

UNIVERSITY of PENNSYLVANIA *Almanac*

Tuesday,
May 7, 2002
Volume 48 Number 33
www.upenn.edu/almanac/

GSFA's 2002 G. Holmes Perkins Award: Dr. David De Long

The **G. Holmes Perkins Award** is given in recognition of distinguished teaching and innovation in the methods of instruction in the classroom, seminar, or studio to a faculty member in the Graduate School of Fine Arts. The award is named in honor of G. Holmes Perkins who served as Dean of the Graduate School of Fine Arts from 1951-1971, and was established by former Dean and Paley Professor Patricia Conway in 1993.

This year's recipient is *Dr. David G. De Long*, professor of architecture and of city and regional planning. He has been teaching American architectural history and theories of historic preservation at the Graduate School of Fine Arts since 1984. Dr. De Long was chair of the Graduate Group in Historic Preservation from 1984-1996 and GSFA's Associate Dean for Graduate



David De Long

Studies of Fine Arts from 1992-94. He is internationally recognized for his many contributions as historian and educator, author, preservationist, curator and designer. Dr. De Long has been the recipient of a number of awards, including the Wyck-Strickland Award, given by the Germantown-based Wyck Association to honor those who have made outstanding contributions in the fields of architecture and preservation

“with an understanding of and sensitivity to the past.” Dr. De Long will retire from the faculty at the end of this semester, but will continue to teach on a part-time basis. He is one of the newly emeritus faculty (*see page 12*).

Conclusion of Penn's Way 2002

To the Penn Community:

We would like to thank all of you who participated in the Penn's Way 2002 Workplace Charitable Campaign. We especially want to thank all of the coordinators and facilitators in the schools and centers who volunteered and worked so hard to make this campaign a success. We are delighted to inform you that our partner organizations, the United Way of South-eastern Pennsylvania and the Center for Responsible Funding, have reported that this year's campaign met our campaign goal and raised over \$400,000. You should all be proud of this incredible accomplishment. The compassion and generosity of Penn's faculty and staff truly reflected this year's theme: *Commitment to Our Community*. A campaign report is posted on the Penn's Way website, www.upenn.edu/osl/pennsway/.

Again, we congratulate all who participated and helped to make Penn's Way 2002 a success!

—Valarie Swain-Cade McCoullum,
—Mitchell Marcus,
Penn's Way Co-Chairs

School of Veterinary Medicine Teaching Awards

The teaching awards at the School of Veterinary Medicine are always presented during the annual Student Government Dinner Dance. This year the Franklin Institute was the venue and 250 students, faculty, and staff gathered to celebrate the Veterinary Medical Student Government Teaching Awards and awards given by the dean.

Dean Alan M. Kelly presented the **Dean's Award for Leadership in Basic Sciences** to *Dr. Ronald Harty*, assistant professor of microbiology. The **Dean's Award for Leadership in Clinical Science** was presented to *Dr. Amy Kapatkin*, assistant professor of surgery. These two awards honor one faculty member from the clinical departments and one from the basic science departments who have made outstanding contributions to teaching their disciplines.

Dr. Kenneth Drobatz, associate professor of critical care medicine, received the **Carl J. Norden Distinguished Teacher Award** established in 1963 “to recognize outstanding teachers who, through their ability, dedication, character and leadership, contribute significantly to the advancement of the profession.”



Kenneth Drobatz

The four classes honored the faculty members they considered to be outstanding teachers.

The **Class of 2002** presented awards to *Dr. Corinne Sweeney*, professor of medicine, and *Dr. Amy Kapatkin*, assistant professor of surgery. The **Class of 2003 Award** honored *Dr. Patricia Sertich*, associate professor of reproduction. *Dr. Wilfried Weber*, professor of pathology, received the **Class of 2004 Award**. The **Class of 2005** presented an award to *Dr. Robert Washabau*, associate professor of medicine.

Dr. Corrine Sweeney was also presented with the **Veterinary Medical Alumni Society Excellence in Teaching Award**. This annual award is based on the recommendations of recent graduates and is funded by VMAS.



Ronald Harty



Amy Kapatkin



Corinne Sweeney



Patricia Sertich



Wilfried Weber



Robert Washabau

In Memory of Shannon Schieber

To remember Shannon Schieber, the 23-year-old Wharton doctoral candidate who was murdered in her Center City apartment four years ago today (*Almanac* May 12, 1998), the Penn Women's Center is holding a Memorial at noon today at the Women's Center, 3643 Locust Walk. The University community is invited to attend and share remembrances.

IN THIS ISSUE

- 2 Speaking Out: Bikes on Walks; Payroll Info Online
- 2 Death of Dr. Roll; SEC Actions; Council Coverage
- 4 SENATE: Report of the Committee on the Faculty
- 5 Procedures Regarding Misconduct in Research
- 8 SENATE: Report of the Committee on Administration
- 9 Policy for Postdoctoral Fellows in Physical, Biological, and Health Sciences and in Engineering
- 11 Hamilton Village Architect; Thanks for Sharing Observations on Academia; Fulbright Scholars Program; Bosch Fellowships to Germany
- 12 Honors & Other Things
- 13 U@PENN
- 14 OF RECORD: PENNCard Policy; May Volunteer Opportunities
- 15 Update; Crime Stats; Classifieds
- 16 Three-Year Academic Calendar

Speaking Out

Bicyclists vs. Pedestrians

We may be thankful Sir Peter—Sir Peter Shephard, a Visionary Landscape Architect and Planner—never saw Blanche Levy Park, his ‘pedestrian-oriented area’, degrade into a high-speed bicycle raceway because our university hasn’t the courage to insist on good social citizenship. Penn is quite likely the only school among the Ivy League wherein bicycle-riders deliberately plow into walkers with a hearty “get the hell out of my way!” And it ain’t ‘hell’ they’re yellin’. I honestly believed that after that potential student’s mother suffered a broken collarbone during a campus tour somebody in charge would wise up and take charge. But then I also thought we’d see some action after a co-worker had her ankle snapped on the Walnut Street sidewalk last April. Penn placed two nice green trashbins against the wall. Now we can slink to and from work. Like the lady says, “It isn’t a family anymore, it’s a business.” Well it’s bad business when employees and customers are laid up murmuring to lawyers.

—Jerry Briggs, *Van Pelt Library*

Response

The University does have a Bicycle Policy that has been in effect since 1994. The Penn Police actively enforces the policy. A section of the policy reads as follows:

- Bicycles may not be operated on Locust, Smith and Hamilton Walks between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. Cyclists should dismount their bikes and walk their vehicles between the above-mentioned hours.

In addition to University policy, the Pennsylvania Vehicle Code and the Philadelphia Code prohibits any person above the age of twelve from riding a bicycle on any sidewalk or pedestrian pathway in a business district. The Penn campus area meets the definition of a business district. University Police are authorized to enforce both the Pennsylvania Vehicle Code and City of Philadelphia Ordinances. Consequently, those found in violation of the Pennsylvania Vehicle Code would qualify for issuance of a Traffic Citation.

Penn Police officers on foot and on bicycles are aware of and share the safety concerns that pedestrians have relative to unsafe operation of bicycles on campus walkways. Officers are detailed to campus walkways every day to enforce appropriate ordinances. Through visible, proactive patrol, our officers will make the walkways of our campus safer for all members of our community.

If a member of the community should observe a bicycle operating in a manner inconsistent with University policy, I encourage you to bring the situation to the attention of the Penn Police by reporting this activity to the department. Walk to the nearest Blue Light emergency phone and report the activity to our Communications Center. An officer will be dispatched and the situation will be managed appropriate to the offense.

—Thomas A. Rambo, *Chief of Police*

Convenience vs. Confidentiality

I recently received e-mail notification of the new “U@Penn” system whereby faculty/staff payroll information will be web-accessible. I am writing to express my deep concern at the implementation of this system. I do not see any compelling rationale for putting payroll/benefits information on the web, and the security exposure is substantial.

I take considerable effort to avoid putting personal information, such as home address, home telephone number, social security number, credit card numbers, etc., on any computer where they could be accessed from the outside even in principle. This system will make it possible for a malicious hacker to obtain even more sensitive information about me.

I am aware that ISC has gone to some lengths to ensure that the system is as secure as possible. However, the security relies entirely on the integrity of my PennNet password. This password has been stolen at least once in the past, probably by a sniffer program, and I have to anticipate that it will be stolen in the future. Even without the password vulnerability, however, history has shown that systems believed to be totally secure can have hidden weaknesses that come to light only when there is a major breach of security.

There is of course a tradeoff between convenience and security. For example, student records are also on the web via the PENN InTouch and other systems. That is a case where I would agree that the convenience of students and designated faculty and staff accessing the information outweighs the putative risk of its becoming public. Salary information is, I believe, in a different category. I have never needed to know my benefits status at 10 p.m. on a weekend—waiting until working hours to contact my business administrator or the Benefits Office has been perfectly acceptable up to now.

I hope that Penn will rethink the implementation of the U@Penn system.

—Paul A. Heiney, *Professor of Physics*

Response

We are in complete agreement with Professor Heiney that the need to maintain the confidentiality of personal information is extremely important. We can assure him that we have given the matter careful attention with regard to U@Penn. This is a responsibility that we all take very seriously. We also recognize that the inno-

Reminder: Almanac Schedule

There is no issue of *Almanac* scheduled for Tuesday, May 14. There are only two weekly issues remaining in the spring semester schedule: May 21 and May 28. If you need to publish information of concern to faculty and staff, please contact *Almanac* to reserve space. *Almanac* does not publish weekly in the summer months. A mid-July issue is anticipated, as usual. Breaking news will be posted to *Almanac Between Issues* and *Express Almanac* will be sent as needed.

—Ed.

vative use of technology may entail some risks, which must be balanced against opportunities to enhance service delivery and improve administrative efficiencies. We believe that, in this case, the appropriate safeguards have been taken to mitigate the risks while achieving some significant benefits.

U@Penn’s ability to control data and content presented, along with the current state of access controls, will provide increased convenience to the Penn community through a fast, secure and easy to access web application. In an environment where administrative efficiency is a desired goal, U@Penn will reduce calls on business administrators’ time as well as reduce the number of “back office” inquiries permitting focus on the more complex service needs of the faculty and staff. Due diligence has been performed to protect and secure the information in accordance with University security policy and best practices.

Personal information is not actually stored within the web application; it is only when an individual selects information on the U@Penn site that the information is retrieved from the personnel/payroll system and displayed. If the application is not accessed, the data remains secured in the existing payroll/personnel system. There is no “identifying information” presented on screens with the actual personal data. In addition, a time-out factor is employed so that if an individual fails to log out and/or respond within a predetermined period, the session is automatically logged off. The application verifies that an individual has a valid record on the personnel/payroll system and all activity to U@Penn is logged.

Over the last several years, increasingly more stringent requirements for passwords have been in place making it more difficult to “guess” passwords. The web security software in use does not permit the transmission of clear text passwords and encrypts them. The servers on which the applications operate are not general purpose machines, e.g. do not run e-mail, are located in a secure facility and operate behind “firewalls”, which further reduce the risk of unauthorized access.

We believe that U@Penn will provide faculty and staff with a convenient means of accessing their information, but we also recognize that individuals may choose not to use this convenience. For the Penn community in general, U@Penn will be a fast, secure and flexible means of obtaining information that would otherwise require significant verbal or written communications.

—Robin H. Beck, *Vice President for Information Systems and Computing*

—Kenneth B. Campbell, *Comptroller*

—John J. Heuer, *Vice President for Human Resources*

Ed Note: See page 13 for more information on the new U@Penn web-based service.

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

Death of Dr. Roll, Civil Engineering

Dr. Frederic Roll, emeritus professor of civil engineering, died on April 29 at the age of 80.

Dr. Roll earned a B.A. in civil engineering at City College of New York in 1944 and earned a masters and Ph.D. from Columbia University in 1949 and 1957 respectively. He joined the Penn faculty in 1957 and remained here until he retired in 1986.

He was co-author of *The International Handbook of Structural Concrete*, a book that was a milestone in the field. In 1963 and 1964 he was a visiting research fellow at the Cement and Concrete Association, England. He served as president of the Philadelphia Chapter of the American Society of Civil Engineers, an organization that named him Structural Engineer of the Year in 1987.

Dr. Roll is survived by his wife, Christine. There will be a memorial service on Monday, May 13, at noon in the social room of the Philadelphian, 2401 Pennsylvania Ave. Memorial donations may be made to the American Cancer Society, 428 Exton Commons, Exton, PA, 19341.

April Council Meeting Coverage

At the April 24 University Council meeting—the last of the semester—GAPSA presented an overview of its recently completed three-year strategic plan to support student groups, in an effort to bring graduate students from across the University together into a more cohesive community.

Dr. Gerald Porter, chair of the Personnel Benefits Committee, gave highlights from his report (*Almanac* April 23) on health care costs and privacy.

Dr. Ned Lally, chair of the Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics Committee, (*Almanac* April 23) discussed academic support for student athletes, the advantages of the Pre-Freshman Program for athletes as well as non-athletes, and the notion of providing incentives to encourage student-athletes to improve their GPA, perhaps by providing a trophy to the team with the best GPA.

Dr. Paul DeWeer, a member of the International Programs Committee, discussed several aspects of their report (*Almanac* April 23) including the move of the Office of International Programs to new and expanded office space at International House.

President Judith Rodin responded to a question about releasing international students' information. She said that the American Association of University Presidents met in Washington, D.C. with Homeland Security Director Tom Ridge and the group will be "vigilant about giving input to administration in D.C."

(The next three committee reports are scheduled to be published in the May 21 issue).

Dr. Daniel Ruff, chair of the Bookstores Committee, presented his report which focused on the availability of textbooks; merchandising of non-text books such as trade and popular books; and the possibility of discounts with online vendors.

Dr. David Smith, chair of the Communications Committee, touched on some of the areas his committee was charged with: electronic privacy policy; remote access and library user authentication; evolution of the Penn homepage and the Undergraduate Admissions website.

Dr. Eric Orts, chair of the Community Relations Committee, said that a new website will be unveiled next month to improve communications between Penn and the community. A number of other topics are addressed in their report.

Dr. Helen Davies, chair of the Quality of Student Life Committee, reported that her committee examined the impact of fraternities and sororities on undergraduate student life. She said that more oversight of the Greek organizations is needed.

Dr. Mitchell Marcus, chair of the Safety and Security Committee, said that they accepted the revised PENNCARD Policy and discussed building security recommendations that are being reviewed by Penn Police. They also reviewed pedestrian and traffic safety.

The meeting concluded with a discussion of issues to be addressed in the coming academic year.

SENATE From the Senate Office

The following statement is published in accordance with the Senate Rules. Among other purposes, the publication of SEC actions is intended to stimulate discussion among the constituencies and their representatives. Please communicate your comments to Executive Assistant Carolyn Burdon, Box 12 College Hall/6303, (215) 898-6943 or burdon@pobox.upenn.edu.

Actions Taken by the Senate Executive Committee Wednesday, May 1, 2002

1. Chair's Report. Professor David Hackney reported on the University's Emergency Energy Program for this summer. There may be a need to limit air-conditioning during the hottest days, as was the case last summer. Electric bills for 12 months are based on the University's consumption during peak periods. Limiting air-conditioning and turning off air handlers for periods of 30 minutes can save the University millions of dollars. He urged faculty to contact their dean in advance if problems are anticipated. He noted that it is hoped that the Report on Teaching Evaluations will be available in the fall. The Minority Equity Committee has received data and will finalize their plans in the fall. Graduate student unionization is still under discussion and at this point no vote has been taken. The Committee on the Faculty's recommendations on the Gender Equity Report were enthusiastically received by the administration.

Professor Hackney extended thanks to Carolyn Burdon, executive assistant to the Faculty Senate Chair, chairs of Senate committees, Sarah Kagan, Past Secretary of the Faculty Senate, Edward Rubin, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, Gerald Porter, Past Chair of the Faculty Senate and Mitchell Marcus, Chair-elect of the Faculty Senate.

2. Past Chair's Report on Academic Planning and Budget Committee and Capital Council. Professor Gerald Porter stated that there was one meeting of the Academic Planning and Budget Committee since the last SEC meeting. At that meeting, held on April 23, Omar Blaik, Vice President for Facilities and Real Estate Services, reviewed the FY03 Capital Plan. The final meeting of the committee for this academic year is scheduled for May 7. There is a meeting of Capital Council scheduled for May 31.

3. Faculty Liaisons to Trustee Committees. Professor Porter, faculty liaison to the Trustee Committee on Budget and Finance, described changes that will be made beginning this month to improve communications between faculty and trustees.

Old Business

4. Task Force on Retirement. Associate Provost Barbara Lowery announced that this was a preliminary report. Professor Jerry Rosenbloom outlined the proposed recommendations growing out of the year-long work of the task force.

5. Proposed Revised Procedures Regarding Misconduct in Research. Professor Vincent Price presented the report of the Senate Committee on the Faculty (*see report and procedures on pages 4-7*). He reminded SEC that several revisions were reviewed by the Faculty Senate, dating back to 1997. The Committee on the Faculty believes the latest revision is a fair and sensible approach within the Federal guidelines that retains the rights of the respondent, the University and confidentiality. Several SEC members expressed concern that there had been no review of the proposed revised procedures by the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

It was moved and seconded that the Senate Executive Committee endorse the Proposed Revised Procedures Regarding Misconduct in Research [dated April 15, 2002], pending review by the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility. The motion was adopted by an overwhelming majority. Faculty Senate Chair-elect Marcus said he will ask SCAFR to expedite their review.

6. Proposed Revised Policy for Postdoctoral Fellows. Committee on Administration Chair Dennis Yao noted that SEC had referred the policy back to committee to consider whether the expanded policy applied to postdoctoral fellows in the humanities. The Provost's Council on Research recommended and the Senate Committee on Administration concurred that the proposal be cut back to the original scope, that is, for the physical, biological, health sciences and engineering. Concern about the requirement that all research materials must remain at the University in the event a postdoctoral fellow leaves has been revised so that this is negotiated on an individual basis. The revision also broadens mentoring policies.

Professor Yao moved adoption of the proposal [dated April 24, 2002] (*see pages 9-10*). The motion was seconded and adopted unanimously.

7. Report of the Senate Committee on Administration. Professor Yao drew attention to the annual report (*see page 8*), emphasizing the section on the Cost of Research. The Provost's ongoing study of the matter presents an opportunity for the faculty to institutionalize a review of the issue, to form a partnership with the Provost, to provide input, and report to the faculty.

Professor David Hackney turned the chair over to Professor Marcus.

New Business

Professor Mitchell Marcus took office as Chair of the Faculty Senate. He thanked Carolyn Burdon for her 30 years of service, noting that she is the heart and soul of the Faculty Senate.

8. Election of Four SEC Members to the Council Steering Committee. Nominations were made and ballots were circulated.

9. Chair of the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty. Professor Eric Bradlow was reappointed chair of the committee.

10. Optional June 5, 2002 meeting. It was agreed to cancel the June meeting.

Report of the Senate Committee on the Faculty

Proposed Revisions to Procedures Regarding Misconduct in Research

April 18, 2002

The Senate Committee on the Faculty ("SCOF") was asked to consider a draft of revised "Procedures Regarding Misconduct in Research" (the "Procedures") that was developed by the Research Misconduct Procedures Review Committee, chaired by Professor David Manning (the "Manning Committee").

The Manning Committee's work represents a continuation of an effort to revise the Procedures so as to reflect developing federal law. Thus, in 1997 the Procedures (as published in *Almanac* on September 3, 1991) were revised to include an addendum recommended by the Office of Research Integrity of the U.S. Public Health Service (*Almanac*, September 9, 1997). [The existing procedures that would be changed by these proposed revisions can be located at: www.upenn.edu/assoc-provost/handbook/]. Thereafter, SCOF considered and commented upon proposed revisions prepared by the Manning Committee's predecessor. In a letter dated December 7, 1999, Gregory Possehl, Chair of SCOF, recommended that "the Provost should select a body to redraft the Procedures ... in light of the final White House Office of Science and Technology ["OSTP"] recommendations." Notification of OSTP's final federal policy on research misconduct was published on December 6, 2000, and that policy is reflected in the Manning Committee's draft.

SCOF discussed the draft at two meetings, including one attended by Professor Manning and Robert Terrell of the General Counsel's office, an ex officio member of the Manning Committee. In addition, the Chair of SCOF met personally or in telephone conference with the same individuals on two occasions. As a result of those meetings, the draft was extensively revised to accommodate concerns expressed by members of SCOF. We are now pleased to recommend approval of the revised draft, which we believe represents a sensible and fair approach to a difficult and complicated subject, one that implicates individual, institutional and public interests and that is embedded in a complex federal regulatory environment.

The field of policy choice with respect to the Procedures narrowed considerably after OSTP's final policy was published, at least if, as SCOF believes, it is not thought sensible to have one policy on research misconduct for federally sponsored research and another for non-federal research. The federal policy defines research misconduct, prescribes the necessary predicates for a finding of research misconduct, invites research institutions to make the initial response to allegations of research misconduct (with the alternative being immediate direct federal agency involvement), and sets forth the general elements of an acceptable process for such a response.

The federal policy provides that the institutional response will usually consist of several organizationally separated phases, including an inquiry to determine whether an investigation is warranted, an investigation leading to recommendations, and an adjudication, defined as a phase "during which recommendations are reviewed and appropriate corrective actions determined." The policy contemplates that the institutional process may be supplemented by additional oversight or investigative steps by the appropriate federal agency, and it sets forth a variety of requirements to notify federal authorities during and at the conclusion of the institutional

process. Finally, the policy provides guidelines for developing "fair and timely procedures for responding to allegations of research misconduct," including safeguards for informants, safeguards for subjects of allegations, norms of objectivity and expertise for those involved in reviewing allegations and conducting investigations, reasonable time limits for the conduct of each stage, and protections to ensure confidentiality.

SCOF believes that the revisions to the Procedures now proposed by the Manning Committee faithfully reflect the requirements of federal law and will fairly and responsibly serve the sometimes conflicting interests of the individuals involved in allegations of research misconduct, of the University and of the public. The process prescribed provides numerous protections against hasty or ill-considered judgments concerning research misconduct, while requiring that serious and credible allegations be examined thoroughly and promptly. Apart from protections afforded to complainants and informants, a respondent is afforded a meaningful opportunity to participate at each stage of the process, including (1) the right to reply to the report of a preliminary inquiry committee (1.3), (2) the right to an advisor (who may be a lawyer) when appearing before a formal investigation committee (2.2), (3) the right to make a written reply to (2.3), and to initiate a hearing concerning any material findings of fact in (2.4), the draft report of a formal investigation committee, and (4) the right to make a written reply to the final report of a formal investigation committee (2.5). In addition, a respondent has the right to challenge alleged procedural irregularities and/or instances of bias at any stage of the process and to appeal a denial of such a challenge to the Provost (4.2). Finally, and a provision reflecting SCOF's expressed concerns, under section 4.3, "[a]ny final action taken by the Dean under Section 3.3, and any administrative action taken under Sections 4.4, 4.5, 4.6 or 4.7 may be reviewed under other established University grievance and appeal procedures to the extent such review is within the stated jurisdiction of such procedure."

SCOF recognizes that some aspects of these proposed revisions to the Procedures may not comport with the expectations and/or views of some members of the community, particularly those whose exclusive focus is the interests of potential respondents. We repeat, however, our view that such a focus is incomplete and that, when all of the legitimate interests are taken into view, the proposed revisions represent a fair and responsible approach to a complex problem. We commend the Manning Committee for its efforts and in particular for its thoughtful responses to our concerns.

Emily A. Blumberg, Medicine
Stephen B. Burbank, Law, *Chair*
Charles Dwyer, Education
Vincent Price, Communication
Gino C. Segre, Physics & Astronomy
Ex Officio

Faculty Senate Chair David B. Hackney, Neuroradiology
Faculty Senate Chair-elect Mitchell Marcus,
Computer & Information Science

Procedures Regarding Misconduct in Research

April 15, 2002

Introduction

The University relies on its faculty to establish and maintain the highest standards of ethical practice in academic work, including research. Misconduct in research is forbidden and represents a serious breach of both the rules of the University and the customs of scholarly communities.

Although instances of research misconduct are relatively rare, the University has a responsibility to detect and investigate possible misconduct and to resolve cases of possible misconduct fairly and expeditiously.

The primary responsibility for maintaining integrity in research must rest with those who perform it. In light of this responsibility, the University expects each faculty member:

- a. To maintain and further the highest standards of ethical practice in research. Especially important are integrity in recording and reporting results, care in execution of research procedures, and fairness in recognition of the work of others.
- b. To be responsible for the integrity of the research carried out under his or her supervision, no matter who actually performs the work or under what circumstances.
- c. To accept that a claim of authorship implies a definable major contribution to the work and an acceptance of responsibility for the methods and findings of the work.
- d. To keep thorough and verifiable records of research and to insure that exact copies of these records are preserved by the unit in which the work is done.
- e. To report suspected research misconduct to the appropriate dean.

The University must also establish certain standards to assure a healthy environment for research. These standards include procedures for dealing with alleged research misconduct.

These procedures are applicable to members of the University of Pennsylvania standing faculty, standing faculty-clinician-educator, associated faculty, academic support staff, and emeritus faculty when acting as such.

Research Misconduct Defined

Research misconduct is defined as fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, or other serious deviation from accepted practices in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results.

- Fabrication is making up data or results and recording or reporting them.
- Falsification is manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record.
- Plagiarism is the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, or results, or works without giving appropriate credit.
- Serious deviation from accepted practices includes but is not limited to stealing, destroying, or damaging the research property of others with the intent to alter the research record; and directing or encouraging others to engage in fabrication, falsification or plagiarism. As defined here, it is limited to activity related to the proposing, performing, or reviewing of research, or in the reporting of research results and does not include misconduct that occurs in the research setting but that does not affect the integrity of the research record, such as misallocation of funds, sexual harassment, and discrimination, which are covered by other University policies.

The research record is the record of data or results that embody the facts resulting from scientific inquiry, and includes, but is not limited to, research proposals, laboratory records, both physical and electronic, progress reports, abstracts, theses, oral presentations, internal reports, and journal articles.

Some forms of misconduct, such as failure to adhere to requirements for the protection of human subjects or to ensure the welfare of laboratory animals, are governed by specific federal regulations and are subject to the oversight of established University committees. However, violations involving failure to meet these requirements may also be covered under this policy or possibly by other University policies when so determined by the responsible committees or institutional officials.

Research misconduct does not include honest error or differences of opinion.

Findings of Research Misconduct

A finding of research misconduct requires that:

- There be a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community; and
- The misconduct be committed intentionally, or knowingly, or recklessly; and
- The allegation be proven by a preponderance of evidence.

Procedures for Handling Alleged Research Misconduct

The following procedures recognize the need to protect the rights and reputations of all individuals, including those who are alleged to have engaged in misconduct and those who report the alleged misconduct. These procedures also recognize that ethical standards are not only an individual obligation but represent a responsibility to the institution, to scientific communities, and to the public.

All committees and parties to an inquiry or investigation have the obligation to maintain maximum confidentiality throughout the proceedings. Exceptions to this obligation are those noted for the Dean and Provost in Section 4. All persons concerned have the obligation to cooperate and furnish all requested information. If any party refuses to do so, the committees of inquiry and investigation will note this in their reports to the Dean.

Charges of misconduct must be resolved expeditiously in a fair and objective manner, protecting the rights of the person or persons against whom a complaint has been filed (the respondent), the person or persons filing the complaint (the complainant), and persons serving as informants or witnesses.

The making of knowingly false or reckless accusations regarding research misconduct violates acceptable norms of behavior for members of the University community and may result in formal charges being brought against the person making such accusations under University procedures.

1. Preliminary Inquiry

1.1 Before filing a complaint of research misconduct, an individual is encouraged to review the matter with his or her Department Chair, Dean, and/or University Ombudsman, to seek advice from individuals he or she trusts, and through such consultation to determine whether the matter should be pursued. Inquiry into research misconduct should be initiated by written complaint filed with the Dean of the School in which the respondent has his or her primary appointment. The complainant can be any individual, whether or not affiliated with the University. To the extent possible, the complaint should be detailed, specific, and accompanied by appropriate documentation. Upon receipt of the complaint, the Dean will notify the Provost. The Dean and the Provost have the responsibility to protect the position and reputation of the complainant and any informants or other witnesses, and to protect these individuals from retaliation, so long as their allegations were made in good faith. The Provost will notify the Chair of the Faculty Senate that a complaint has been filed and the nature of the complaint, but will not identify the complainant, any informant, or the respondent, in order to preserve maximum confidentiality at this very preliminary stage of inquiry.

1.2 Upon receipt of a properly documented complaint, the Dean will inform the respondent of the nature of the charges, making every effort to avoid identifying the complainant or any informant. The Dean will outline to the respondent, and to the complainant, his or her rights and obligations by reference to this and other relevant University procedures. The Dean will take steps to secure all documents, data, and other materials that appear to be relevant to the allegations. The respondent is obligated to cooperate fully in all such efforts. The materials will be copied and the copies provided to the respondent. The originals will be retained as specified in Section 4.12. Every effort will be made to minimize disruption to the respondent's research during this and subsequent phases of the inquiry subject to Sections 4.4-4.7. The Dean will also appoint a preliminary inquiry committee consisting of at least three individuals, none of whom is a member of the same department as, or a collaborator with, or has a conflict of interest with the complainant or respondent. The

members of the committee should be unbiased and have appropriate backgrounds to investigate the issues being raised. They may but need not be members of the faculty of the University. Upon appointment of the preliminary inquiry committee, the Dean will notify the complainant and the respondent of the names of the committee members. The Dean will also make every effort to protect the identities of both complainant and respondent with respect to the larger community. The appointment of the preliminary inquiry committee will ordinarily be completed within two weeks of the receipt of a properly documented complaint.

1.3 The preliminary inquiry committee will gather information and determine whether the allegation warrants a formal investigation. The committee will then submit a written report of its findings to the Dean with a copy to the Provost, the complainant, and the respondent. The report should state what evidence was reviewed, summarize relevant interviews and include the committee's recommendation, which will be decided by simple majority of the committee; any dissenting opinion will be noted. This report will ordinarily be submitted within 30 calendar days of receipt of the written complaint by the Dean. The respondent will be given the opportunity to make a written reply to the report of the preliminary inquiry committee within 15 calendar days following submission of the report to the Dean. Such reply will be incorporated by the Dean as an appendix to the report. The entire inquiry process should be completed within 45 calendar days of the receipt of a properly documented complaint by the Dean unless circumstances clearly warrant a delay as determined by the Dean in consultation with the Provost. In such cases the record of inquiry will detail reasons for the delay.

1.4 If the report of the preliminary inquiry committee finds that a formal investigation is not warranted, the Dean may (i) drop the matter, (ii) not initiate a formal investigation, but take such other action as the circumstances warrant, or (iii), in extraordinary circumstances, nonetheless initiate a formal investigation. The decision of the Dean will be reviewed by the Provost, who will either concur or require that it be changed. The decision and its review should be completed within 25 calendar days of the receipt by the Dean of the report (10 days following a response, if any). The Dean will inform the concerned parties of the decision. In the event that a formal investigation is not initiated, the Dean and the Provost will, as appropriate, use diligent efforts to restore the reputation of the respondent and to protect the position and reputation of the complainant unless the complaint was found not to be made in good faith. The Provost will notify the Chair of the Faculty Senate that the case has been dropped.

1.5 If no formal investigation of the respondent is conducted, sufficient documentation will be maintained for at least 3 years following the inquiry to permit a later assessment of the reasons that a formal investigation was not deemed warranted (see Section 4.12).

1.6 If the report of the preliminary inquiry committee finds that a formal investigation is warranted, or the Dean or Provost decides the matter should be pursued through a formal investigation, the Dean will initiate a formal investigation as provided in Section 2. The Provost will inform both the Chair of the Faculty Senate and the appropriate government agency or source funding the research, in writing, that a formal investigation has been initiated and will identify the respondent to the agency or source.

2. Formal Investigation

2.1 To initiate a formal investigation, the Dean will appoint a formal investigation committee of not less than three individuals, none of whom has been a member of the preliminary inquiry committee but whose appointment will be subject to the same provisions governing appointment of the preliminary inquiry committee as described in Section 1.2. A majority of the formal investigation committee must be members of the standing faculty. One of the appointed members will be designated Chair of the committee by the Dean. The formal investigation will be initiated by the committee as soon as possible and in no case more than 30 calendar days after the report of the preliminary inquiry committee has been received by the Dean. The formal investigation will be divided into four phases: i) investigation and development of an initial factual record, ii) draft report of the findings, iii) hearing, if requested, and iv) final report of the findings. The Office of the General Counsel will provide guidance in procedures appropriate to the case and may have a representative present at any or all meetings of the committee. The representative will not participate directly in the proceedings except when and as requested to do so by the committee.

2.2 Investigation and development of an initial factual record. The formal investigation committee will be provided with copies of the complaint, the report of the preliminary inquiry committee, and any other materials acquired by the preliminary inquiry committee during the course of its inquiry. The formal investigation committee will undertake a thorough examination of the allegations, including, without limitation, a review of all relevant research data and proposals, publications, correspondence, and records of communication in any form. Experts within or outside the University may be consulted. The formal investigation committee will also investigate any possible acts of research misconduct by the respondent that come to light during its investigation, and will include them in its findings. Whenever possible, interviews will be conducted with the complainant and respondent, as well as with others having information regarding the allegations. Tapes will be made of all interviews and saved for reference. Summaries of the interviews will be prepared, provided to the interviewed party for comment or revision, and included as part of the investigatory file. When appearing before the committee the respondent and the complainant may each be accompanied by an adviser, who may be a lawyer but who may not participate directly in the proceedings except when and as requested to do so by the committee. The committee will not conduct formal hearings at this point. Except in unusual cases, the respondent and the complainant will not appear before the committee at the same time.

2.3 Draft report of the findings. Following development of the initial factual record, the formal investigation committee will prepare and provide a written draft report of its findings to the respondent, to the complainant, and to the Office of General Counsel. The report will describe the allegations investigated, how and from whom information was obtained, the findings and basis of the findings, and will include texts or summaries of the interviews conducted by the committee. The report will conclude with a statement that the committee finds the charge(s) made by the complainant or otherwise emerging during the course of its proceedings to be unsubstantiated or substantiated by a preponderance of evidence. For each charge considered, the vote of a majority of the committee will constitute the decision of the committee.

2.4 Hearing. If the respondent contests any material finding of fact made by the committee in the draft report, he or she may request a hearing before the committee. The request must be made to the committee in writing within 15 calendar days following receipt of the draft report. Any such request must specify findings the respondent asserts are erroneous, the basis for the claimed error, identify each witness the respondent may desire to examine at the hearing, and specify the purpose for calling such witness and the nature of the testimony expected. Upon receipt of such a request, the committee will promptly schedule a hearing. The committee will use reasonable efforts to secure the attendance at the hearing of any witness requested by the respondent who may have information relevant to the disputed finding of fact. The committee may also request the attendance of witnesses in addition to those requested by the respondent, in which case the respondent will be provided with a list of these witnesses at the time the request is made. At the hearing, the respondent and committee will each have an opportunity to examine each witness. The respondent may be accompanied by an advisor, who may be a lawyer but may not participate directly in the proceedings except when and as requested by the committee. The committee will have full authority to determine all matters concerning the conduct of the hearing, including the number of witnesses, the amount of time allocated for questioning each witness, and the duration of the hearing. The committee may require that it pose questions on behalf of the respondent.

2.5 Final report of the findings. Following completion of the hearing, if any, the committee will submit a written final report to the Dean with copies to the Provost, the complainant, and the respondent. This report should describe the policies and procedures under which the investigation was conducted, how and from whom information was obtained, the allegations investigated, the findings and the basis of the findings, and should include texts or summaries of the interviews and hearing, if any, conducted by the committee. The committee will state that it finds the charge(s) made by the complainant or otherwise emerging during the course of its proceedings to be unsubstantiated or substantiated. The conclusion will be reached by vote as provided in Section 2.3. The vote will be recorded. If the vote is not unanimous, a statement of any dissenting opinion will be included in the report. If the committee finds that a viola-

tion of University policy in addition to or other than research misconduct might have been committed, a description of the possible violation will be included for consideration by the Dean under other procedures. The final report will ordinarily be submitted within 90 days of the appointment of the formal investigation committee. The respondent and complainant will each be permitted to make a written reply to the Dean with a copy to the Provost within 15 calendar days of submission of the report. The Dean will ask the committee to respond in writing to any replies from the respondent or complainant within 7 calendar days. All such responses and replies will be incorporated as appendices to the report of the formal investigation committee.

3. Adjudication

3.1 The Dean will consider the final report and replies. If the Dean in consultation with the Provost determines that there has been procedural error that is likely to have affected the committee's findings, or that any material finding is unsupported by a preponderance of evidence, the Dean will remand the matter to the committee for further proceedings. Upon acceptance of the report by the Dean, the Provost will report the outcome of the investigation to the Chair of the Faculty Senate and the appropriate government agency or source funding the research. The Provost will also provide a copy of the report to the appropriate government agency or source funding the research, as required. The entire formal investigation process should be completed within 120 calendar days of its initiation, unless circumstances clearly warrant a delay as determined by the Dean in consultation with the Provost. In such cases the reasons for a delay will be documented.

3.2 If the final report of the formal investigation committee finds the charges to be unsubstantiated, the Misconduct in Research proceeding will be terminated and the concerned parties will be informed. The Dean and the Provost have the responsibility to take an active role to repair any damage done to the reputation of the respondent or the complainant (provided the complainant acted in good faith), and to take appropriate action should they determine that the accusation was knowingly or recklessly false.

3.3 If the report of the formal investigation committee finds the charges against a faculty member to be substantiated, the Dean in consultation with the Provost will take whatever actions are appropriate to the level of intent of the misconduct, the consequences of the behavior, and other aggravating and mitigating factors in accordance with University procedures and which consider the previous record of the respondent. The Dean in consultation with the Provost will determine whether there is substantial reason to believe that just cause exists for suspension or termination, and will take other steps as may be appropriate under the University's Procedure Governing Sanctions Taken Against Members of the Faculty. In any subsequent proceeding commenced under such procedure, the final report of the formal investigation committee and all replies and responses thereto will form part of the record and be accorded appropriate weight.

4. Other Actions and Procedures

4.1 The Dean may designate the Associate or Vice Dean to represent him or her in the administration of any case of misconduct. The Provost may similarly designate the Deputy Provost, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, or Vice Provost for Research to represent him or her.

4.2 If the respondent believes that any action of the Dean, preliminary inquiry committee, or formal investigation committee violates procedures set forth in this document or otherwise introduces an unfair bias into the proceedings, he or she may submit to the Dean, preliminary inquiry committee, or formal investigation committee, respectively, a written objection stating the nature of the action and the reasons why the action may influence either the material findings of fact or the conduct of the proceedings. The objection to the Dean or respective committee must be made promptly. If the Dean or respective committee finds that the objection does not merit action, or if the respondent is not satisfied with the nature of any corrective action, the respondent may appeal to the Provost. The Provost will decide the matter and will have the authority to take corrective action. Proceedings will not be delayed during consideration of the respondent's objection by the Provost unless the Provost determines that a delay is essential for fair consideration.

4.3 Any final action taken by the Dean under Section 3.3, and any administrative action taken under Sections 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, or 4.7 may be reviewed under other established University grievance and appeal procedures to the extent such review is within the stated jurisdiction of such procedures. All other actions taken, proceedings conducted, and reports prepared under this procedure are not subject to review or consideration under the Faculty Grievance Procedure.

4.4 The Dean in consultation with the Provost will, during the course of the inquiry or formal investigation, take administrative action, as appropriate to protect the welfare of animal or human subjects.

4.5 At any time during the preliminary inquiry or formal investigation, the Dean and Provost will immediately notify the relevant funding agency(ies) if public health or safety is at risk; if agency resources or interests are threatened; if research activities should be suspended; if there is reasonable indication of possible violations of civil or criminal law; if Federal action is required to protect the interests of those involved in the investigation; if the University believes the preliminary inquiry or formal investigation may be made public prematurely so that appropriate steps can be taken to safeguard evidence and protect the rights of those involved; or if the research community or public should be informed.

4.6 Subject to Section 4.5, the Dean and Provost will, during the course of the inquiry and formal investigation, take administrative action, as appropriate to protect funds for sponsored research and ensure the purpose of any external financial assistance.

4.7 The Dean in consultation with the Provost will, during the course of the inquiry and formal investigation, take administrative action, as appropriate to ensure an acceptable working environment for individuals under the direction of, or working with, the respondent. The Provost and Dean will also notify individuals, programs, or institutions of allegations or developments that would necessitate immediate action in order to prevent the likelihood of substantial harm.

4.8 The Chairs of the preliminary inquiry and formal investigation committees will inform the Dean of any issues relevant to Sections 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, and 4.7 arising during the course of the proceedings.

4.9 Inadvertent failure to tape any interview under Section 2.2 will not be considered a procedural defect requiring correction.

4.10 If the final report of the formal investigation committee finds charges have been substantiated, the Provost will take appropriate steps to correct any misrepresentations resulting from the misconduct in question upon acceptance of the report by the Dean. Collaborators, and other affected individuals, organizations, or institutions will be informed. If misrepresented results have been submitted for publication, already published, or otherwise disseminated into the public domain, appropriate journals and other sponsors will be notified.

4.11 If the Dean is the complainant or respondent or in any other way has a conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest, he or she is obligated to remove him- or herself from the case during the preliminary inquiry and formal investigation and to transfer to the Provost responsibility for carrying out these procedures. In carrying out the latter the Provost will assume the role specified for the Dean and the President that specified for the Provost in sections 1, 2, 3, and 4.

4.12 Complete records of all relevant documentation on cases treated under the provisions of this policy will be preserved by the offices of the Dean and the Provost in a manner consistent with the Protocols for the University Archives and Record Center. In cases adjudicated under Section 3, records will be preserved for a minimum of ten years following completion of all proceedings. Records of cases that are dropped under the provisions of sections 1.4 or 3.2 will be preserved for at least three years following the initial inquiry, but not as part of the personnel record of the respondent.

4.13 The University may act under these procedures irrespective of possible civil or criminal claims arising out of the same or other events. The Dean, with the concurrence of the Provost, after consulting with the General Counsel, will determine whether the University will, in fact, proceed against a respondent who also faces related charges in a civil or criminal tribunal. If the University defers proceedings, it may subsequently proceed irrespective of the time provisions set forth in these procedures.

Report of the Faculty Senate Committee on Administration

April 24, 2002

Charge for 2001-2002

This Committee was asked to (1) analyze and follow up on last year's survey of the school deans on the administrative relationship between the schools and the central administration, (2) report and make recommendations regarding the Provost's ongoing study of the cost of research at the University, (3) review the University policy on Postdoctoral Fellows, and (4) review a revised policy on misconduct in research when proposed.

Cost of Research

The majority of the work of the Committee related to the Provost's ongoing study on the cost of doing research at Penn. A presentation of the preliminary results of the study was made to the Committee. The Committee understands that this type of analysis is currently unique among the Ivy Plus group.

Before describing some of the preliminary results of this valuable study, it is useful to provide some perspective about indirect research charges and costs at the University. Indirect charges differ considerably across research grants. Grants such as NIH and NSF grants have an official overhead rate of 58.5%, which is negotiated by the University for all Penn schools. This rate has decreased in recent years. Other grants such as Pew or Sloan Foundation grants pay only a much smaller overhead rate while some foundations pay no overhead at all. Thus, overhead cost recovery differs substantially across types of grants. There is tremendous variation in the distribution of types of grants as well as the dollar value of the grants across the schools.

There exists a tension between administrators that need to recover indirect costs and researchers who view higher overhead recovery as decreasing the direct cost portion of their grant or reducing the competitiveness of their grant application. This tension is not as apparent in the case of NIH grants where researchers do not perceive the indirect "tax" rate as affecting the competitiveness or the direct cost of their grants.

In the University's "Responsibility Center Management" (RCM) approach, the schools (resource centers and auxiliaries) receive the bulk of the revenues received by the University. For example, 81% of the indirect costs that are generated by research grants in a school are returned to that school. Indirect cost recovery accounts for approximately 18% of the University's revenues and 8% is the percentage of the academic budget, excluding the health system.

The primary objective of the study on the cost of doing research at Penn was to determine the indirect cost of support per expended dollar on direct research. This analysis is input into another important question: Is Penn recovering its indirect costs in its research charges?

Using fiscal year 1999 data, indirect cost expenditures are calculated in four categories: central, school, department, and facility. The facility cost is the biggest driver of indirect costs accounting for about half of indirect costs. The facilities cost is calculated as the \$ cost/square foot times the square feet assigned to research and is quite sensitive to how schools assign space to the research category. Treatment of facilities funded by donors is treated the same as those funded by the University. However, in recent years only the School of Engineering and the Wharton School have had buildings largely paid for with donor gifts.

Research activities across schools are quite different. Specific school-by-school breakdowns of indirect costs were not provided. However, schools with less than \$5 million in research grants per year were estimated to have total incurred (as opposed to charged) indirect costs of about 33% compared to 61% for schools that had over \$10 million of research per year.

The detailed analysis produced a shortfall in recovered versus actual indirect costs of about \$37 million for FY99 on a recovered base of \$103.6 million. Under RCM, the shortfall falls mainly on the schools.

The Committee understands that the study will be used as a management tool. An important aspect of this study is that it allows the University and the schools to make a more accurate calculation about the extent to which their indirect costs of research are covered. The study also puts pressure on the schools (and departments) to provide more accurate inputs

into the cost calculation process, refine the calculation to account for special needs for various types of research, and better manage their research expenses. Faculty attention and input into this process is important and the Committee encourages the faculty in each school to ensure that their interests and input are fully represented at the school level.

Earlier it was mentioned that different grants have different allowable (or feasible) overhead rates. While any incremental contribution to overhead costs helps a school, faculty should be aware that the higher indirect cost recovery grants are making a greater contribution to the school's common overhead pool. It is therefore possible that on the margin such differences could generate some pressure on the faculty to apply for grants with greater allowable overhead rates. Also, greater recovery of expenditures characterized as overhead (indirect costs) on federal grants may sometimes be possible as "direct" costs on non-federal grants, so the faculty should expect some encouragement towards adopting "best practices" with respect to grant writing. Absent direct incentives to adopt such practices, however, faculty grantees are unlikely to prefer such reallocation of costs.

The study will allow the University and the schools to get a better idea of what overhead rate is appropriate to recover research costs on a school by school basis. The preliminary analysis of the Provost's study did indicate considerable variation in this regard across (research) sizes of schools. If the gap between actual and recovered costs is mostly attributable to one or two schools and particularly if these schools have a disproportionate percentage of the University's total research income, it is possible that some pressure may develop over time for a two-tiered rate system for some federal grants to replace the current single-rate system. Such a two-tiered system would have, of course, positive effects on the higher rate school(s), but probably also a corresponding negative effect on rates for the other category of schools.

Knowledge about the sources of costs also provides a basis for beginning an exploration of how incurred costs vary across types of research (e.g. wet labs versus pure office projects) and what types of research projects incur incremental research costs or are likely to have no effect on research costs on the margin. Schools may use cost recovery information to develop policies that have higher expectations for indirect cost recovery for established investigators and those with large or expensive laboratories. The Committee also recognizes that many faculty at the University incur very low indirect research costs and in some cases recover more indirect costs than their research incurs.

The presentation to the Committee came late in the academic year. Important missions of the Committee in this area are to develop a greater understanding of research costs at Penn, educate the faculty about these costs, and provide useful input into the process. Greater appreciation of these issues may increase the willingness of faculty to help shoulder and take additional responsibility for the general indirect cost burden of the University or their school. Greater faculty cooperation on research overhead recovery will likely depend on educating the faculty about the links between recovered overhead monies and how those monies are used to support immediate research costs.

The Committee understands that many faculty have questions about the approach toward calculating indirect costs and efforts to control them and these questions need to be addressed. Finally, the Committee notes that decisions about appropriate cost recovery should take into account that research done in one school benefits other schools by strengthening the overall research environment at Penn.

Other Items Reviewed

After reviewing the survey of school deans conducted last year, the Committee decided that the information provided did not provide a strong basis for independent follow-up action. Many of the relevant issues flagged by the survey related to issues raised by the "Cost of Doing Research at Penn" study and therefore, the Committee decided to focus its efforts in that area.

The Committee reviewed a modification of the existing policy on

postdoctoral fellows, which was proposed by the Provost's Council on Research. The PCR adopted changes suggested by the Committee. Subsequently, the Committee recommended that SEC approve the revised policy.

The revised policy on misconduct in research was referred to the Committee on the Faculty.

Recommendations for Next Year's Committee

Based on the Committee's examination of the cost of research at Penn, the Committee recommends the following areas be pursued next year: (1) indirect costs, allocated costs, and subvention and their relationship to the overall budget, (2) differences in the policies of various schools with respect to the type of grants that are encouraged, how the monies received to support the indirect cost of research at each school are used, and how

startup research projects or changes in strategic direction are dealt with, (3) how the special needs and demands of the School of Medicine affect its cost recovery, (4) how the schools determine teaching versus research space, and (5) how facilities and administrative costs are determined and managed.

Dennis A. Yao, Business and Public Policy, *Chair*
Dorothy Cheney, Biology
S. Walter Englander, Biochemistry & Biophysics
Peter McCleary, Architecture
Charles W. Mooney, Law
David P. Pope, Materials Science
Ex officio:

Senate Chair, David B. Hackney, Neuroradiology
Senate Chair-elect, Mitchell Marcus, Computer & Information Science

Policy for Postdoctoral Fellows in the Physical, Biological, and Health Sciences and in Engineering at the University of Pennsylvania

April 24, 2002

brackets indicate deletions, underlines indicate insertions

This policy applies to all three categories of postdoctoral fellows that are identified in the payroll system of the University, based upon funding source: postdoctoral researcher (supported from a research grant), NRSA-postdoctoral fellow (supported by an individualized or institutional National Research Service Award), and postdoctoral fellow (supported by a private foundation or non-profitable charitable organization).

Preamble

Postdoctoral fellows (PDFs) come to the University for further training in their chosen discipline. An individual who has been designated as a PDF by her/his School receives training conducted in an apprenticeship mode, where she/he is working under the supervision of an established faculty member who serves as a mentor. As dictated by the nature of the program, the fellow may be undertaking scholarship, research, service, and teaching activities, all of which provide training essential for career development. Because education is a pre-eminent mission of the University and because PDFs are professionals in training, it is important that the programs for postdoctoral fellows are designed to advance their careers, in addition to contributing to the mission of the unit in which they are working. The Policy for Postdoctoral Fellows is designed in recognition of this distinctive position of postdoctoral fellows within the University community.

Appointment and Resignation

Letter of Appointment

When a faculty member makes a firm offer of appointment to a postdoctoral [fellow] candidate, a letter should be written to the candidate prior to commencement of duties. This letter should set forth at least the basic terms of appointment including the period of appointment (dates of appointment), the [stipend] compensation level, all included benefits and a statement that the [fellow's] candidate's appointment is subject to all University policies, and be accompanied by a copy of the Patent Policy and the corresponding Participation Agreement. If the appointment is renewed or extended, that action should be documented by a letter, which includes the foregoing information.

The candidate should be required to return a countersigned copy of each letter of appointment or renewal indicating acceptance of the terms set forth, as well as a signed Patent Policy Participation Agreement. The letters (countersigned copies) and signed agreement should be placed in a permanent file kept in the office of the appropriate Department. (If the faculty member is not affiliated with a specific department, the file may be kept in the office of the Institute or Center with which the faculty member is associated.) The letters of appointment and renewal should indicate whether the mentor has funding in hand to fulfill the terms of the appointment; if not, the letter should indicate the duration of assured funding. When the appointment is to be coterminous with external funding, research grant, contract, training grant, etc., that fact should be included in the letter of appointment, including the end date of the funding even when renewal is expected. A notice of termination should be given in writing at least three months prior to the end of appointment.

[Obligations of Postdoctoral Fellows]

[Postdoctoral fellows have certain obligations to their mentor, the laboratory in which they are working, the Department with which they are associated, the grantor whose funds support them, and the University. These obligations include but are not limited to: (i) the conscientious discharge of their research responsibilities; (ii) conformity with ethical standards in research; (iii) compliance with good laboratory practice including the maintenance of adequate research records, and due observation of University standards regarding use of isotopes, chemicals, infectious agents, animals, and the like; (iv) observation of appropriate guidelines regarding human subjects if applicable; (v) open and timely discussion with their mentor regarding possession or distribution of materials, reagents, or records belonging to their laboratory, and any proposed disclosure of findings or techniques privately or in publications; (vi) collegial conduct towards coworkers and members of the research group; (vii) compliance with all applicable University policies. All data and research records generated in University laboratories remain the property of the University.]

Proof of Doctoral Degree

Eligibility for appointment as a postdoctoral fellow requires an advanced degree, PhD, MD, or equivalent. It is the intent of the University of Pennsylvania that international fellows have advanced degrees which are equivalent to those provided in domestic institutions in order to qualify for appointment as postdoctoral fellows. It is the responsibility of the fellow to provide transcripts which certify that she/he has received her/his degree, and it is the responsibility of the mentor to be sure that this documentation is satisfactory and that it is included in the trainee's file attached to the letter of appointment. If the trainee has completed the requirements for the PhD but has not yet received her/his degree, then she/he should supply documents certifying that the thesis has been approved and indicating the date when the degree is expected to be conferred; this special exception applies only to trainees receiving their degrees from domestic institutions.

[Stipend Level]

[Minimum stipend levels for postdoctoral fellows are to be the NIH recommended postdoctoral stipend levels.*]

[If these minimal levels of compensation cannot be offered, a proportional (%) appointment should be made to clearly indicate that the appointee is entitled to seek and perform additional University services (teaching, diagnostic laboratory, technical) up to the recommended annual level of compensation.]

[*For example, in 1995 these levels were:]

[\$19,608—from 0 to less than 12 months of prior postdoctoral experience]

[\$20,700—from 12 to less than 24 months of prior postdoctoral experience]

(continued on page 10)

Policy for Postdoctoral Fellows

(continued from page 9)

Terms of Appointment

According to current University policy, no doctoral postgraduate can serve at the University of Pennsylvania for more than five years at the status of Postdoctoral Fellow.

Compensation Level

Minimum compensation levels for postdoctoral fellows are set annually by the Vice Provost for Research, in consultation with the Provost's Council on Research, representing all of the Schools of the University. If these minimal levels of compensation cannot be offered, a proportional (%) appointment should be made to clearly indicate that the appointee is entitled to seek and perform additional University services (teaching, diagnostic laboratory, technical) up to the mandated annual level of compensation.

Postdoctoral Notice of Resignation

When a postdoctoral fellow chooses to resign from her/his position prior to the end of the appointment period, it is expected that she/he will provide at least one month's notice.

Benefits

Health Insurance

[Postdoctoral fellows] PDFs must have health insurance. [Postdoctoral fellows] PDFs are eligible to receive single person health insurance, as provided under a basic University of Pennsylvania Group Health Insurance Plan. This benefit should be paid as an addition to the [stipend] compensation and no premium should be deducted from the [stipend] compensation of the postdoctoral fellow. If the [fellow] PDF elects family coverage, the difference between the single and family premium [will be deducted from the fellow's stipend] can be paid from one of three sources. It can be deducted from the PDF's compensation; it can be paid by the funding source if it is an allowable expense; or it can be paid by the unit to which the PDF is recruited. If the [fellow] PDF elects to waive health insurance coverage through the University, she/he must certify that she/he has alternate insurance which provides at least comparable coverage.

[New Child Leave]

[Postdoctoral fellows are eligible to receive up to six weeks' new child leave with full pay, paid from the same source as the stipend.]

Vacation Time

PDFs are eligible for 16 work days paid vacation leave per appointment year including University holidays. If the PDF elects to work during a University holiday they may take the vacation at another time. Vacation leave is not cumulative from one appointment year to the next. All vacation leave must be approved in advance by the mentor.

Sick Leave

Postdoctoral Fellows may continue to receive stipends for up to 15 calendar days of sick leave per year. Sick leave is not cumulative from one appointment year to the next. Under exceptional circumstances, this period may be extended at the discretion of the mentor. Mentors may require medical verification by a physician for absences longer than three consecutive sick days.

New Child Leave

Postdoctoral fellows are eligible to receive up to 30 calendar days new child (up to 2 years of age) leave with full pay, paid from the same source as the compensation, supplemented with up to 15 calendar days vacation or sick leave if available.

Terminal Leave

A period of terminal leave is not permitted.

Obligations and Responsibilities

Obligations of Mentors

Mentors' responsibilities include: (i) developing a mutually defined research project; (ii) encouraging PDFs to present their work, and to publish their results in a timely fashion; (iii) encouraging PDFs to acquire and enhance their knowledge and technical skills as dictated by their current and future needs; (iv) encouraging PDFs to apply for training and research support as appropriate; (v) meeting regularly with their PDFs to discuss progress in their research; (vi) providing an annual review of

performance; (vii) insuring that PDFs are aware of University policies regarding postdoctoral training; (viii) providing career counseling.

Obligations of Postdoctoral Fellows

Postdoctoral fellows have certain obligations to their mentor, the unit in which they are working, the Department with which they are associated, the grantor whose funds support them, and the University. These obligations include but are not limited to: (i) the conscientious discharge of their research responsibilities; (ii) conformity with ethical standards in research; (iii) compliance with good scholarly practice including the maintenance of adequate research records; (iv) observation of appropriate guidelines regarding human subjects and due observation of University standards regarding use of isotopes, chemicals, infectious agents, animals, and the like, if applicable; (v) open and timely discussion with their mentor regarding possession or distribution of materials, reagents, or records belonging to their unit, and any proposed disclosure of findings or techniques privately or in publications; (vi) collegial conduct towards coworkers and members of the research group; (vii) compliance with all applicable University policies.

Training

Orientation

A [standard] compendium of information should be given to each postdoctoral fellow upon arrival at the University. This compendium should be available on the University's website and could include a registration form to be completed by the postdoctoral fellow, a copy of these guidelines, [the Faculty Handbook, the Patent Policy, the telephone directory,] conflict of interest and financial disclosure policies, intellectual property policies, Procedures Regarding Misconduct in Research, parking policies, a clear statement about benefits, the current City, Commonwealth, and Federal taxation policies, sources of information within the University, explanation of the mediation services available. Preferably, periodic orientation sessions should be provided for all new postdoctoral fellows. The departments should arrange e-mail accounts for their postdoctoral fellows [and for orientation necessary to use the e-mail account].

Training Program Elements

Postdoctoral fellows are considered to be professionals in training. One goal of their professional experience at Penn is to provide training relevant to the responsible conduct of research. Such training should include the following elements, as appropriate to the individual trainee: (1) data management, ownership of intellectual property and tangible research materials; (ii) mentor/trainee responsibilities; (iii) publication practices and responsible authorship; (iv) peer review; (v) rights of collaborators; (vi) human subject research; (vii) research involving animals; (viii) research misconduct; (ix) conflict of interest; and (x) compliance with existing Federal and University policies.

Miscellaneous

Application for Grants

Each school should set a policy about the rights of postdoctoral fellows to apply for grants as Principal Investigator. If the school policy permits such applications, it is suggested that there be a requirement for approval by a knowledgeable tenured faculty member as well as the usual approval by department chair and dean on the transmittal form.

Mediation Services

It is recognized that from time to time disagreements may arise between postdoctoral fellow and mentor. Postdoctoral fellows should be clearly informed about the options which they can exercise under such circumstances. In particular, they should be made aware of services available through the ombudsmen in individual Schools and through the office of the Ombudsman in the University [and in the School of Medicine (separate office)].

[Application for Grants]

[Each school should set a policy about the rights of postdoctoral fellows to apply for grants as Principal Investigator. If the school policy permits such applications, it is suggested that there be a requirement for approval by a knowledgeable tenured faculty member as well as the usual approval by department chair and dean on the transmittal form.]

Hamilton Village Architects: MGA Partners

University officials have selected MGA Partners, Architects of Philadelphia to undertake the Hamilton Village Renewal project slated to begin this summer.

MGA is well acquainted with Penn's campus. Recent projects include design of the Commencement Ceremony in Franklin Field in 2000; design and implementation of office space for Facilities and Real Estate Services as well as Penn Children's Center in the former General Electric Building in 2000; renovation and new facade for the Annenberg School in 1999; and the renovation of Kings Court/English College House in 1992.

Partners Robert Z. Shuman, Jr. and Daniel Kelley noted that this work represents "the beginning of Penn's aspirations for the renewal of Hamilton Village as a vibrant campus place." Stated goals include improved building aesthetics, renovated and enlarged public facilities to support the College House program, and increased comfort and attractiveness in private residential spaces. Hamilton College House is the first high-rise of the three to be addressed, and new landscaping in the adjacent areas will be handled by Penn's master planners, Olin Partnership.

Summer 2002 work in Hamilton College House will consist of elevator upgrades; installation of sprinklers in student rooms; installation of a superior fire alarm system; the stabilization and sealing of the concrete exterior; and the first phase of landscape improvements. A consultative committee of students, faculty and staff has been named to advise the Hamilton Village project.

Members include:

Co-chair: Doug Berger, Director of Housing and Conference Services

Co-chair: Prof. David Brownlee, Director of College Houses and Faculty Master of Harnwell College

Julia Cassidy, undergraduate resident in Harrison College House

Dr. Srilata Gangulee, Senior Fellow in Harrison College House

Kirsten Grubbs, representative from the Undergraduate Assembly

Michael Portnoy, Chair of the Residential Advisory Board

Shahnaz Radjy, Residential Advisor in Hamilton College House

Roberta Stack, House Dean of Hamilton College House

Cory Thorne, Graduate Associate in Harnwell College House

A separate advisory committee of Hamilton students, faculty, and staff will also be established to advise on matters specific to the House.

Thanks for Sharing Observations on Academia

For several years Career Services has organized two academic career series for doctoral students and postdoctoral fellows: the Academic Career Conference held in the fall and Faculty Conversations on the Academic Job Search and Academic Life held in the spring semester. The speakers featured in these programs are members of the faculty and the administration. This year more than ten Penn faculty from many departments and several administrators, including the President, took the time to speak on such topics as interviewing, how a search committee operates, negotiating offers, understanding tenure, life in the academy and "having a life." Many others who were asked but had conflicts offered to speak at another time. And five faculty members from other institutions also participated.

For future academics, the importance of hearing faculty members speak on these topics cannot be underestimated. Doctoral students are very grateful for the chance to hear about issues that are or will soon be real concerns and to ask questions about them. Faculty speakers often find it enjoyable to present and discuss these issues with students from various disciplines.

I'd like to thank those Penn faculty and administrators who generously shared their own stories and their observations on academia this year and in past years. During the summer I will soon be contacting potential speakers for the fall. If you're interested in participating, please contact me at vick@pobox.upenn.edu.

—Julie Vick, Graduate Career Counselor
Career Services

Fulbright New Century Scholars Program Competition

The competition is now open for the Fulbright New Century Scholars Program (NCS), an exciting and innovative new research initiative in the Fulbright Scholar Program.

Now in its second year, NCS brings together annually 25-30 outstanding research scholars from the U.S. and abroad to engage in multidisciplinary collaboration on a topic of global significance under the leadership of a Distinguished New Century Scholar Leader. For the academic year 2002-2003, the research focus is "Addressing Sectarian, Ethnic and Cultural Conflict within and across National Borders." Edward Tiryakian, Professor of Sociology, Duke University, will serve as the NCS Distinguished Scholar Leader. Approximately one third of the participants will be U.S. scholars; the remaining two thirds will be visiting scholars from outside the U.S.

NCS provides a unique research opportunity for participants to pursue individual research objectives as well as to engage in ongoing collaboration and interaction focusing on the NCS research theme. NCS Fellows will not only undertake a 3-6 month international research visit during the program year but will also come together for a pre-program orientation and goal setting session, a mid-term meeting, and a final plenary seminar.

Benefits include individual awards in the amount of \$41,500 plus travel and per diem to cover participation in program seminars and meetings.

Deadline for receipt of applications is *October 1, 2002*. Program details and application materials will be available on www.cies.org; requests to be added to the NCS mailing list should be directed to: ncs@cies.iie.org.

You may also contact Micaela S. Iovine, Senior Program Officer at: miovine@cies.iie.org.

The Fulbright Scholar Program is sponsored by the United States Department of State, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs.

—Joyce M. Randolph, Executive Director, Office of International Programs (OIP)

Robert Bosch Fellowships to Germany

As the countries of the world become more interdependent, the Robert Bosch Foundation recognizes the importance of familiarizing American professionals with the political, economic, and cultural environment of Europe in general and of the Federal Republic of Germany in particular. To further this goal and to strengthen the ties of friendship and understanding between the United States and Germany, the Foundation is sponsoring a Fellowship Program which enables young American professionals to participate in an intensive work and study program in Germany. Although a prime goal of this program is the advancement of American-German/European relations, it, in addition, contributes to the participants' professional competence and expertise, and broadens their cultural horizons.

The Robert Bosch Foundation Fellows receive internships in such key German institutions as the Federal Government, the Federal Parliament, headquarters of private corporations, mass communications, and other governmental or business entities. They normally work at a high executive level. The Foundation will make every reasonable effort to secure positions for fellows related to their professional goals.

Candidates for the program are competitively chosen from the fields of Business Administration, Economics, Journalism and Mass Communications, Law, Political Science and Public Affairs/Public Policy.

The program runs from September 2003 through May 2004. Applications are available online: www.cdsintl.org/rbfpintro.html. Applications, complete with all requisite documentation, must be submitted by *October 15, 2002* to:

CDS International, Inc.

US representative for The Robert Bosch Foundation Fellowship Program,

871 United Nations Plaza,

15th Floor (First Avenue at 49th Street) New York, NY 10017-1814

Telephone: (212) 497-3500; Fax: (212) 497-3535; E-mail: bosch@cdsintl.org

—Clare Cowen, Associate Director, International Fellowships
Center for Undergraduate Research and Fellowships (CURF)



Are you responsible for some of the 331,000 hits to *Almanac's* website last week?

Get on Board Express Almanac

To sign up for our listserv to receive e-mail notification when we post breaking news between issues, send an e-mail message with "subscribe" as the Subject to almanac@pobox.upenn.edu and include your name, and e-mail address and mailing address.

—Ed.

Honors & Other Things



Thomas Lubensky



Alan MacDiarmid

Two NAS Members

This year two faculty members have been named to the National Academy of Sciences. They are *Dr. Thomas C. Lubensky*, the Mary Amanda Wood Professor of Physics and *Dr. Alan G. MacDiarmid*, the Blanchard Professor of Chemistry.

Dr. Lubensky, an international leader in condensed matter physics, is chair of the department of physics and astronomy. His area of specialization is soft materials such as liquid crystals, membranes, vesicles, and langmuir films and complex fluids such as microemulsions. He has been named a Sloan fellow and a Guggenheim fellow and is co-author of the textbook, *Principles of Condensed Matter Physics*.

Dr. MacDiarmid, the recipient of the Nobel Prize for chemistry in 2000, is recognized for his groundbreaking research on conductive polymers (*Almanac* October 17, 2000). He has received awards from the American Chemical Society, the Royal Society of Chemistry, and the American Institute of Chemists, and was the recipient of a Sloan fellowship. Earlier this year, he was elected to membership in the National Academy of Engineering. Dr. MacDiarmid holds more than 30 U.S. patents.

Membership in the NAS is granted in recognition of "distinguished and continuing achievements in original research." There are 36 other NAS members on Penn's faculty.

AAAS Inductee: Dr. Boruch

Dr. Robert F. Boruch, the University Trustee Professor of Education, in the Graduate School of Education and co-director of the Center for Research and Evaluation of Social Policy (CRESP), and professor of statistics in Wharton, has been inducted into the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Dr. Boruch is also a professor at the Fels Center of Government and the Annenberg School for Communication's Summer Institute. He is a fellow at the Jerry Lee Center of Criminology and the Leonard Davis Institute of Health Economics.



Robert Boruch

He is a founder and chair of the international Campbell Collaboration, an organization which prepares, maintains and promotes access to systematic reviews of evidence on the effects of programs in the areas of education, crime and justice and social welfare.

Chair of Dietitians: Dr. Compher

Dr. Charlene W. Compher, assistant professor of nutrition science, has been elected chairperson of the Dietitians in Nutrition Support Practice Group of the American Dietetic Association. The three-year post provides leadership and representation to almost 4,000 dietitians, whose practice is concentrated in enteral and parenteral feedings.

Colposcopy Society President

Wendy Grube, a lecturer in the School of Nursing, has been named president of the Philadelphia Colposcopy Society. She is only the second nurse to hold this position.

Medicinal Chemistry Study Section

Dr. Madeleine M. Joullie, professor of chemistry, has become a member of the Medicinal Chemistry Study Section, Center for Scientific Review for a term from July 2002 through June 2006. Members are selected on the basis of their demonstrated competence and achievement in their scientific discipline as evidenced by the quality of research accomplishments, publications in scientific journals, and other significant scientific activities, achievements and honors.

Dr. Bowles to Fellowship Program

Dr. Kathryn H. Bowles, assistant professor of nursing has been granted admission to the National Library of Medicine fellowship program in Medical Informatics. The program takes place at the Marine Biological Laboratory Woods Hole, Ma.

Vital Signs on Channel 6

PENN Vital Signs, the UPHS medical TV show, will be presented on WPVI, Channel 6, on Saturday, May 18 at 7 p.m. The show will follow two patients on their journey through the latest surgical development for Parkinson's disease and how the team at the Penn Neurological Institute cares for the patients and their families. The show will be rebroadcast on Sunday, May 19, at 1 p.m. For more information see www.pennhealth.com.

The 2002 Emeriti Faculty

At the April 16 ceremony honoring professors who recently were accorded emeritus status, President Judith Rodin and Provost Robert Barchi acknowledged the achievements of the following faculty members:

Roger D. Abrahams, Hum Rosen Professor in Folklore and Folk Literature ('85)
*Peter H. Arger **, Professor of Radiology ('81)
Ruzena K. Bajcsy, Professor of Computer and Information Sciences ('72)
William W. Beck, Jr., Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology ('73)
Robert W. Beideman, Associate Professor of Oral Medicine ('67)
Harold J. Bershad, Professor of Sociology ('66)
*Robert H. Cox **, Professor of Physiology ('69)
David G. De Long, Professor of Architecture ('85)
*McIver W. Edwards, Jr. **, Associate Professor of Anesthesia ('68)
Norik Ellison, Professor of Anesthesia ('72)
*John J. Furth **, Professor of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine ('63)
Carol P. Germain, Associate Professor of Nursing ('78)
Paul E. Green, Professor of Marketing ('61)
William L. Kissick, Professor of Molecular and Cellular Engineering ('68)
Harold L. Kundel, Matthew J. Wilson Professor of Research Radiology ('80)
Erle Leichty, Clark Research Professor of Assyriology ('68)
Alan E. Mann, Professor of Anthropology ('69)
*Bryan E. Marshall **, Horatio C. Wood Professor of Anesthesia ('68)
Charles J. McMahon, Jr., Professor of Materials Science and Engineering ('64)
E. Neil Moore, Professor of Physiology/Animal Biology ('62)
Daniel D. Perlmutter, Professor of Chemical Engineering ('64)
Ronald Piddington, Associate Professor of Anatomy and Histology ('67)
Phyllis Rackin, Professor of English ('64)
Bryan W. Roberts, Professor of Chemistry ('67)
Ludo Rocher, W. Norman Brown Professor of South Asia Regional Studies ('66)
Jerry S. Rosenbloom, Frederick H. Ecker Professor of Insurance and Risk Management ('74)
Arie Schimmar, Associate Professor of Business and Public Policy ('83)
M. William Schwartz, Professor of Pediatrics ('73)
Irving M. Shapiro, Professor of Biochemistry ('69)
Rosemary A. Stevens, Professor of History and Sociology of Science ('79)
Joyce E. Thompson, Professor of Nursing ('79)
Lewis G. Tilney, Professor of Biology ('67)
Robert J. Tisot, Associate Professor of Periodontics ('70)
James E. Wheeler, Professor of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine ('72)
Ruth E. York, Associate Professor of Nursing ('81)

* Accorded emeritus status in 2000.

Note: The year in parentheses is the year the professors joined the faculty ranks.

Ivy Stone 2002

The 2002 Ivy Stone was designed by *Joyce Lee*, C '02, and will be placed in the wall on the northside of 36th and Locust Walk (opposite the 2001 Ivy Stone).



Ivy Day Award Recipients

Senior Honor Awards and recipients are:

Spoon Award: Joshua D. Klein, COL

Bowl Award: Kisimbi K. Thomas, NUR

Cane Award: Dimitri Dube, COL

Spade Award: Michael K. Krouse, W

Althea K. Hottel Award: Dana E. Hork, COL

Gaylord P. Harnwell Award:

Lindsey F. Mathews, COL

David R. Goddard Award:

LaToya J. Baldwin, W

R. Jean Brownlee Award: Jennifer Kwon, COL

Leadership Awards

Association of Alumnae Fathers' Trophy:

Jodie G. Antypas, COL

Class of 1915 Award:

Richard M. Springman, EAS

Class of 1946 Award: Lee P. Gerson, COL

James Howard Weiss Memorial Award:

Jed A. Gross, COL

Penn Student Agencies Award:

Adam G. Leitzes, W

Alumni Society Student Award of Merit:

Miriam M. Ackerman, COL

Louis Hornick III, COL

Rachel M. Joseph, COL

David B. Kagan, EAS

Jennifer A. Moore, COL

Sol Feinstone Undergraduate Awards:

Nicolas L. Cuttris, C '02

Jesse Fuchs-Simon, C '02

Jason M. George, EAS '03

Prashanth Jayaram, EAS '02

Iris L. Lin, W '03

Neil J. Luthra, W '03

Alison Malmon, C '03

Suha Shah, W '03

Javier M. Starkand, W '03

Nisha E. Thomas, W '02

Morgan M. Vandagriff, W '02

Aubrey J. Wise, W '02

Ivy Title for Women's Tennis

The Penn's Women's tennis team won their second straight Ivy League title this spring with an undefeated season (7-0). Alice Pirsu, a sophomore on the team is ranked 20th in the nation. She is undefeated in her Ivy League matches this year.

Men's Lacrosse Awards

Seniors *Mike Iannacone* and *Scott Solow* were each named the 2002 E. T. Clark Award winner as the most valuable players for the Penn Lacrosse program.

Red and Blue's Most Improved Player Award: senior *Joe Roberta*

Quakers' Scholar-Athlete Award: junior *Evan Weinberg*

Quakers' Unsung Hero Award: senior *Roger Egan*

Hammer Award: junior co-captain *Alex Kopicki*

The Coaches Award: senior *Peter Scott*

SAS Dean's Scholars

Each spring, the Dean of SAS recognizes nine College students for their outstanding academic achievements. This year's winners:

Laura Geller, C '02, Asian and Middle Eastern studies program with a history minor
Catherine le Graw, C '02, economics, dual degree with Wharton

Afia Ofori-Mensa, C '02, English
Vijay Sankran, C '02, biochemistry with a chemistry minor

Sanjay Kasturi, C '03, biological basis of behavior and South Asia regional studies

Daniel Stahl, C '03, economics with a biology minor

Anita Yu, C '03, comparative literature and theory

Rodrigo Guerra, C '04, physics and biochemistry

Jean-Francois Mondon, C '04, linguistics.

Graduate Dean's Scholars

Deborah Amberson, Romance Languages

Brian Gregory, Folklore and Folklife

Christiane Gruber, History of Art

Miriam Jacobson, English

Monica Popescu, Comparative Literature

Alex Purves, Classical Studies

Vadim Rusu, Physics and Astronomy

Christina Sanchez-Carretero, Folklore and Folklife

Jason Weeden, Psychology

CGS Dean's Scholar

Huizhong Jin, Economics

Correction

The *Lynda* Hart Award announced in last week's issue of *Almanac* was misspelled. We regret the error.

—Eds.

Interesting Sites on the Web

Do you know of an interesting Penn website that is up-to-date, and easy to navigate: *Almanac* is now accepting suggestions for inclusion in the "Other Interesting Sites" link on our homepage.

—Ed.

U@PENN: A Web Service to View Payroll and Personnel Information

The Divisions of Finance, Human Resources and Information Systems & Computing are pleased to announce the first release of U@PENN, a new, secure web service that allows faculty, staff, and student employees who receive payments through the University payroll system to review their individual pay stubs, benefit information and payroll/personnel data online.

The initial services that will be available to you on *May 14* are as follows:

My Pay—View each of your weekly or monthly pay stubs that have been issued since November 19, 2001.

My Benefits—View a description of the Retirement Plan in which you participate and the amount of your contributions, along with contact information for your health & welfare benefits. Also, for non-exempt employees whose Paid Time Off balances are kept in the payroll system, the current balances will be reported.

My Profile—View your personal data maintained in the University's payroll/personnel system. Examples include: home address, emergency contact, date hired, job class, your school or center & organizational unit, etc.

Related Links—Link to other web sites associated with your employment at the University of Pennsylvania.

FAQs—View answers to frequently asked Payroll or Human Resource questions collected from the Payroll Office & Human Resources.

Visit U@Penn at <https://sentry.isc.upenn.edu/uatpenn> anytime Monday through Sunday, except 4 a.m. to 6 a.m.

U@Penn is the first step in building the foundation for a faculty and staff portal or electronic gateway that will eventually allow individuals to not only view their information, but also to interact electronically with the Payroll/Personnel system in order to keep their data accurate and up to date.

A great deal of care has been taken to provide a system that protects your privacy

and prevents other people from gaining access to your information. The access and security components of U@Penn are described below:

1) To access U@Penn, you will need a PennNet ID and Password. Your PennNet ID is unique and determines which information you are eligible to view. The associated password, which should be known only to you, prevents others from viewing your information. It is very important that you not divulge the password associated with your PennNet ID.

If you do not have a PennNet ID, you should visit <http://www.upenn.edu/computing/help/doc/passport/netid.html> for instructions or visit the Penn Card Center or PennNet ID stations on campus.

2) Once signed onto the U@Penn service using your PennNet ID and password, you are connected to a secure web site, signified by 'https://' instead of 'http://' at the beginning of the URL. Secure sites incorporate technology that protects data from being viewed in transit from a database to your monitor.

3) Your payroll information is not actually stored on the web. Only when you select information on the U@Penn site is that information retrieved from the personnel/payroll system and displayed on your screen. For example, when you click on the 'My Pay' tab, pay information is transmitted to your screen; if you don't click, nothing is transmitted.

We hope you will find this new self-service application convenient to use and that direct access to your data will be effective. We would very much like to hear your comments and/or suggestions for features that should be considered for inclusion in the next release.

Please contact us at uatpenn@isc.upenn.edu.

—Division of Finance

—Human Resources

—Information Systems & Computing

May Volunteer Opportunities

Dear Penn Community,

Following is our monthly posting of community service opportunities. As many of you know, each month, Penn Volunteers In Public Service (Penn VIPS) posts a list of volunteer opportunities. This list represents the many requests we get from the surrounding community for assistance/partnerships.

During the previous month, Penn VIPS undertook its annual Penny Drive. This year, the \$600 that was collected will benefit the VA Medical Center's Comfort House located at 41st and Baltimore Avenues.

Thanks for your support of this venture. Please contact me via e-mail, at sammapp@pobox.upenn.edu or by phone at (215) 898-2020 to volunteer for any of the programs.

—Isabel Mapp, Associate Director, Faculty, Staff and Alumni Volunteer Services, Director, Penn Volunteers In Public Service, Center for Community Partnerships

How would you like to help prepare a University City or a West Philadelphia high school student for the world of work? Hire them to do general office work and expose them to their areas of interest. We have students interested in the medicine, law, computers and much much more. Mentor a student. Hire a student to work in your department. Students earn academic credits and are paid through the YouthWorks Program for their internship.

Is your department upgrading its computers? Would you like to donate your used computers to a worthy cause? The Center for Community Partnerships and a group of volunteers are working to provide computers to West Philadelphia schools, churches, families and nonprofit agencies. Join us by donating your used computers to this cause. Visit our website at: www.upenn.edu/ccp/computerdonations.

Do you have a paid summer job for a student? Many Penn families are inquiring about summer jobs for their teenagers.

Move Out Drive Leaving campus? Travel light. Donate your clothing, bikes, computers and other articles. Bring donated items to: Isabel Mapp, Center for Community Partnerships, 133 South 36th St., room 504.

Development and Alumni Relations is seeking volunteers to help out at Alumni Weekend Events May 10-12. Help welcome back Penn alumni for their reunions. This is a perfect opportunity to service your community while enjoying good times and free food. Duties include greeting and registering guests and alumni as well as Attending receptions, picnics, parades, and taking part in other reunion festivities. Housing extensions are limited but all are welcome.

OF RECORD

The PENNCard Identification Policy has been expanded to accommodate emergency events. This addition to the policy previously appeared in Almanac For Comment and has been reviewed and approved by the Division of Public Safety Advisory Board and is endorsed by the University Council Safety and Security Committee.

—Maureen Rush, Vice President for Public Safety

PENNCard Policy

Effective May 1, 2002

In Emergency Events

In the event of a heightened security risk, members of the Penn community must be prepared for the enforcement of all existing PENNCard policies, as well as potentially greater restrictions on access to campus buildings and events.

Faculty, staff and students of the University of Pennsylvania *must* carry their PENNCard Identification Cards with them, or risk being denied access to a University event or building.

Schools and Centers may implement procedures regarding their individual building internal security that exceed those governing the general PENNCard policies adopted by the University.

Security Policy for After Hours Use of University Buildings

1. All building users (students, staff, faculty) are required to prominently display their PennCards between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.—7 days a week, with the obvious exception of students, staff and faculty residents in residential buildings and those actively participating in activities in athletic buildings.

2. All building users should notify security officers or Penn Police officers immediately if they observe any individual inside the building acting suspiciously or without a PENNCard.

3. If a Penn Police officer or security officer observes anyone in the building between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. without their PENNCard, that person will be asked to leave the building and to return with the card. Officers will provide assistance with escort or shuttle services.

4. No one is authorized to prop or otherwise cause any exterior building door to be held open. If this is observed, the door should be closed and/or the situation reported to a security officer or a Penn Police officer as soon as possible. Everyone should be alert for anyone who attempts to enter the building through an exit door as someone is leaving. Such observations should be reported to Penn Police or security immediately.

5. All building users are asked to exit through non-emergency exit doors only. ("Emergency Exit Only" doors will be marked appropriately).

6. In an emergency situation arises and no officers are in the immediate area, persons should immediately call 511 (the Penn Police emergency number) to report the incident.

The University recognizes that perpetrators of crimes are not always easily identifiable. Crimes can be committed by both University and non-University members. These policies are intended to enhance security and security awareness for all students, staff and faculty in campus buildings used after normal University hours. Violations of these safety procedures will be documented by Penn police and/or security officers and can result in appropriate University disciplinary action.

Security Policy for 24-Hour Academic Buildings

Building Usage. Limit the number of buildings being used for 24-hour academic activities. Spaces for after-hours activities within buildings should be limited to specific rooms and floors. Rooms and labs not designated for 24-hour use should be secured to prevent use after hours.

Building Access. Limit after-hours access to one door only; this door should be accessible only by card reader or security staff member who checks IDs or otherwise controls access (sign-in/out, or a card reader as in residential buildings).

Security Officers. Require the presence of an adequate number of security officers during after hours activities—the number and deployment of officers to be determined specifically for each facility.

ID Card Visibility. Require all after-hours building users to prominently display their PENNCards between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.

Building Exit Control. Limit the number of non-emergency exit doors, and ensure they lead to well-lighted, non-secluded areas. All exit doors will be armed with intrusion- and prop-detection alarm devices monitored by Penn Police. Appropriate signage regarding door alarms will be displayed at these doors.

Security Technology & Maintenance. All security devices will report electronically to the Penn Police. High building-maintenance standards for doors, locks, lighting and other safety related equipment will be observed. All life-safety related maintenance requests will be processed as a high priority.

Awareness. All building users will be provided information describing after-hours policies to ensure awareness and compliance.

Update

MAY AT PENN

CORRECTION

The 15th Annual Poster Session on Aging was listed incorrectly in the May At Penn Calendar. The date of the conference is May 16.

EXHIBIT

11 *Off the Wall: Current Work by Robinson Fredenthal*; Robinson Fredenthal, sculptor; Opening reception 5-7 p.m.; weekdays 9 a.m.-5 p.m.; weekends by appointment; Kroiz Gallery, Architectural Archives. Through September 30.

FITNESS AND LEARNING

9 *Human Research: Beyond Compliance Creating a Culture of Conscience*; learn how Penn has increased protection for human subjects and enhanced support of clinical investigators; 4:30-6:30 p.m.; Class of '62 Auditorium, John Morgan Bldg. (School of Medicine).

10 *Annual Morris Arboretum Spring Plan Sale-Members Preview*; open only to members of the Arboretum; become a member and receive a free plant; 10 a.m.-7 p.m.; followed by plant sale for the public May 11 (Morris Arboretum).

11 *Great Plants for Your Home Garden Tour*; mature examples of unique plants available for sale. Horticulture experts help select plants; 10:30 a.m. (Morris Arboretum).

TALK

9 *What's Wrong With Cloning Your Cat?*; Arthur Caplan, bioethics; 2 p.m.; rm. 200, College Hall (Center for Bioethics).

Deadlines: The deadline for the weekly Update is each Monday for the following week's issue. The next issue is scheduled for May 21. The deadline for the Summer At Penn calendar is May 14. For submission information, see www.upenn.edu/almanac/calendar/caldead.html.

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 22 to April 28, 2002**. Also reported were **19 Crimes Against Property (including 16 thefts, 2 retail thefts and 1 burglary)**. Full reports on the Web (www.upenn.edu/almanac/v48/n33/crimes.html). Prior weeks' reports are also on-line.—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 22 to April 28, 2002**. 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 (215) 898-4482.

4/22/02	8:37 AM	3100 Chestnut	Window to vehicle broken
4/22/02	4:00 PM	224 S 40th St.	Bad traveler's check used
4/22/02	3:13 PM	3401 Civic Center	Security Officer assaulted/Arrest
4/23/02	9:52 AM	4040 Chestnut	Harassing calls received by staff
4/24/02	9:57 AM	3744 Spruce St.	Attempt to cash bad AMEX check/Arrest
4/25/02	9:34 AM	300 S. 34th St.	Traffic stop/male wanted/Arrest
4/26/02	3:04 AM	4052 Spruce St.	Numerous harassing phone calls received
4/26/02	4:00 PM	34th/Spruce	Unauthorized male in area/Arrest
4/26/02	4:10 PM	200 S 33rd St.	Male running illegal card game/Arrest
4/27/02	12:15 PM	100 S 38th St.	Male panhandling/refused to leave/Arrest
4/28/02	10:24 AM	4043 Walnut St.	Window broken with brick

18th District Report

12 incidents and 3 arrests (including 8 robberies and 4 aggravated assaults) were reported between **April 22 to April 28, 2002** by the 18th District covering the Schuylkill River to 49th St. & Market St. to Woodland Ave.

4/22/02	6:00 AM	4500 Pine St	Aggravated Assault
4/22/02	6:00 AM	4500 Pine St	Aggravated Assault
4/22/02	8:25 PM	5200 Larchwood	Robbery/Arrest
4/22/02	10:05 AM	4800 Chester	Robbery
4/23/02	1:31 AM	916 46th St	Robbery/Arrest
4/23/02	5:30 PM	3600 Market St	Robbery/Arrest
4/25/02	8:15 AM	1320 48th St	Aggravated Assault
4/24/02	4:08 PM	1018 48th St	Robbery
4/24/02	5:25 PM	33 40th St	Robbery
4/26/02	8:15 AM	3939 Ludlow St	Aggravated Assault
4/26/02	2:55 AM	4600 Baltimore	Robbery
4/28/02	11:58 AM	1109 47th St	Robbery



LeDray at ICA: *Come Together*, 1995-96, from the San Francisco Museum of Art, opens May 10.

CLASSIFIEDS—PERSONAL

HOME INSPECTION

Need Home Repairs? You may be entitled to money for home repairs. Roof/plumbing leaks, water stains, etc. at *no cost to you*. Call for free property inspection today. Lisa Smith (215) 424-6748.

ACCOUNTANT

Tax Professional on Campus—Tax Return preparation & advice by Sage CPA/MBA for personal & small business; non-profits, estates, trusts, alien & Green Card Residents, advice, appeals, audits. No charge for first appointment-Day/Evg. Early Filer & Off Season Discounts. Call Tim (610) 853-2871—3916 Locust Walk (Church Admin. Office).

Almanac is not responsible for contents of classified ad material.

To place a classified ad, call (215) 898-5274.



Off the Wall: Thousands of paper models documenting a lifetime of geometric explorations by Robert Fredenthal, BA '63, BArch '67, the designer of *Black Forest*—the sculpture adjacent to Meyerson Hall will—be at the Kroiz Gallery; the opening is May 11.

CLASSIFIEDS—UNIVERSITY

RESEARCH

Spina bifida: Researchers at the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine are working with individuals and families affected by spina bifida to identify the causes of this serious birth defect. This research study is open to individuals with myelomeningocele (spina bifida cystica or aperta) and their families. For more information about this study, please contact Katy Hoess (215) 573-9319 or 866-275-SBRR (toll free), e-mail: khoess@cceb.med.upenn.edu or visit our website at: www.sbrr.info.

Do you have high cholesterol? Doctors at Penn are launching a novel new research study looking at two well-known cholesterol lowering agents. The study involves several visits to the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania. If you have elevated cholesterol levels, are not currently taking any lipid-lowering medications, and think you might be interested in this study, please contact Rose Giordano at Giordano@mail.med.upenn.edu or (215) 662-9040. Compensation is provided.

Interested in preventing prostate cancer? Call Lisa @UPCC (215) 614-1811 regarding SELECT research study.

Almanac is not responsible for contents of classified ad material.

To place a classified ad, call (215) 898-5274.



Almanac

Suite 211 Nichols House
3600 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6106
Phone: (215) 898-5274 or 5275 FAX: (215) 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 Marguerite F. Miller
ASSOCIATE EDITOR Margaret Ann Morris
ASSISTANT EDITOR Tina Bejian
STUDENT ASSISTANTS Jean-François Brunet; David Fecteau; Chris McFall; Kristin Snell; William Yeoh; Shante Rutherford

UCHS INTERN

ALMANAC ADVISORY BOARD: *For the Faculty Senate*, Martin Pring (Chair), Helen Davies, David Hackney, Phoebe Leboy, Mitchell Marcus, Joseph Turow. *For the Administration*, Lori N. Doyle. *For the Staff Assemblies*, Michele Taylor, PP&A; Karen Pinckney, A-3 Assembly; David N. Nelson, 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).

University of Pennsylvania

Three-Year Academic Calendar, 2002-2003 through 2004-2005

Fall	2002 Fall Term	2003 Fall Term	2004 Fall Term
Move-in and registration for Transfer Students Tuesday	August 27	August 26	August 31
Move-in for first-year students; New Student Orientation Thursday	August 29	August 28	September 2
Labor Day Monday	September 2	September 1	September 6
New Student Convocation and Opening Exercises; Penn Reading Project Wednesday	September 4	September 3	September 8
First Day of Classes Thursday	September 5	September 4	September 9
Add Period Ends Friday	September 20	September 19	September 24
Drop Period Ends Friday	October 11	October 10	October 15
Fall Term Break Friday-Sunday	October 11-13	October 10-12	October 15-17
Family Weekend Friday-Sunday	October 18-20	October 24-26	October 29-31
Homecoming Saturday	November 2	November 8	October 16
Advance Registration, Spring Term Monday-Sunday	October 28-November 10	October 27-November 9	November 1-November 14
Thanksgiving Break Begins at close of classes Wednesday	November 27	November 26	November 24
Thanksgiving Break Ends 8 a.m. Monday	December 2	December 1	November 29
Fall Term Classes End Monday	December 9	December 8	December 10 (Friday)
Reading Days Tuesday -Thursday	December 10-12	December 9-11	December 13-15 (Mon.-Wed.)
Final Examinations Friday-Friday	December 13-20	December 12-19	December 16-22 (Thur.-Thur.)
Fall Semester Ends Friday	December 20	December 19	December 22 (Thursday)
Spring	2003 Spring Term	2004 Spring Term	2005 Spring Term
Spring Semester classes begin Monday	January 13	January 12	January 17
Martin Luther King, Jr. Day (observed) No classes Monday	January 20	January 19	January 17
Add Period Ends Friday	January 24	January 23	January 28
Drop Period Ends Friday	February 14	February 13	February 18
Spring Break Begins at Close of Classes Friday	March 7	March 5	March 4
Classes Resume at 8 a.m. Monday	March 17	March 15	March 14
Advance Registration for Fall and Summer Sessions Monday-Sunday	March 24-April 6	March 22-April 4	March 21-April 3
Spring Term Classes End Friday	April 25	April 23	April 22
Reading Days Monday-Wednesday	April 28-30	April 26-28	April 25-27
Final Examinations Thursday-Friday	May 1-9	April 29-May 7	April 28-May 6
Alumni Day Saturday	May 17	May 15	May 14
Baccalaureate Sunday	May 18	May 16	May 15
Commencement Monday	May 19	May 17	May 16
Summer	2003 Summer Session	2004 Summer Session	2005 Summer Session
12-Week Evening Session classes begin Monday	May 19	May 17	May 16
First Session classes begin Tuesday	May 20	May 18	May 17
Memorial Day (No classes) Monday	May 26	May 31	May 30
First Session Classes End Friday	June 27	June 25	June 24
Second Session classes begin Monday	June 30	June 28	June 27
Independence Day (No classes)	July 4 (Friday)	July 5 (Monday)	July 4 (Monday)
Second Session; 12-Week Evening Session classes End Friday	August 8	August 6	August 5

Note: The University's Three-Year Academic Calendar is subject to change. In the event that changes are made, the latest, most up-to-date version will be posted to *Almanac's* website, www.upenn.edu/almanac.