begun exploring this new electronic terrain in a variety of ways, including the creation of engaging 24-hour classroom discussions among faculty and students, a new pre-freshman course which introduces students to Penn even before they arrive on campus, and a variety of new courses for professional, master's and certificate programs. The value of these new tools is apparent—they allow us to extend teaching beyond the physical boundaries of the traditional classroom and provide greater flexibility in how and when students can learn. They also allow both faculty and students to take advantage of some of the most up-to-date research results anywhere in the world. In addition to their augmentation of our traditional residential programs, the new electronic tools also allow us to reach new students anywhere in the world.

This new environment carries with it both enormous promise and considerable risk—the inherent risk in doing nothing and the risk in doing something, but not doing it well. Those institutions that can change, innovate and lead are likely to thrive; those that cannot are in danger of losing their preeminence. We affirm that in distributed learning, as in residential learning, Penn must retain its position as the institution of choice for the very best students.

The number of distributed learning programs offered is growing rapidly; over 700 accredited institutions in the United States now offer some form of distributed learning. However, most of these programs are held in community colleges or in state universities and represent an expansion of their traditional extension programs. A few of our peer institutions—Duke, MIT, Cornell, Stanford and Oxford for example—offer master's degree or certificate programs. Penn, like those institutions, is just now entering this rapidly-emerging network-based educational field. Although we offer web-based courses and audio lectures-on-demand, degree-granting and even certificate programs are still rare.

The new technologies also provide opportunities to expand continuing or life-long education, including certificate, executive education and professional recertification programs. Pre-college programs and intellectual enhancement courses aimed at older students are of increasing interest as well.

On the other hand, while distributed learning should significantly enhance the way we deliver our traditional residential programs, initiatives currently underway among our peers do not include undergraduate and Ph.D. programs. For the foreseeable future, undergraduate and Ph.D. degree programs will remain the domain of residential instruction among institutions of Penn's caliber.

Penn does have a potential competitive advantage in distributed learning. We are, and have always been, entrepreneurial. And we are already strong in the established fields where distributed learning is making the greatest inroads—business, health, and engineering fields where knowledge changes rapidly and practitioners cannot easily find time in their

careers to pursue additional education full-time.

The proliferation of distributed learning educational programs raises a number of important questions: *What admission criteria should be used in enrolling students? Which faculty should teach the courses and on what basis should they be compensated? Who should monitor the quality of the programs?* What is clear is that in distributed learning Penn must aim to be among the very best, maintaining established University levels of excellence.

Distributed learning also raises complex questions regarding the funding, development, distribution and marketing of such programs. Their development involves real and recurring costs, including significant technology infrastructure. Some universities have made expensive investments in equipment and personnel in order to maintain control of the development and delivery of their programs. Others have formed collaborative agreements with for-profit firms raising questions about the control over course content, admissions, and the choice of learning sites. Finally, distributed learning also raises significant legal and accreditation issues including copyright and intellectual property, and the impact of state and international regulations.

Penn is already exploring the new technological terrain of distributed learning through individual schools initiatives. As we sort through the significant academic, legal and financial questions raised by this new technology, we advocate accountable experimentation and innovation.

We recommend the establishment of an internal fund to provide planning and startup costs for new academic distributed learning programs. In addition, we propose the creation of a small facilitation unit in ISC to assist faculty and schools with the development and implementation of such projects and to serve as a clearinghouse for “best practices.” Finally, we strongly urge project developers to seek advice from the General Counsel's staff on likely legal and regulatory issues, including accreditation in non-traditional jurisdictions, consistency with rules related to the University's tax-exempt status, rights to use the University's name and other trademarks, and intellectual property rights in course content. The General Council's office must approve all agreements with outside parties, as it currently does. The use of the University's name, as always, requires special attention.

In addition to these central initiatives, we propose that each school extend its approval and monitoring procedures to distributed learning courses, certificate programs and degree programs. These procedures should take into account the novel elements raised by distributed learning. All distributed learning degree programs, including those having the same academic content as existing residential programs, should be approved by the Academic Planning and Budget Committee which will use its established procedures for approving new degree programs. A three-year school-based review process should be instituted to assess each distributed learning program and determine whether it is meeting its stated goals and remains consistent with Penn's academic mission.

Finally, each school should indicate its plans for distributed learning degree and certificate programs as part of its regular report to the Provost's office on the strategic plan of the school and the [Agenda for Excellence](#). While there is no presumption that every school will engage in distributed learning in the near future, we do hope that each school will give serious thought to the possibilities it presents.

I. Introduction

Through the Internet, scholars, students, and researchers can now regularly study, interact and present their work throughout the world. Recently, there has been a dramatic acceleration in “distance learning” or “distributed learning”—educational programs delivered from a home site to students in remote sites anywhere around the world through the Internet.

Penn is committed to innovation wherever it enables us to strategically position the preeminence of our educational programs. The states that the University “will creatively deploy new technologies, recognizing that technology is revolutionizing the ways in which knowledge is acquired, created, and disseminated” and will make “strategic investments” in new programs across the arts and sciences and in the professions.

Penn is, above all else, a premier academic university. Our admission policy has long held that selectivity is the appropriate strategy for maintaining our status as a leading research and teaching university. This strategic vision should be applied to the challenges posed by the new technologies. Our preeminent goal must be to offer the finest programs to the finest students. The world has many superb students who are not able to study at Penn in a residential sense but would be wonderful Penn students nevertheless. Distributed education tools can bring Penn to them and, in the process, maintain and increase Penn’s stature as one of the finest institutions of higher education in the world.

II. The Landscape of Distributed Learning

A. Distributed Learning Defined

Distributed learning takes a myriad of forms. It includes synchronous learning, such as two-way video and audio-conferencing and asynchronous learning, where the student and teacher do not need to learn and teach at the same time or in the same space. There is little doubt that the most effective learning takes place in a highly interactive personal format. For this reason, synchronous learning is the most widely used method of teaching in a distributed format. State-of-the-art video-conferencing technology can mimic traditional classroom interaction quite effectively. Asynchronous learning also has a key role to play for students learning at home and at work. New educational programs that are developed, whether for residential students or non-residential students, will most likely use a mix of synchronous and asynchronous techniques.

B. Distributed Learning Initiatives in Higher Education

In the past several years, institutions of higher education have accelerated the pace with which they have adopted distributed learning tools. From 1991 to 1996, the number of private, four-year institutions with distributed learning programs more than doubled. Duke, M.I.T., Cornell, Oxford, and Stanford are now offering distributed learning master’s degree programs and many other institutions are developing such programs.

Clearly, the distributed learning market has great potential. A 1995 national survey of U.S. adults conducted by Washington State University showed that regardless of income level, 81 percent of respondents viewed gaining additional education as important to success in their work. To this group, the advantages of nonresidential distributed learning are obvious. For established professionals, enrolling in a residential program can be disruptive to a career and home life. Distributed learning, on the other hand, allows students to study wherever they might live and work.

Distributed learning programs are particularly appealing to those who work in fields where knowledge is changing rapidly, such as engineering, science, medicine, and business. In fact, a disproportionate number of the existing distributed learning degree and certificate programs are in engineering and technical fields. Notably, seventy five percent of the master’s programs offered by the most highly selective universities are in engineering and computer science.

Another 25 percent of distributed learning master’s programs at research universities are in business administration. As with engineering, business students are in a field where keeping up-to-date is critical and

where knowledge of the distributed learning technologies is likely to be high. Both fields also attract large enrollments and produce graduates who work in a wide range of leading corporations. In these fields, distributed learning programs can be marketed directly to and through employers.

Distributed learning is also attractive in continuing education or pre-college programs. In continuing education, such programs are typically aimed at nontraditional undergraduates who tend to be older and established in jobs. These students may or may not be seeking a bachelor’s degree and are often solely interested in further intellectual development. For example, Brown University has just introduced its CyberLearning Community program consisting of non-credit courses open to all students interested in humanities courses ranging from Homer’s *Odyssey* to Buddhist Thought and Practice. In pre-college education, Stanford has an Educational Program for Gifted Youth offering multimedia, computer-based undergraduate courses such as mathematics, physics, and expository writing to secondary school students outside of the classroom. These talented students can then move into university-level courses with advanced placement credit even before finishing high school.

By contrast, none of the top undergraduate institutions offer bachelors degree programs via distributed learning. In undergraduate education, the residential experience is vital because it brings students together in a new living and learning format away from home. Residential undergraduate education will thrive for many decades to come. The real challenge facing undergraduate education is how to exploit the power of the new teaching technologies to enhance the quality of the residential experience.

Ph.D. education is also unlikely to move to a distributed learning format. Outstanding Ph.D. education requires individualized intellectual interaction between the professor and the student. As of spring 1997, no distributed learning Ph.D. programs were offered by the top fifty universities with the exception of an unusual program in engineering at the University of Virginia. However, distributed learning technologies will certainly affect Ph.D. education in their ability to create more timely intellectual collaborations across universities and more flexible teaching arrangements within a university.

C. Distributed Learning Initiatives at Penn

Today at Penn, most distributed learning programs are in the experimental or start-up stage. Individual distributed learning courses are certainly more prevalent than degree or certificate programs. As successful results are achieved, individual courses will likely be aggregated to form certificate and degree programs. For example, Penn’s School of Engineering and Applied Science, supported by Sloan Foundation funding, is converting its master’s program in Telecommunications into web format. At this moment, Penn has only one degree program offered exclusively through distributed learning—a masters degree program in nurse-midwifery offered by the School of Nursing to a small number of students across Pennsylvania. The program uses the Commonwealth’s HealthNet video-conferencing network and is generously supported by the Bureau of Maternal and Child Health.

New information technologies are providing substantial instructional enhancements for faculty who adapt their teaching techniques to the new media. Such technologies are beginning to enrich Penn’s residential programs. Entering students who arrive each fall are already familiar with emerging educational technologies and these students are eager to use computer, video and audio to enrich the courses they take at college. Students also have the ability to network with our faculty before they come to Penn. In the Class of 2002, 64.3 percent of the students admitted early reported an e-mail address on their applications. Taking advantage of this electronic accessibility, Professors James O’Donnell and Alan Filreis started a lively writing course to introduce these students to Penn.

Penn is also experimenting with pre-college programs. The goal, in part, is to attract the brightest college prospects to our residential program. Full-fledged distributed courses for pre-college students under develop-

ment at Penn include a calculus course and an anthropology course.

Additionally, a number of schools are entering the distributed learning continuing education arena with certificate, executive education and professional recertification programs. Among these programs is a new Wharton certificate program that targets individuals who hold a bachelor's degree and are interested in advancing their business careers.

D. Distributed Learning Initiatives Among For-Profits

Producing a successful distributed education course can be far more demanding than preparing a traditional course for classroom delivery. Like our traditional residential programs, distributed learning courses require excellent content. But given the nature of the student body, the needed content may require a different mix between theory and up-to-date application. In addition, they require an effective integration of visual material, text, audio, and video.

Given these differences, for-profit companies are increasingly playing an important role in distributed learning. Firms that own video-conferencing facilities and equipment as well as the necessary production and marketing expertise are particularly well positioned in this emerging field. Some of these firms actively seek universities to collaborate with them in creating distance learning programs. Caliber Learning Network, for example, does not seek to compete with universities in creating academic content but instead specializes in converting traditional educational material into multimedia format, and then presenting it through their network of remote-site studios. Other companies, although potentially interested in collaboration, are more likely to be competitors in creating content. Firms such as Microsoft and Motorola provide advanced technical training to their own employees and are now interested in attracting professionals in other firms who wish to upgrade their skills.

Collaborating with for-profit companies has potential advantages, including their capacity to provide considerable expertise in visual content and technical abilities. It also eliminates the need to make expensive investments and costly upgrades. Such collaboration also carries with it risks. Existing distributed learning initiatives are still in their early stages of development and as such, important philosophical and practical considerations need to be considered. *Will such programs limit a university's flexibility? At the other extreme, will the collaborating firm simply be able to adopt the academic content and do its own programs? Who will have control over the course standards, admission standards, and the choice of sites?* For these reasons, collaboration with for-profits need to be closely monitored by the schools and the University.

The landscape of distributed learning programs is likely to include an array of traditional universities offering their own programs, universities collaborating with for-profit companies, and for-profit companies breaking new ground on their own. Based on Penn's goals of academic excellence, our highest quality and most challenging competitors are likely to continue to be universities such as Stanford and MIT. Penn will certainly not compete with the Internet equivalent of the diploma mills that have long existed. Nor will we compete with for-profit firms that forgo high content standards in order to appeal to the widest possible audience.

III. Issues

The new tools of distributed learning force us to rethink our approach to educating students. This is not only a challenge that must be accepted, but an opportunity that we should embrace. This environment of enormous promise does carry with it considerable risk and forces us to address some difficult and groundbreaking questions.

(1) What technologies work and how will they differ across programs?

The visual and audio content of distributed learning programs can be critical to their success. To date, distributed learning programs have experimented with a mix of two-way video-conferencing, web-based audio and video formats, e-mail, video tapes, and short-term face-to-face instruction.

(2) What type of infrastructure will be needed to support these programs and make certain that they are successful?

Production of any educational program using the Internet will require new investments in computing equipment and personnel. Video-conferencing requires remote classroom facilities and equipment, and on-site remote technical support staff. Providing these resources often leads to the

formation of business relationships with for-profit firms or other educational institutions that possess the needed facilities, equipment and staff.

(3) How will these distributed learning collaborations be structured? The details of the structure are of great importance to the University as well as the ultimate success of the venture. In general, a joint venture with a for-profit entity will pose significantly greater legal challenges for the University than will a more traditional vendor relationship, particularly in the area of tax law compliance and intellectual property rights. From the outset, schools and programs should prepare a detailed business plan of any proposed relationship with an outside entity.

(4) What types of courses should be developed?

Courses can be developed across all of Penn's schools and must meet established University levels of excellence. Optimally, courses should be based on existing residential courses and complement scholarly research interests of the faculty.

(5) What standards will guide admission to the program and how will students' progress be monitored?

It has long been a cornerstone of Penn's admission policy that our selectivity helps sustain our worldwide recognition as a leading research and teaching university. The core clientele of distributed learning courses may differ significantly from Penn residential programs. They are likely to include busy executives and professionals with many years of on-the-job experience who may be outstanding students yet not perform as well on traditional measures as do students just out of college. Schools and programs, however, should not deviate from Penn's long-standing practice of selectivity in admitting students. One important way of assuring student quality is to establish admissions standards of equal selectivity to those applied to students in residence. A judicious use of some residence requirements should help to ensure the quality of distributed learning programs.

(6) How will faculty be chosen to teach in distributed learning programs? If standing faculty are used, what is the best way to compensate them?

A key indicator of excellence in distributed learning will be the extent to which standing faculty are involved in the teaching of courses. The essential research and teaching goals of the University should not be compromised. Over-load teaching of distributed learning courses has some advantages, but may be a distraction from in-load teaching and research commitments. Thus, the mix of in-load and over-load teaching must reflect the needs of the program and the interests and availability of the faculty.

(7) Who will monitor the quality of the programs offered to ensure that the reputation and standards of the University are maintained?

The faculty of each school must be responsible for the maintenance of high quality instruction, but the new technologies require a new type of vigilance over presentation and content. All of Penn's twelve schools have an interest in maintaining the excellent reputation of their own programs as well as those throughout the University.

IV. Recommendations

To be successful, distributed learning programs must contribute to the *Agenda for Excellence's* overarching goal of having world-class students taught by world-class faculty. In addition to this superordinate goal, the *Agenda* also specifically envisages the development of strategic masters programs and the deployment of the new technologies that are embodied by distributed learning courses. To attain these goals, we believe it is important to support and encourage accountable experimentation in distributed learning programs. We thus make recommendations in five broad areas relating to distributed learning programs at Penn:

1. Create a Penn Distributed Learning Venture Capital Fund

We advocate that arrangements be made for the University to sponsor an "internal venture capital fund" for new distributed learning programs. A subcommittee of Academic Planning and Budget (AP&B), expanded to include faculty and staff possessing particular expertise in distributed learning, should direct this fund and oversee its administration. Funds should be used to provide planning and startup costs for individual schools or groups of schools with meritorious programs. In providing this funding, the University should act as a partner with the schools: distributed learning programs that receive internal venture funding will, in addition to any

division of revenues, in accordance with standing University policies, return a share of their revenues as a royalty to fund successor programs. Like all good venture capital firms, the University will actively support and hold accountable the management of the distributed learning programs it supports.

2. Form an ISC Distributed Learning Facilitation Unit

To preserve the quality of Penn's entries into new educational markets, a small working unit should be created in Information Systems and Computing (ISC), within existing budgetary limits for 1998-99, to support and facilitate distributed learning programs in the schools. Working under the Vice Provost for Information Systems and Computing and with the guidance of the subcommittee of AP&B, this unit should offer a full range of assistance on the technology, marketing and distribution of distributed learning programs. The unit should work to help schools define and implement program ideas in the ways that most effectively meet their particular business objectives. It should provide information on distributed learning programs offered elsewhere, including markets, competitors, formats, and media. The unit can coordinate acquisition of equipment and software across schools to take advantage of possible economies of scale and quantity discounts. The unit should maintain updated knowledge and contacts in the areas of vendors and potential collaborators, which may include both for-profit and not-for-profit companies who offer technology, marketing and distribution services, or who seek academic content for the distributed learning market. In sum, this unit should serve as a clearinghouse for "best practices" and an adviser for programs that need assistance. In performing these functions, the unit should work closely with the Office of the General Counsel on legal and regulatory matters, and with the Office of the Provost on institutional policy and strategy.

3. Monitor Contract Formation through the Office of the General Counsel and the Executive Vice President

Distributed learning initiatives will often benefit from collaboration or contracting with for-profit firms that have expertise in areas of visual presentation and technology or in network facilities and off-site facility staffing. Collaborations with for-profit firms raise both important opportunities and novel questions that need to be carefully considered. The business and legal aspects of all such collaborations should be evaluated by the Office of the Executive Vice President and the Office of the General Counsel. The University must protect its right to control the academic content, the form of presentation of that content, and Penn's tax-exempt status in any collaborative agreement.

The General Counsel's office should devote resources to the development of expertise in and responsiveness to requests to handle distributed learning contracts on behalf of schools and programs. The office, using outside counsel when necessary, should be prepared to act expeditiously on requests from the schools or programs. General Counsel's staff should advise project developers on legal and regulatory issues, including accreditation in non-traditional jurisdictions, consistency with rules related to the University's tax-exempt status, rights to use the University's name and other trademarks, and intellectual property rights in course content.

The starting point for contract formation should be the University's existing policies on these matters. The General Counsel's office, in collaboration with the ISC facilitation unit, should also work to adapt and streamline these policies to conform to the new realities of the distributed learning era. Although a single standard form contract is unlikely to fit the needs of all programs, the interests of the schools and the University are best protected by a unified approach to the general issues that are raised. The goal of this effort should be to develop alternative standard forms that represent the interests of the University and its faculties and to ensure compliance with all applicable legal requirements.

4. Establish School Strategic Planning and Reporting on Distributed Learning Initiatives

To maintain high levels of excellence in our programming, it is necessary to establish a strategic approach to advance Penn's distributed learning programs. In order to fulfill that need, each school should report regularly to the Office of the Provost on its plans in the distributed learning degree and certificate programming areas. The reports should show how

the prospective distributed learning plans address both the strategic plan of the school and the *Agenda for Excellence* and provide answers to the issues raised above. There is no presumption that every school will engage in distributed learning in the near future, but there is every reason to hope that each school will give serious thought to the possibilities it offers.

5. Approve, Monitor and Evaluate Distributed Learning Programs

Each of Penn's schools should adopt school-based procedures for evaluating all distributed learning courses, certificate programs, and degrees. In particular, these procedures should address the issues raised above and explicitly review a detailed academic plan and a business plan of any proposed relationship with outside entities. We also recommend that for the foreseeable future all programs be reviewed by the originating school on an on-going basis to assure quality and to guide planning for the future. Finally, given the potential global impact for certificate programs taught via distributed learning, we recommend a careful re-evaluation by school leadership of all current certificate programs prior to their distribution by these new media.

Through the established procedures of AP&B, the University and the proposed distributed learning subcommittee of AP&B should adopt specific, comprehensive procedures for approving all degree-granting distributed learning programs, even when those programs have the same academic content as existing residential programs. These procedures should be based on and congruent with current procedures, but should be expanded to incorporate the novel elements raised in distributed learning programs. Since the trustees of the University grant all degrees, the Academic Planning and Budget Committee should forward all degree programs it approves, including those that are similar to existing residential programs, to the trustees of the University for their approval. This would establish extra safeguards on the adoption of distributed learning degree programs.

For all distributed learning degree programs, the University should establish a three-year review process to assess their fulfillment of the stated goals of the programs. These reviews should be rigorous, normative, academic, and market-based. They should be guided by the academic and business plans put forward at the initiation of the distributed learning programs. Finally, the reviews should ensure that all distributed learning programs are consistent with Penn's academic mission and capacities.

V. The Future of Distributed Learning at Penn

The future is upon us—and it is moving faster and in far more significant ways than we could have anticipated. Not only are the new network and information technologies transforming the way we teach and interact, they are also challenging our traditional student markets even while they foster new ones. They are also pushing academic institutions into a convergence with the private sector. Guided by the *Agenda For Excellence*, Penn will move forward into this new educational era with a deliberate entrepreneurial deployment of distributed learning technology. With the curriculum review structure and the technical resources proposed here, Penn will put forward the best of its educational programs to take full advantage of the strengths of the new media. We will thereby ensure that Penn's stature will remain world-class in both its traditional residential programs as well as its new, innovative distributed learning ventures.

Provost's Committee on Distributed Learning

Michael L. Wachter, Interim Provost (Chair)

Gregory Farrington, Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Eduardo Glandt, Heuer Professor of Chemical Engineering

Richard E. Kihlstrom, Miller-Freedman Professor of Finance

Walter Licht, Professor of History and Associate Dean for Graduate Studies, School of Arts and Sciences

Janice F. Madden, Professor of Sociology and Vice Provost for Graduate Education

James J. O'Donnell, Professor of Classics and Vice Provost for Information Science and Computing

Jerry Wind, Lauder Professor of Marketing

Michael Eleey, Associate Vice Provost, IS&C (ex officio)

Bernard Lentz, Director of Institutional Research and Analysis (ex officio)