

UNIVERSITY of PENNSYLVANIA

Almanac

Tuesday,
September 3, 2002
Volume 49 Number 2
www.upenn.edu/almanac/

Faculty Senate Leadership for 2002-2003



The Faculty Senate announces its leadership for this academic year: (left to right) David Hackney is the past chair, Mitchell Marcus is the chair and Lance Donaldson-Evans is the chair-elect. See the Senate's Elected Officers and Committee Members on page 2 along with a Welcome Back message from the new Chair of the Faculty Senate.

At Penn, Over the Summer . . .

- *Campus Dining Services* signed a one-year management contract with Aramark to "add flexibility, improve quality and innovate the campus dining program" (see the July 16 issue online for this and more summer news).
- *Penn and Trammell Crow Company* terminated the arrangement entered into in 1998 for project management services for capital construction projects and property management and transaction services for off-campus properties as well as for the Neighborhood Preservation and Development Fund (see full story online at www.upenn.edu/almanac).
- *ISC* announced the implementation of a new authentication method called Kerberos and the replacement of PennNet IDs and passwords with PennKeys (user name) and password (for more about these security measures see the July 16 issue online).
- *The campus is changing* with the completion of Wharton's Jon M. Hunstman Hall, the 300,000 square-foot academic building as well as the David Pottruck Health and Fitness Center, which provides an additional 65,000 square feet of recreational space joining the existing Gimbel Gymnasium. The new state-of-the-art facility will provide 115,000 square feet of indoor recreational space to better serve the fitness needs of the Penn community (see September AT PENN for dates and times of tours).
- *GSE* will assist three low-performing West Philadelphia elementary schools under an agreement with the Philadelphia School Reform commission. GSE will receive funding to help improve student achievement at Henry C. Lea School, Alexander Wilson School, and William C. Bryant School by advising, assisting and providing services to the schools in curriculum, professional and leadership development; parental and community involvement; student assessment and student academic support and enrichment. These partnerships augment Penn's involvement in public school education at the newly named Alexander School, the newest public school in West Philadelphia (see story at right).

IN THIS ISSUE

- 2 Welcome Back: From the Senate Chair; Senate Officers Elected for 2002-2003
- 3 Welcome Back: From the President
- 4 Deaths: Dr. Tybel Bloom, Mr. Norman Day, Mr. Warren Ford, Dr. Klaus Hummeler, Dr. David Knight, Mrs. Joanne Lucid, Dr. Chaim Potok, and Dr. Margaret Sovie
- 5 Speaking Out: Biomed Communications; Personal Privacy; Prescriptions
- 6 Report on Human Subjects Research in the SocioBehavioral Sciences
- 9 Procedures Pertaining to Departments; Policy on *upenn.edu* Domain Space; Research Funding; Policy of Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action
- 10 Three-Year Academic Calendar: 2002-2003 through 2004-2005
- 11 Admissions Seminars for Penn Families; Secular and Religious Holidays; Express Modem Pool; CrimeStats; Classifieds
- 12 Getting *Almanac* in print and online

Pullout: September AT PENN

Honoring Sadie Tanner Mossell Alexander: A Role Model for Future Generations of Students

In a tribute to a woman whose lists of personal and professional achievements are unparalleled, the Penn-Assisted School is now officially The Sadie Tanner Mossell Alexander University of Pennsylvania Partnership School. The School Reform Commission passed a resolution in August approving the name.

The neighborhood PreK-8 university-assisted public school was created through the collaboration of Penn, the School District and the Philadelphia Federation of Teachers, and serves a diverse catchment area with families from nearly 20 countries.

Dr. Alexander was a pioneer for African-American women, blazing educational and professional trails, and a role model for anyone striving to end prejudice and discrimination.

"I am very pleased that the School Reform Commission agreed with our recommendation to have our school named after a woman of great recognition," said Sheila A. Sydnor, the school principal. "Sadie Tanner Mossell Alexander exemplified true leadership, perseverance and dedication to our city and our country. Our students will know and emulate the values of this great lawyer, educator and pioneer as they pursue their education. Mrs. Alexander will serve as the role model for all who will cross our threshold."

Born in 1898 into a family whose members had fought discrimination and segregation in Canada, Wales and the U.S., Dr. Alexander was the first African-American woman to earn a doctorate in economics, not only at Penn, but also in the nation. She was also the first African-American woman to enroll in law school at Penn and earn a law degree, the first African-American woman to pass the bar and to practice law in Pennsylvania.

"She had to be better than the very best," said Jerry Jordan, vice president of the PFT. "She had a lot of obstacles to overcome. She's going to be a great role model for the children who attend the school."

President Harry S. Truman appointed Dr. Alexander to the President's Committee on Civil Rights, whose report, *To Secure These Rights*, served as the foundation of the civil rights movement in America and was the basis for future civil rights policy decisions and legislation. President Jimmy Carter appointed her chairperson of the White House Conference on Aging, charged with addressing a range of social and economic needs of the elderly.

"There is no more fitting tribute to my mother than to name this newly created and state-of-the-art public school in her honor," said Rae Alexander-Minter, Ed.D., speaking for the family. "Sadie Alexander's life and work and her love of education will serve as a model of excellence and high achievement for all the students who attend and graduate from the Alexander School. May education and learning be central to their lives and work and move them forward to lives of personal and academic fulfillment," she said.

The school opens this fall for grades PreK-2 and 5-6 in a newly constructed 83,000 square feet, \$19 million building that can accommodate up to 650 students in 28 classrooms. Clustered in modules, the classrooms overlook a central multi-story atrium that will also serve as a gathering place for students and community. Other features include a gymnasium/auditorium, instructional media center, science labs, music rooms, art room and full-service cafeteria.

"This is a fantastic facility for the children of West Philadelphia and a great place for them to learn and grow," said Dr. Susan Fuhrman, dean of GSE. "We're very proud of the partnership that made this school a reality and thrilled, of course, that it's been named for Sadie Alexander."

A grand opening and ribbon-cutting ceremony is planned for this fall. (For a timeline for Sadie Alexander's life, see www.upenn.edu/almanac)



Sadie Alexander

SENATE From the Senate Chair

The Faculty Senate Agenda 2002-2003

On behalf of the Faculty Senate, welcome back to Penn for the beginning of the new academic year! For those of you new to Penn, the Faculty Senate is the deliberative body and the voice of the Penn faculty. The Senate functions primarily through the Senate Executive Committee (SEC), an elected group which meets monthly, and through a number of committees. SEC's agenda and actions are published here in *Almanac* to solicit your feedback.

SEC also gives advice on current issues and problems facing the University through the frequent consultations that take place between the Senate leadership (the Chair-elect, Lance Donaldson-Evans; the Past Chair,

SENATE From the Senate Chair

Faculty Senate Officers Elected for 2002-2003

TO: Members of the Standing Faculty
FROM: Mitchell Marcus, Chair

I would like to thank the Senate Nominating Committee, chaired by David Brownlee, for their work in fulfilling their role for the Faculty Senate. (See *Almanac* January 9, 2002, for members of the Nominating Committee.)

No additional nominations were received by the deadline and therefore the Senate Nominating Committee's slate of nominees is hereby declared elected. Effective immediately, the Faculty Senate Officers for this year are:

Chair: Mitchell Marcus (prof computer & information science)
Past Chair: David B. Hackney (prof radiology at HUP)
Chair-elect: Lance Donaldson-Evans (prof Romance languages)
Secretary: Louis A. Thomas (assoc prof management)
Past Secretary: Edward L. Rubin (prof law)
Secretary-elect: Vincent Price (assoc prof communication)

Newly elected as At-large members of the Senate Executive Committee for 3-year terms:

Barry Cooperman (prof chemistry)
 Horace DeLisser (asst prof pulmonary & critical care/medicine)
 Howard Goldfine (prof microbiology/medicine)
 David P. Pope (prof materials science & engineering)

For a 1-year term: Lynn H. Lees (prof history)

Newly elected as an assistant professor member of the Senate Executive Committee for a 2-year term:

Sudipto Guha (asst prof computer & information science)

Newly elected to the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility for 3-year terms:

Arthur L. Caplan (Trustee prof bioethics/medicine)
 Madeleine Joullie (prof chemistry)
 Martin Pring (assoc prof physiology/medicine)

For a 2-year term: John W. Fantuzzo (prof education)

Newly elected to the Senate Committee on Conduct for 2-year terms:

David B. Brownlee (prof history of art)
 Susan Gennaro (prof nursing)
 Judy Meinkoth (assoc prof pharmacology/medicine)

Newly elected to the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty for 3-year terms:

Jere Behrman (prof economics)
 Linda Brown (prof nursing)

The terms of the new Faculty Senate Officers and the newly elected members of the Senate Executive Committee, the Committees on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, Conduct, and Economic Status of the Faculty begin immediately. Full committee memberships will be published this fall in *Almanac*, or please contact the Faculty Senate Office by mail at Box 12 College Hall/6303 or by telephone at (215) 898-6943.

David Hackney; and myself) and the President and the Provost. It is quite important to this dialogue that you keep SEC and its leadership informed of your own concerns and views; you can contact either your SEC constituency representatives or the Senate leadership directly by phone or e-mail. You can reach me by e-mail at mitch@cis.upenn.edu or at (215) 898-2538.

The Faculty Senate and its leadership face a major change and challenge this fall. Executive Assistant Carolyn Burdon will be retiring, after running the Faculty Senate office for 31 years. Well beyond fulfilling her official duties keeping the Faculty Senate office running smoothly and her extended role in attempting to keep the annually changing Senate leadership on track, Ms. Burdon, though not a faculty member, was in many ways the heart and soul of the Faculty Senate. Her daily counsel and good advice will be missed. Kristine Kelly, who most recently worked in the President's office, will staff the Faculty Senate office.

This fall, SEC will consider a wide range of proposed policies. Key among these are new policies on retirement, on teaching evaluation, and several new policies on the appropriate and ethical conduct of research.

For the past two years, a Retirement Task Force appointed by the Provost has examined aspects of retirement which resulted from the elimination in 1994 of mandatory retirement at age 70 and from policies adopted then as a result of this uncapping. The final report of this committee, chaired by Associate Provost Barbara Lowery and Prof. Jerry Rosenbloom, was completed in the spring, and will appear in *Almanac* early this fall. I am asking the Senate Committee on Administration to study this report and to give SEC its evaluation. SEC's response as a whole will be forwarded back to the Task Force and to the Provost.

Two proposals dealing with the appropriate conduct of research have now been handed to SEC for comment. After some modification, a revision of Procedures Regarding Misconduct in Research was endorsed by the Senate Committee on Administration last spring, and then by SEC, contingent on a review by the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (SCAFR). After review by SCAFR early this fall, it will be returned to SEC for final approval. The Provost has also forwarded to SEC a proposed policy which addresses conflict of interest for faculty participating in clinical trials, developed in consultation with the School of Medicine administration and faculty. It will be reviewed by the Senate Committee on Administration early this fall before being reviewed by SEC as a whole.

Two other policies regarding research are now taking shape within the University. Vice Provost for Research Neal Nathanson is now forming a committee to formulate policy on Institutional Conflict of Interest; he has kept the Faculty Senate leadership well informed during this process. A working group chaired by Annenberg School Deputy Dean Larry Gross has formulated a set of principles towards clarifying guidelines for the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for sociobehavioral research, published in this issue of *Almanac*. After a discussion of this study by SEC, Vice Provost Nathanson intends to charge a committee to formalize regulations for this IRB.

The final report of a faculty-administration Committee to Assess the Evaluation of Teaching, chaired by Deputy Provost Peter Conn and Prof. David Pope, was presented during the summer to the Provost and the Faculty Senate. I have asked the Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy to study this report, and to advise SEC on what further actions we might take on the proposed recommendations it contains.

Last year, SEC passed a resolution strongly endorsing the recommendations of the joint faculty-administration Committee on Faculty Gender Equity chaired by Associate Provost Barbara Lowery and Prof. Phoebe Leboy, and endorsed additional vigorous actions within the University to maintain and further gender equity among the faculty. As a follow up to the work of that committee, President Judith Rodin, Provost Robert Barchi and then-Senate Chair David B. Hackney charged a joint faculty-administration Minority Equity Committee, chaired by Prof. John B. Jemmott, to undertake a systematic review of the status of minority faculty at the University. We hope to have a report from this committee this fall.

Beyond considering the wide range of proposed policy changes pre-

sented above, I am charging the Faculty Senate Committees with a range of additional charges that include:

- investigating potential negative impacts of both proposed and implemented federal regulations following the events of September 11 on the University's dual roles of teaching and research, and proposing steps to ameliorate those impacts;
- investigating the negative impacts of the skyrocketing cost of scholarly journals, and proposing steps that can be taken by the Faculty and University to ameliorate those impacts.

Other policies to be examined by Senate Committees and then by SEC include changes to faculty policies proposed last year by various of Penn's schools.

A tremendous level of faculty effort and thoughtfulness was required to produce the reports mentioned above. The willingness of the faculty to serve on committees that wrestle with difficult, sometimes contentious issues is a prerequisite to our University functioning as a living community of scholars and teachers. I look forward to working with you this year, as new issues move forward, and I will keep you informed throughout the year through *Almanac*. Have a productive and successful year!



FROM THE PRESIDENT

The Journey to Understanding and Knowledge

Each year we welcome new students and colleagues who bring fresh energy and ideas to the Penn community.

As an academic community, we eagerly examine and explore issues in depth. We pick apart one another's arguments, theories, and papers—because we know that the impact of different views and perspectives strengthens our work. We joyfully seize the challenge to consider society's most vexing and intractable problems.

No other milieu, I believe, even comes close to a university campus for sheer intellectual exuberance. The Penn community derives its intellectual vitality from a fundamental and unshakeable commitment to freedom of thought, inquiry, association, and of expression. We provide open forums for critical thinking and informed discussions. We also provide safe haven for the widest possible range of opinions, from the brilliant and sublime even to the scurrilous and ridiculous.

As we begin a new academic year so close to the first anniversary of September 11, we continue to feel both collective anguish over the tragedy that befell our country, and collective apprehension over what is yet to come. During these uncertain times of escalating tensions and peril, I believe it becomes more important for all of us to reaffirm and renew our commitment to the values of academic community.

These values include unfettered freedom of expression, the importance of civic engagement in every aspect of University's life, and robust, honest engagement with those with whom we disagree.

The next year may put these values to the test as the Penn community confronts many issues that undoubtedly will stir up strong emotions and profoundly serious disagreements among us. Whether we are debating issues right at home, such as graduate student unionization, or those that hit close to home, such as the tragic conflict in the Middle East, we face a very tall order: How do we encourage thoughtful discourse and debate while at the same time allowing all voices to be heard?

As educators, we teach our students to explore issues thoroughly. We draw distinctions between informed arguments steeped in civility and reason on one hand, and repulsive rants steeped in hatred and nonsense on the other. We know how much knowledge and understanding our students gain from the former. We despair over the pain and anger the latter creates among members of the Penn community.

I expect the coming year to be filled with the kind of intrepid explorations and robust discussions worthy of a great University and its superb faculty, students, and staff. I would also hope and expect that members of our community will refrain from speech, gestures, or actions solely intended to rip us asunder.

Nonetheless, we must also anticipate that someone on the Penn campus may uncork a nasty brew of vicious comments that seek to marginalize or dehumanize a segment of our campus community.

If and when that happens, how should we respond?

Some might argue that some views are so heinous and hateful to a community that anyone who expresses them should be condemned, pun-

ished, or even expelled. However, if we cherish freedom of expression as a core academic value, then we must resist the urge to use the power of the University or the presidency to silence any lawful speech or flatten any speaker who expresses hateful and despicable views.

Our defense of free speech does not mean we therefore remain aloof either to the pain felt by groups who are the targets of hate speech, or to their deeply felt concerns for their own safety.

To the contrary, the University will go to great lengths to provide the resources to support thoughtful, reasoned dialogue and debate. We will not hesitate to call upon Public Safety, the Chaplain's Office, or University Life to provide whatever protection and support is needed to promote a physically safe environment for all members of the campus community, including groups who have suffered religious and ethnic prejudice in the wake of September 11.

In the past, some members of the Penn community have mistakenly interpreted my refusal to condemn specific speech publicly as a sign of personal or institutional insensitivity or indifference.

Privately, I churn in dismay and disgust at the offensiveness and ignorance of views expressed by a minuscule number of people in the Penn community. But I also don't believe that presidential condemnations of specific speech strengthen our academic community. To the contrary, they tend to stop the debate dead in its tracks.

I believe we are better off using even the most objectionable speech as a catalyst to a productive, illuminating, and inclusive conversation that becomes a forum for reasoned and thoughtful ideas.

Invariably, hateful ideas will crumble under the weight of relentless scrutiny and informed debate.

In recent years, members of the Penn community have responded to incidents of hate speech by turning understandable outrage into creative engagement. Just over the past year, I have observed a passionate determination by Muslims, Jews, and Christians on campus to forge a true interfaith dialogue. I know I can always count on the Penn community to harness its passion and acumen to remain vigorously and constructively engaged.

Let's begin the new academic year in this spirit of "spirited" engagement with each other as a continuing public conversation and collective enterprise through which we build the kind of robust and creative academic community we all desire. The academic community of Penn, which persists in the face of rapid and far-reaching changes, will be strengthened and enhanced to the benefit of all. Let our journey to understanding and knowledge go forward.



Deaths

Dr. Tybel Bloom, Social Work

Dr. Tybel Bloom, emeritus professor of social work, died July 15 of pneumonia at the age of 89.

Dr. Bloom earned her MSW from Penn in 1944, after having earned her BA from the University of Minnesota in 1934 and worked for five years at the Ramsey County Welfare Board in St. Paul, Minn. She subsequently worked at the Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic and then taught at the University of Southern California before joining the Penn faculty in 1955.

Dr. Bloom earned her DSW here in 1960, becoming associate professor in 1966 and full professor in 1968 before becoming associate dean for curriculum. She also published several articles, including "Social Casework: the Functional Approach" for the *Encyclopedia of Social Work* in 1977. She became emeritus professor in 1979.

She is survived by a brother, Norman, and a sister, Myra Jacobs. Memorial donations may be made to the Senior Associates Scholarship Fund, in care of the University of Pennsylvania, CGS, 3440 Market St., Philadelphia, PA 19104.



Tybel Bloom

Mr. Day, Architecture

Norman Day, emeritus associate professor of architecture and city planning, and an urban designer with McCormick, Taylor Associates, died on July 16, at the age of 69.

Mr. Day received his BA in architecture from the University of Minnesota Institute of Technology in 1955 and a MArch from MIT in 1958. He also attended a program of study in city planning, at the Architectural Association & Town Planning Institute in London (1959-1960). His fields of specialization included urban design, comprehensive urban planning, metropolitan and regional planning; urban transportation planning and design, central area revitalization, new community planning and design, planned residential developments, community and environmental impact analysis.

GSFA Dean Gary Hack said "I knew Norman for many years, beginning when he taught in the mid-west and as a visiting critic at Illinois; he encouraged me to pursue urban design. He taught a generation of urban designers at Penn, and continued teaching in city planning as recently as three years ago when he oversaw a studio working on design around transportation station in Bogota."

He is survived by his wife, Nancy; daughters, Dana, Leslie, Taryn and Leah; sons, Daniel, Joel, and Andrew; 14 grandchildren; and brothers, Ralph, Gordon, Larry and Mardell. Donations may be sent to Habitat for Humanity.

Mr. Ford, Planning & Operations SOM



Warren Ford

Warren Ford, a special services assistant, Space Planning and Operations in the School of Medicine died on August 4 at the age of 59. Mr. Ford began working at Penn in 1969 as a utility worker at SOM and remained there until his death.

He is survived by his wife, Brenda; four daughters Cassandra, Octavia, LaToya and Bria; 11 grandchildren; four sisters; and two brothers. Donations may be sent to Mrs. Brenda

Ford, 5027 Knox Street, Philadelphia, PA 19144. A memorial service will be held on September 13, from 3-4:30 p.m. in the Auditorium & Lobby of BRB II/III.

Dr. Klaus Hummeler, Virologist

Dr. Klaus Hummeler, emeritus professor of pediatrics at the School of Medicine and first director of Joseph Stokes Jr. Institute at CHOP, died July 14 at the age of 80.

Dr. Hummeler was born in Hamburg, Germany. He received a medical degree from the University of Hamburg, then immigrated to the United States in 1949. He came to Penn in 1952 and was named the first director of Joseph Stokes Jr. Institute in 1972 and retired in 1989.

Dr. Hummeler is survived by his wife, Mary Hummeler; his daughter, Deborah Dunning; his sister; and three grandchildren.

Donations may be made to the Klaus Hummeler Endowed Fund for Research at CHOP, 34th and Civic Center Boulevard, Philadelphia, PA 19104.

Dr. David Knight, Vet Medicine

Dr. David Harmon Knight, professor emeritus of veterinary medicine, died of a heart attack July 15 while bicycling near his home. He was 64.

A specialist in veterinary cardiology, Dr. Knight joined the faculty in 1967 and spent his entire career at Penn, retiring last year. He was a charter member of the American College of Internal Medicine and a member of the American Heart Association, and served as chief of the section of cardiology in the College of Veterinary Medicine for many years.

Additionally, Dr. Knight was an accomplished athlete. He was a member of the crew team as an undergraduate at Cornell University, rowed for the Vesper Boat Club and Bachelor's Barge Club in the 1960s, and was an alternate on the U.S. Olympic rowing team in 1964. In 1974 became the first U.S. citizen to win the gold medal in the international Canoe Federation in the White Water Slalom race. He won the Masters World Championship in 1982 in pairs rowing in the Netherlands with former Olympian John B. Kelly Jr. In 1985 he was a member of the U.S. Dragon Boat team that raced in Hong Kong. He took up cycling two years ago.

Dr. Knight is survived by his wife of 23 years, Krystyna Wrobel Knight; two sons, Eric and Christopher; his father, Ernest; and a brother. A memorial service is planned for later in September at the Veterinary School.

Memorial donations may be made to University of Pennsylvania School of Veterinary Medicine, 3800 Spruce Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104.

Mrs. Lucid, Gregory College House

Joanne Tharalson Lucid, Associate Master of Gregory College House, died July 31 at home at the age of 75.

For the past four years she and her husband—Dr. Robert Lucid, emeritus professor of English, —served the Gregory College House community; prior to that they did the same in Hill House since 1979. Since the inception of the Penn Reading Project, Mrs. Lucid led a section each fall; last summer she and her husband co-taught a section.

Mrs. Lucid was born and raised in Oregon, earned her BA in English from Seattle University in 1949 and a MA in teaching from Wesleyan University in 1964.

After 31 years as a teacher in Philadelphia public schools—29 years of them teaching at Germantown High School, where she taught English, drama, and debate—she retired in 1995. She had been active with the Philadelphia Federation of Teachers. She was named all-time teacher of the year in 1985.

'Miz Lucy,' as her school children often called her, was known for her strength, kindness, and no-nonsense straight talk and to many was a valued friend. "I do not think I go too far if I say that she was the stuff from which we look to maintain our besieged hopes for humanity, our ongoing desire to still believe in ourselves through the darkest hours and years," Norman Mailer said in a letter.

She is survived by her husband of 48 years, Dr. Robert Lucid, and a son, John.

Dr. Chaim Potok, Novelist

Dr. Chaim Potok, novelist, whose characters struggled with their ties to their conservative Jewish communities and their desire to explore the world outside of it, died July 23 at his home in Merion at the age of 73.

Having previously received an English degree from Yeshiva University and being ordained as a rabbi at the Jewish Theological Seminary, Dr. Potok received his Ph.D.

in philosophy from Penn in 1965. He was also Baccalaureate Speaker in 1983, at which time he received an honorary degree from Penn.

He is also remembered for classes he taught beginning in 1992 for the General Honors Program, the first he gave analyzing *The Gates of November: Chronicles of the Slepak Family*, the biography of Solomon Slepak he was writing at the time. He continued teaching a class entitled *The Post-Modernist Search for Self* until the fall of 2000.

Dr. Potok's protagonists face the restrictions placed on their lives by their conservative religious communities: one entertaining dreams of being a psychologist, another painting crucifixions, despite the rejection they will face from their families. These themes were revisited and revisited in best-selling works, *The Chosen* and *My Name is Asher Lev*.

These themes, were also the author's struggles, whose desire to paint and write and his decision to leave the parochial school system and attend the Jewish Theological Seminary, conflicted with his Orthodox family and upbringing.

In addition to writing novels, Dr. Potok served as a U.S. Army Chaplain in Korea from 1955 to 1957, and produced non-fiction works, including *Wanderings: Chaim Potok's History of the Jews*.

Dr. Potok is survived by his wife, Adena; two daughters, Rena, who teaches in the English department (BA '83, MS '90, Ph.D. '95) and Naama; a son, Akiva; two grandchildren and two sisters, Charlotte Hering and Bella Sobolofsky.

When Dr. Potok took part last semester in the "Spirit of Liberty Symposium" on religious liberty, he observed:

I am not so naïve as to think we can do away with all the differences between religions, I



Chaim Potok

would hope to do away with the hatred those differences have elicited. Despite our divisiveness and tawdriness, there is still here the dream of dialogue, of listening; especially at this very moment. If it cannot happen in America, where on Earth can it happen?

Dr. Margaret Sovie, Nursing

Dr. Margaret D. Sovie, the Jane Delano Professor of Administration at the School of Nursing, died on August 16 of pulmonary fibrosis at the age of 69.

Dr. Sovie was a nationally known authority in the field of nursing administration. She graduated from the St. Lawrence State Hospital School of Nursing in 1964, and served as a nursing supervisor at the Good Shepherd Hospital and then

as education director for nursing services at Upstate Medical Center, both in Syracuse. After serving as director of nursing at the University of Rochester, Dr. Sovie became chief nursing officer at HUP in 1988, a position she held until 1996. From 1996 until her death she was the Jane Delano Professor of Nursing Administration and was a nurse practitioner at Penn's health annex at Myer Recreation Center. Dr. Sovie was



Margaret Sovie

a member of the Institute of Medicine.

"Dr. Sovie was a fearless researcher. She meticulously gathered and analyzed data to advance the science, providing information to help nurses and hospitals do a better job caring for patients. Never straying far from the care of the patient, Dr. Sovie provided direct patient care herself while maintaining a research agenda," said Dr. Afaf I. Meleis, dean of the School of Nursing.

Dr. Sovie is survived by her husband of 48 years, Alfred; brothers William, Maurice and Timothy Doe; sisters Patricia Frye and Mickey Snye. Memorial donations may be made to the Nursing School Memorial Scholarship Fund, School of Nursing, Development Office, 420 Guardian Drive, Philadelphia, PA 19104.

Speaking Out

On Biomed Communications

I just learned that the School of Medicine has closed my former department, Biomedical Communications. After spending 36 years as director, and building an excellent department of photographers, illustrators and computer graphic artists, with a reputation of excellence, I am truly dismayed at the Medical Schools decision to close an integral service to not only the Medical Center, but to the University as well.

Biomedical Communications was a self-supporting department and never received proper support for growth from the Medical School administration. It was always a challenge to create more space within the confines of the original limited space in the MedLibrary. There were many promises to expand, to allow us to increase services and equipment, but promises were cheap and nothing was ever done. I guess that I retired at the proper time in July 1999. It is truly a shame.

— Art Siegel, former Director of Biomedical Communications

Privacy on Auction Block

I'm mighty irked to read the Executive Director's, Human Resources, glib pontifications. Leny Bader maintains, 'the protection of personal privacy is an important priority at Penn. This message has been clearly conveyed to all our vendors...'

If Human Resources didn't allow anyone with a buck and a hustle to shop the employment records looking for fresh meat, vendors selling names to more vendors selling names to still more vendors wouldn't have those names in the first place, hence no letters to Speaking Out howling with outrage.

I pitched a royal fit when Friends of the Library—recipient of 10% of my take-home—shared my particulars. 'Oh,' soothed the spin-doctors, 'we don't sell names, we exchange donor-lists'. What a nifty little game of fish that must be: "We'll swap four hundred of our suckers for four hundred of yours."

Do let's keep in mind your name and my Social Security number were melded, creating 'ghosts'. Then HUP billed Medicare for hospitalization given these non-existing patients. We are employed by an ethical Brigadoon. The University we serve with

loyalty and love has placed our privacy on the auction-block.

And if ya think that accusation a mite too harsh, how about the latest vendor mailing using University personnel: a shameless pitch ending with this escape clause—*P.S. The University of Pennsylvania does not endorse Answer Financial, any particular product offered, or any available product provider. Nor do we supplement any purchases you may make through them*—all under the aegis of the University crest, 'Human Resources' bold as brass nails as if we've just been handed an official message from an employer expected to be above-board.

The Division of Human Resources has been entrusted with confidential information. That information has now blown across the continental landmass, all the way to Encino, California.

With our Faculty/Staff Telephone Directory printed outside the United States, home address floating around loose and who-knows-where before arriving on-campus by mid-October, who can say for sure what 'increasingly sensitive pieces of personal data' really are off-limits?

— Jerry Briggs, Van Pelt Library

Pricy Prescriptions at Pharmacies

We agree with Professor McDevitt's point about the use of social security numbers on our Caremark prescription cards (*Almanac* Vol. 49, No. 1). It is an "unacceptable misuse of our identity information". We were both very disturbed when we received our prescription cards in the mail with our social security numbers available to anyone other than us who opened our mail or working the counter at the pharmacy. We wonder how such an oversight on the part of Caremark is excusable. In our opinion, no apology is enough for the misuse of sensitive information such as one's social security number.

In addition, our recent visit to the pharmacy was a surprise in itself! In the month of June, a prescription refill cost \$0.93. One month later, the month of July, that same refill now costs \$5 for a generic drug no less. This astronomical increase is incomprehensible and quite frankly infuriating. How is it that an institution such as the University of Pennsylvania continues to do business with a company whose prescription drug plan increased by 400% in one month? In addition, these price increases are made on prescriptions needed for life-preserving reasons.

How can a prescription plan justify charging a young person more than \$70 for a few vials of insulin? Imagine the surprise when, the other day, a purchase of a drug that is needed literally to save someone's life, quadrupled in price! Not only are we paying more for our prescriptions but we are also paying more for our health care coverage. How can this outrageous price inflation be justified?

— Sharon D'Hurieux, Law Development
— Tricia Owen, Alumni Relations

Response from HR

We have already addressed the first part of the letter from Sharon D'Hurieux and Tricia Owen, in the *Almanac* issue of July 16, 2002. This is a response to the second part of this letter.

Because of the tremendous increase in the prices of prescription drugs, the University—like other organizations—has taken steps to maintain the fiscal viability of our plan and at the same time offer a market competitive benefit. The increase referred to in the letter resulted from the changes in our plan effective July 1, 2002 so that brands without generics now have an employee's co-insurance of 30% at retail. If purchased by mail order, the co-insurance will be 10%. Furthermore, there is now a minimum of \$5 for generics and \$15 for brands bought at retail. This accounts for the increase from \$0.93 to \$5 mentioned in the letter. These minimums are lower with mail order purchases.

Even with these changes, benchmarking data show that Penn's plan is more generous than most employers' plans because it provides out-of-pocket limits which protect our employees from substantial expenses. In addition, mail orders now count towards these out-of-pocket limits. The University continues to pay a substantial portion of the costs of prescriptions, and this can be illustrated by requesting the full prices of these drugs from the pharmacists.

Instructions on how to order by mail as well as information on the drugs and their cost can be obtained by accessing Caremark's website at www.rxrequest.com or calling 1-800-378-0802.

— Leny Bader, Executive Director, Human Resources, Benefits

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.

On October 16, 2001, a statement was published in *Almanac* (<http://www.upenn.edu/almanac/v48/n08/OR-HumanSubj.html>) setting down guidelines for Institutional Review Board (IRB) review of research in the social and behavioral sciences. As promised in that statement, we commissioned a Working Group “to propose guidelines for the ethical use of human subjects in sociobehavioral research at the University of Pennsylvania”. The Working Group has now submitted their report titled “Report of the Working Group on Human Subjects Research in the Sociobehavioral Sciences” which is published below. The report contains a number of recommendations; we shall be reviewing them and undertaking to implement many of them in the course of the next year. Comments on the report may be sent via e-mail by *September 24, 2002* to nathansn@mail.med.upenn.edu

— Neal Nathanson, Vice Provost for Research
— Mitchell Marcus, Chair, Faculty Senate

Report of the Working Group on Human Subjects Research in the SocioBehavioral Sciences

May 2002

Current University policies, based on agreements with the Federal government, require that all research involving human subjects be subject to review by our Institutional Review Board [IRB] system. Under the Federal government’s regulations at 45 CFR 46, research is defined as “a systematic investigation including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge.”

The requirement for IRB review extends to research conducted by faculty, staff, research fellows, and students, whether funded or unfunded. While researchers in bio-medical and behavioral sciences have long been accustomed to human subjects review procedures, many social and behavioral researchers have not previously been aware of, nor held to these formal requirements.

In response to the questions of policy and implementation raised by the application of human subjects review procedures to the sociobehavioral sciences, in Fall 2001 the Vice Provost for Research and the Chair of the Faculty Senate appointed a Working Group comprised of University faculty drawn from several different schools and departments who represent the variety of social and behavioral disciplines across the University. The Working Group was charged to consider principles that guide the ethical conduct of behavioral and social science research on human subjects, and to offer recommendations for improvements in the human subjects review policies and practices at the University.

Foremost in our discussions was the recognition that compliance with University and federal rules requires the efficient processing of reviews. The University can not expect researchers to cooperate with the review system if it can not perform in a timely and appropriate manner. Efforts in this direction are ongoing, and have already resulted in the establishment of an IRB devoted to social and behavioral research. In addition, the IRB has developed a streamlined procedure for processing and approving exempt research. A new form for requesting exemption of a research project has been posted to the Office of Regulatory Affairs (ORA) web site along with a diagram of what constitutes an exempt study. Still, further steps need to be taken if the process of applying for and receiving IRB approval is to be truly efficient.

Equally important, we believe that the community of sociobehavioral researchers at the University and throughout the country are at the early stages of a fundamental shift in our approach to human subjects research. Many of us were educated and began our research careers at a time when these issues were neither explicitly addressed nor formally imposed on our professional practices. We must take steps to incorporate the evolving principles of ethical research practice in our teaching and our research. Over time, as future cohorts of researchers are trained to incorporate these principles and procedures into their practices the role of the IRB system will become both more widely understood and less burdensome on researchers and on IRB members.

As the Working Group proceeded to consider various domains of sociobehavioral research several themes emerged that led to a set of analyses and recommendations. Chief among these are an emphasis on the importance of instituting educational efforts that would bring current as well as future researchers into fuller awareness of the issues surrounding the ethical use of human subjects in sociobehavioral research. As will be explicated below, we are in favor of the development and implementation of web-based tutorial and certification systems analogous to those now mandated by the Federal government for researchers funded by NIH

in the biomedical sciences.

A second primary focus of our deliberations was the question of where the line should be drawn between research that should and research that should not be subject to IRB review, even under the “exempt from full review” criterion [usually, if somewhat misleadingly, referred to as “exempt research”]. As we shall discuss below, *we believe that it is important both for efficiency and for the credibility of the review system that we define an appropriate threshold below which research need not be submitted even under the exempt category. At the same time, we need to reaffirm the legally mandated requirement that all research involving human subjects that rises above this threshold be submitted for IRB review, if only under the exempt category.* Here, too, we would emphasize that such recommendations become more compelling and persuasive when coupled with the implementation of appropriate tutorial and certification systems to insure that they are properly understood and followed.

I. Education and Certification

While human subject protection issues may not be as prominent in the sociobehavioral sciences as they are in the medical sciences, there is increasing pressure from inside and outside the University for sociobehavioral scientists to address these issues explicitly in their research. This involves a need for a change of culture in the way investigators in a variety of sociobehavioral fields typically engage in research with human beings. Most notably, sociobehavioral scientists may have to submit their research for IRB approval, which involves a layer of review previously not imposed on many of them. To help investigators embrace the increased emphasis on human subject issues, the University should make available the tools to educate its faculty, students and other personnel involved in research activities. In addition, the University has a responsibility to monitor and document that its investigators are properly educated in the ethical conduct of human subjects research. The following recommendations pertain to these new responsibilities faced by the University.

Recommendations:

1. Education for human subject protection: We recommend that the University develop educational tools for helping personnel become familiar with the issues of human subject protection, in particular as they pertain to the sociobehavioral sciences.

2. Minimal education requirement [certification]: We recommend that the University institute a requirement that *all personnel (faculty, research fellows, students, and staff) engaging in research have documented education regarding human subject protection.* At the minimum, such education should involve an explanation and illustration of when it is appropriate for investigators to decide that their research does *not* require IRB review, even at the exempt level. We also recommend that newly recruited faculty be required to have documented education in the University’s human subject protection regulations as part of their appointment process.

3. Monitoring and documentation: We recommend that the University set up a system to monitor and document its personnel’s education with regard to the protection of human subjects and the ethical conduct of research involving humans.

(continued past insert)

Suggestions for Implementation at the University

A. Develop a web-based tutorial for educating sociobehavioral researchers about the ethical conduct of research involving human subjects. This tutorial should have a generic component as well as parts specific to different fields within the sociobehavioral sciences [e.g. survey research, ethnographic research, experimental research, etc.]. This tutorial should have a specific component dealing with debriefing of experimental subjects.

B. Develop an electronic IRB protocol submission system that guides sociobehavioral researchers through all issues potentially pertaining to their research while they are preparing the protocol submission. This could be accomplished by (a) tailoring the submission system for specific branches of sociobehavioral research, (b) linking the submission procedure to the web-based tutorial referred to under suggestion A, and (c) providing a web page on the ORA website with regularly updated links to professional societies' web pages about (field-specific) human subject protection and ethical conduct of research issues.

C. Spin off a new working group that will collaborate with the PennERA development group to implement suggestion B.

D. Produce a brochure highlighting the present working group's recommendations that the University decides to implement. This brochure should be distributed broadly across the University and include the Schools of Medicine and Nursing, since some of the recommendations may affect these Schools as well.

E. Provide personnel with certification of completed components of education in human subject protection, ethical conduct of research, and/or IRB regulations.

F. Encourage faculty and other personnel to become members of the IRB. This would have several benefits: personnel become more intimately familiar with the issues of human subjects research, and the University may improve its ability to promptly review submitted research protocols. Such service to the University should be rewarded appropriately. The Provost and the deans of research intensive schools should articulate their strong support for IRB service by faculty members. Service on the IRB should be counted favorably and explicitly towards evaluation for tenure and/or promotion. In certain circumstances IRB service might be grounds for a course-release.

G. Provide additional training for IRB staff regarding human subject protection in the sociobehavioral sciences. This training should also focus on efficient and efficacious review procedures that will benefit both the IRB and the investigators in terms of turn-around time, required effort and validity of protocol reviews.

II. Survey Research

Survey research typically raises few concerns with respect to human subjects. In its simplest form, sampled subjects are approached for their responses to batteries of items. Forms of approach—interviewing—may be face-to-face or over the telephone; or questionnaires may be self-administered, as through the mail or via the Internet. Recording of responses may be by means of “pen-and-pencil,” by tape recording, or with the assistance of a computer. After the data collection process, the researcher will analyze these data by statistical methods, ranging from tabulation to the application of generalized linear models.

In common practice settings, the costs of participation to respondents are generally low in an absolute sense: a small amount of subjects' time only. Benefits to participation variously include financial remuneration, access to study results, and/or the opportunity to express opinions. In Institutional Review Board (IRB) terms, risks are generally minimal, and benefits generally outweigh the risks. Risks to participation are those attendant to the release of information garnered by the survey that may embarrass or otherwise harm the human subjects, especially if individuals can be identified from the reported study results. These risks can often be mitigated by following standard research practices and professional ethics published by the professional society of the discipline at hand. Evolving practices and technologies within survey research can complicate the assessment and mitigation of costs and risks to participants. These include panel studies, in which respondents are contacted on repeated occasions; and record linkages, e.g., of survey data to administrative records.

Recommendations:

4. IRB review in exemption category: We recommend that, by default, survey research be considered exempt from IRB review if protection of the confidentiality of research subjects is adequately demonstrated (which does not necessarily involve submitting the survey instrument to the IRB). In addition, all other applicable criteria for exemption

of IRB review must be fulfilled (e.g., the research must not involve vulnerable populations). This recommendation is consistent with the already existing regulation CFR 46.101.b (1–4), but we wish to make it explicit that submitting the survey instrument should not be necessary.

5. Waiver of written consent: We recommend that human subjects responding to a survey be considered to have given informed consent if the research is exempt from IRB review. In addition, in order to qualify for a default waiver of written consent, a research protocol must have been presented to the IRB showing that (a) the human subjects will be informed of all applicable elements of consent prior to responding to the survey; and (b) all the criteria for exemption of IRB review are fulfilled. Here, too, this recommendation is already covered by existing regulation CFR 46.116, but what is new is the ‘default’ aspect of the waiver of written consent. Investigators presenting a protocol for review in the exemption category and requesting a default waiver of consent without providing the survey instrument, must have documented training in the issues concerning human subjects protection in survey research.

The criteria for exemption from IRB review can be found on the application for exempt status form available on the website of the Office of Regulatory Affairs of the University of Pennsylvania. The criteria for a waiver of written consent can be found in the Standard Operating Procedures of the IRB of the University of Pennsylvania.

III. Secondary Data Analysis

The end of the archetypal research study is often not the end of the analysis of the data collected by the study. They may live on in the form of *secondary data analysis*. It is important to distinguish the secondary analysis of data from the practice of primary research. The practice of secondary data analysis typically raises no human subjects protection concerns and is properly considered to be *below the standard for IRB review*. In the following, the secondary analysis of data is understood to have the following characteristics: (1) no manipulation of human subjects; (2) no new data collection; and (3) no identification of research subjects. This last point follows from the practice of the initial investigator (whether another investigator or the same person as conducting the secondary analysis), who in releasing the data is presumed to have stripped identifiers so that the confidentiality of the subjects is assured.

In some secondary data files, it is not possible to assure confidentiality, and these data files are typically distributed with the explicit understanding that other researchers must abide by certain rules to maintain confidentiality. Such circumstances should continue to trigger IRB review. In these instances investigators should demonstrate to the IRB that their secondary data are free of subject identifiers or other features that raise the possibility of identification of human subjects, in order to obtain exempt status. If this cannot be demonstrated, then investigators should seek IRB approval for the secondary analysis of the data, through expedited or full-board review procedures.

Recommendations:

6. No IRB review required: We recommend adoption of National Human Research Protections Advisory Committee [NHRPAC, 2001] recommendation 1. Specifically, we recommend that research on a public use data file, that is, “non-identifiable data in a publicly available file” not be considered human subjects research, and therefore not be “under the purview of IRBs” [NHRPAC, 2001]. In addition, we recommend the inclusion of non-confidential public records in the definition of a “public use data file” regardless of whether the data in these non-confidential public records are identifiable. Implementation of this recommendation would require that the investigator is certified as per Recommendation 2.

7. IRB review in exemption category: We recommend adoption of NHRPAC, 2001 recommendation 6. Specifically, we recommend that research on a non-public use data file, that is, non-identifiable data in a non-publicly available or proprietary file be exempt from IRB review, unless vulnerable populations are involved. Investigators planning to study non-public use data files must demonstrate to the IRB that confidentiality of research subjects is protected, either by direct evidence or by showing that the data supplier already received IRB approval in which non-identifiability was considered and confirmed (which does not necessarily involve submitting the survey instrument or the original consent forms to the IRB).

NHRPAC, 2001; Draft Recommendations Regarding Public Use Data Files, July 2001, NHRPAC Social and Behavioral Science Working Group; <http://www.asanet.org/public/humanresearch/datafiles.html>.

(continued on next page)

Suggestions for Implementation at the University

H. Develop an application form for exemption from IRB review specific for survey research and secondary analysis of non-public use data files.

I. Provide guidelines to investigators about when and how to apply for a Certificate of Confidentiality.

IV. Evolving Research

In a broad class of research in the sociobehavioral sciences, the questions posed evolve in the course of investigation. This is the case, for instance, in ethnography, where research questions may only be clarified after a period of observation and where current findings drive the next steps in the study in an evolving manner. Typically, this class of research involves observation of human behavior in the field, with or without active participation by the investigator. While such studies may be common in the sociobehavioral sciences, they do not fit the stereotypical mold of the hypothesis-driven, fixed-protocol research that is central to existing regulations designed for the protection of human participants. For evolving research, such as ethnographic research, oral history, and focus groups, among others, guidelines for when to seek IRB review, and how to make the IRB review process efficient, can be given within the framework of existing regulations. The following recommendations are made for clarification of the roles of investigators and the IRB in the process of human subjects protection as it relates to evolving research.

Recommendations:

8. No IRB review required: We recommend that research involving only *non-interventionist* observations of *publicly* occurring behavior, for which no identifying information is included in the study records, be considered *not* to require review by the IRB. By default, this form of research does not pose risk to human subjects, making it unnecessary to have the IRB approve it, even under the exempt category. *We also recommend that the definition of publicly occurring behavior be understood to include publicly accessible parts of the Internet.*

9. Evolving research certification: Consistent with Recommendation 2, we recommend that a program be established whereby investigators can become certified to conduct ethically sound evolving research. Investigators should be allowed to use their certification as a reference for describing evolving research studies to the IRB. This should serve to eliminate the need to have investigators spell out the details of a dynamic study protocol. The IRB can be assured that the research will be conducted in ethically appropriate fashion, with full protection of the human subjects, when investigators state that research will be conducted within the confines of the ethical framework laid out in the certification program. It should be noted that different investigations by the same investigator(s) must be submitted to the IRB as separate research protocols, and cannot be seen as part of a single study evolving from one investigation into another.

V. Exploratory Research

As part of their professional activities, investigators typically engage in exploratory research on a regular basis. Such research involves conceiving or refining a research question through harmless observation, casual conservation, browsing existing data, etc. IRB regulations stipulate that “research is a systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge” [Federal Policy CFR 46.102(d)]. This raises the question whether and, if so, when exploratory research falls under the purview of the IRB. The following recommendation is made to clarify the role of the IRB in the review of exploratory research.

Recommendation:

10. IRB review required upon disclosure only: We recommend that *exploratory* research be considered *not* to require review by the IRB, even under the exempt category, if the following conditions are met:

- The exploratory research does not involve any vulnerable populations (e.g., children, prisoners);
- The exploratory research involves no interventions by the investigators;
- The exploratory research participants are not identifiable from the study records;
- The exploratory research data and results are not disclosed or published.

However, such research must be submitted to the IRB for retroactive review if/when the investigator anticipates or decides to disclose the data and/or results, or to submit them for publication—unless IRB review is still not required on other grounds (e.g., Recommendation 8, above). Such retroactive review should have the same procedures as if the study protocol had been submitted as a new study before the onset of the exploratory research. If the IRB does not give approval, and appeal of the IRB’s

decision does not change this, then the data and results cannot be disclosed in any form. If the investigator decides to begin a systematic investigation on the basis of exploratory research for which no IRB review was required, then a study protocol must be submitted for IRB review as per existing rules and regulations (unless IRB review is not required on other grounds). Investigators are advised not to wait until the last possible moment to seek IRB approval for their exploratory research.

Suggestions for Implementation at the University

J. Develop a web-based tutorial for educating field researchers about the ethical conduct of research involving human subjects.

K. Develop a web-based course to implement the certification program referred to in Recommendation 2 above.

L. Encourage course directors of courses on research methods or similar topics to help prepare students for taking the web-based course referred to in suggestion K above.

M. Educate the Office of Regulatory Affairs staff about what information to expect from the investigators of field research studies and how to apply the exempt and expedited categories of review to these studies.

N. Empower the IRB to give retroactive approval of exploratory research that has reached the threshold of systematic investigation where IRB review becomes necessary.

VI. Debriefing of Human Subjects

A frequently used technique in experimental sociobehavioral research and other fields of inquiry is the temporary manipulation of individuals’ behavioral or perceptual states to measure or demonstrate a specific behavior, attitude or way of thinking. Often these manipulations involve deceiving experimental subjects about the purpose of the experiment, or about some trait or state of the subjects themselves (e.g., giving them false feedback about their performance). In other cases subjects might be exposed to messages intended to alter their beliefs or attitudes. In the typical instance, at the end of the experiment the true purpose of the research is revealed (e.g., subjects are informed of any deception about the purpose of the experiment, about their abilities or traits, or about the impact of the messages they were exposed to, etc.). It is generally assumed that subjects’ temporary states are undone by means of such debriefing. While many research studies involve some kind of debriefing, little attention is commonly paid to whether or not the debriefing procedures accomplish the intended purpose (i.e., to undo the experimentally induced state). Yet, this issue may have important implications for human subject protection.

If debriefing is an issue, then presumably some part of the consent procedure was omitted (e.g., subjects were not told every aspect of the study, or they were purposely deceived about some aspects of the study). This requires a waiver of aspects of informed consent, which automatically triggers heightened awareness among IRB reviewers. Nevertheless, the discussion then often deals with whether or not that waiver is appropriate; it does not generally focus on the effectiveness of the debriefing procedure. Thus, heightened awareness of the debriefing issue may help to improve the ethical conduct of research on human beings. In some cases, particularly when a manipulation may lead to negative effects, it might be appropriate to require researchers to conduct follow-up investigations to assure that debriefing efforts have been successful.

Recommendation:

11. Review of debriefing: We recommend that specific attention be paid to the debriefing of subjects during the IRB review of experimental protocols. We also recommend that investigators be asked to address this issue specifically in their submitted study protocols and, particularly in the case of manipulations that may cause negative effects, to describe if and how the effectiveness of the debriefing methods they propose to use will be assessed.

*Working Group on Human Subjects Research
in the Sociobehavioral Sciences*

Jeffrey Draine, Social Work
Martha Farah, Psychology
Melanie Green, Psychology
Larry Gross, Communications, *Co-Chair*
Kathleen Hall, Education
Mark Liberman, Linguistics
Deborah McGuire, Nursing
Mark Pauly, Health Care Systems
Pamela Sankar, Bioethics
Herb Smith, Sociology
Greg Urban, Anthropology
Hans Van Dongen, Psychiatry, *Co-Chair*
Susan Watkins, Sociology

OF RECORD

Procedures for the Establishment, Merger and Closing of Departments, Divisions & Similar Entities within Schools

The proposed revision to the Statutes of the Trustees and *The Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators*, Section II.E.14, "Procedures for the Establishment, Merger and Closing of Departments, Divisions and Similar Entities within Schools" published For Comment on April 30, 2002 was approved without comment, accepted Of Record, and became effective July 1, 2002.

— Barbara Lowery, Associate Provost

Policy on the Use of *upenn.edu* Domain Name Space

The Network Policy Committee, IT Roundtable, and the Vice Provost for ISC wish to call your attention to a recently approved computing policy. This policy specifies the naming requirements for domains within the *upenn.edu* domain name space. A structured approach to domain naming conventions will result in less ambiguity and will reduce duplicate requests and/or contention for domain names. The policy also provides links to documents that make the process of requesting changes easier to understand and more consistent with the local policies of School and Center computing.

The full policy text can be found online at <http://www.isc-net.upenn.edu/policy/approved/20011108-upennomain.html>.

— Information Systems and Computing, Networking and Telecommunications

OF RECORD

The following policy, effective July 2000, supercedes Policy # 004, dated October 1, 1973. For more information visit www.upenn.edu/affirm-action/.

The Policy of Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action and Nondiscrimination

The University of Pennsylvania's special character is reflected in the diversity of the Penn community. Men and women of different races, religions, nationalities and backgrounds are necessary to achieve the University's ultimate purpose: the improvement of the human condition through the pursuit of learning and the generation of knowledge. Diversity is prized at Penn because it helps to create the educational environment that best prepares students to contribute to an increasingly diverse and rapidly shrinking world. We must continue, therefore, to seek talented faculty, students and staff who will help constitute a community at Penn that is diverse in race, ethnicity, interests and perspectives.

The foundation for achieving, valuing, and managing diversity at Penn is equal opportunity. We have a clear commitment to equal opportunity, non-discrimination, and affirmative action. This policy re-affirms our commitment in this regard. This policy of equal opportunity, affirmative action, and non-discrimination is fundamental to the effective functioning of the University as an institution of teaching, scholarship, and public service.

Penn adheres to a policy that prohibits discrimination against individuals on the following protected-class bases: race, color, sex (except where sex is a bona fide occupational qualification), sexual orientation, religion, creed, national or ethnic origin, age (except where age is a bona fide occupational qualification), disability (and those associated with persons with disabilities), or status as a special disabled, Vietnam era veteran or other eligible veteran.

Our task is to eliminate any patterns of prohibited unequal treatment from a community that prizes diversity. We must monitor our policies, procedures, and practices for equal opportunity and access to the services, programs, and opportunities our community has to offer individuals.

Penn is committed to ensuring that all academic programs (except where age or sex are bona fide occupational qualifications), including social and recreational programs, and services are administered without regard to an individual's protected-class status.

Penn is also committed to ensuring that its personnel and other employment decisions are made without regard to an individual's protected-class status. Personnel and other employment decisions include, but may not be limited to, outreach and recruitment, application, selection, promotion and other transfers, compensation, benefits administration, layoffs and other personnel transitions, University sponsored training and educational programs, and tuition assistance.

Penn is dedicated to an organizational strategy that supports the full realization of equal employment opportunity for all through affirmative action predicated on the following tenets:

—Judith Rodin, President

This policy is available in alternate format upon request.

From the Office of the Vice Provost for Research

Funding Opportunities for Research

Researchers are often interested in learning about funding opportunities for support of their research programs. The Office of the Vice Provost for Research's website (www.upenn.edu/research/funding) provides access to a service that is available to individual Penn researchers, under a University-wide subscription from the provider, Info-Ed. This service consists of three parts: SPIN, GENIUS, and SMARTS.

- SPIN permits the researcher to search for program announcements in an area of her/his interest.

- GENIUS permits the researcher to enter a brief professional profile, including a list of keywords that identify program announcements of interest to that researcher.

- Under this program, the researcher can request regular downloads of announcements that will be sent as an e-mail, under the rubric of SMARTS.

Since Info-Ed accesses >2,800 different sponsors, including Federal, State, and private not for profit funding sources, a wide variety of opportunities are available. Users can take advantage of any or all three of the services offered according to their individual preferences. Directions are provided on the website. Questions should be addressed to Josie Rook, Assistant Vice Provost for Research, at rookj@pobox, or (215) 898-7236.

1. Serious and imaginative outreach, recruitment, and advertising methods.
2. Periodic reviews of the personnel and other employment decisions made by hiring officers.
3. Thorough analysis of Penn's faculty and staff workforce composition to determine areas of underutilization for which concentrated or special effort is due.
4. Provision of professional and management development opportunities for faculty and staff that builds skills and knowledge around equal opportunity, as well as valuing and effectively managing Penn's diverse work environments.
5. Provision of skill development and enhancement opportunities for staff.
6. Provision of technical assistance on the implementation of this policy, as needed, to schools, departments, and centers.

As a federal contractor, Penn has a written Affirmative Action Plan to address the utilization of women and minorities and to address the inclusion of persons with disabilities, special disabled and Vietnam era veterans in Penn's workforce.

This policy also recognizes an individual's right to raise and pursue concerns of alleged discrimination to a University resource office or to an appropriate individual within a school, department, or center without adverse action or retaliation for doing so. The Affirmative Action Plan describes the University resources available to faculty, staff, students, and applicants for employment or admission to Penn who believe they have been discriminated against on the basis of their protected-class status.

Penn's non-discrimination and affirmative action policies and programs are developed, administered, and monitored centrally through the Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity Programs in collaboration with the Division of Human Resources and the Office of the Associate Provost. The Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity Programs is located organizationally within the Office of the President. Questions and concerns regarding these policies and programs, as well as requests for educational programs on affirmative action, equal opportunity, and nondiscrimination, should be directed to the Executive Director, Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity Programs, Sansom Place East, Suite 228, 3600 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6106, (215) 898-6993 (Voice) or (215) 898-7803 (TIDID).

This policy covers faculty and staff, matriculated students, applicants for faculty and staff employment, and applicants to Penn's academic programs and other activities.

—Robert Barchi, Provost

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 22-24
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 1-14
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 16-23 (Thu-Thu)
Fall Semester Ends Friday	December 20	December 19	December 23 (Thursday)
Spring	2003 Spring Term	2004 Spring Term	2005 Spring Term
Spring Semester classes begin Monday	January 13	January 12	January 10
Martin Luther King, Jr. Day (observed; no classes) Monday	January 20	January 19	January 17
Add Period Ends Friday	January 24	January 23	January 21
Drop Period Ends Friday	February 14	February 13	February 11
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.

Admissions Seminars for Penn Faculty/Staff Families

College-bound teenagers and their parents often can be overwhelmed by the choices and requirements of college admissions. What courses are important to take in high school? How significant are extracurricular activities, essays, test scores, and interviews?

The answers are right here on campus and available to Penn employees and their families, whether their students plan to apply to Penn or elsewhere.

The Undergraduate Admissions Office will host two seminars this week for Penn families whose teenagers are beginning the college search process. One session will be held at 5:15 p.m. on Tuesday, September 3, in the Ben Franklin Room of Houston Hall; it will be repeated on Thursday, September 5, also at 5:15 p.m., in the Terrace Room in Logan Hall.

The sessions will focus on the college selection process for large and small, public and private colleges. Admissions officers will discuss what it takes to gain admission to a competitive college, how to get the most out of a campus visit, and other issues such as financial aid.

The seminars are free, and the office requests participants to RSVP to (215) 898-7126, or seminars@admissions.ugao.upenn.edu.

—Gwynne Lynch, Regional Director of Admissions DC, MD, VA, and Chester and Delaware Counties, PA

OF RECORD

This year Rosh Hashanah will be observed on Saturday, September 7 and Sunday, September 8. Please remember that Jewish holidays begin at sunset on the day preceding the date given; thus the observance of Rosh Hashanah will begin at sundown, Friday, September 6. Yom Kippur is on Monday, September 16. Observance will begin at sundown on Sunday, September 15.

Reminder: Policy on Secular and Religious Holidays

Effective July 1, 1996; Revised March 30, 2001

1. The University recognizes/observes the following secular holidays: Martin Luther King Day, Memorial Day, July 4, Thanksgiving and the day after, Labor Day, and New Year's Day.

2. The University also recognizes that there are several religious holidays that affect large numbers of University community members, including Christmas, Rosh Hashanah, Yom Kippur, the first two days of Passover, and Good Friday. In consideration of their significance for many students, no examinations may be given and no assigned work may be required on these days. Students who observe these holidays will be given an opportunity to make up missed work in both laboratories and lecture courses. If an examination is given on the first class day after one of these holidays, it must not cover material introduced in class on that holiday.

Faculty should realize that Jewish holidays begin at sundown on the evening before the published date of the holiday. Late afternoon exams should be avoided on these days. Also, no examinations may be held on Saturday or Sunday in the undergraduate schools unless they are also available on other days. Nor should seminars or other regular classes be scheduled on Saturdays or Sundays unless they are also available at other times.

3. The University recognizes that there are other holidays, both religious and secular, which are of importance to some individuals and groups on campus. Such occasions include, but are not limited to, Sukkot, the last two days of Passover, Shavuot, Shemini Atzeret, and Simchat Torah, as well as Chinese New Year, the Muslim New Year, and the Islamic holidays Eid Al-Fitr and Eid Al-Adha. Students who wish to observe such holidays must inform their instructors within the first two weeks of each semester of their intent to observe the holiday even when the exact date of the holiday will not be known until later so that alternative arrangements convenient to both students and faculty can be made at the earliest opportunity. Students who make such arrangements will not be required to attend classes or take examinations on the designated days, and faculty must provide reasonable opportunities for such students to make up missed work and examinations. For this reason it is desirable that faculty inform students of all examination dates at the start of each semester. Exceptions to the requirement of a make-up examination must be approved in advance by the undergraduate dean of the school in which the course is offered.

—Robert Barchi, Provost

Penn Express Modem Pool Discontinued on 6/30/02

The Express Modem Pool was discontinued as planned on June 30, 2002. The termination plans were first announced two years ago, when the regular modem pool was discontinued and users were directed to commercial ISP services for remote access to PennNet and the Internet. The Express Pool was used as a transitional service for the convenience of the Penn community, but employed aging technology that did not provide the data transfer speeds that ISPs offer and that are required to take advantage of many of Penn's online services.

Those who had been using the Express Modem Pool as their primary ISP can learn about alternatives at the remote access web page at www.upenn.edu/computing/remote. The web site provides information on whom to contact with questions about the policy and how to get assistance making the transition. A useful chart comparing service options and prices is available at www.upenn.edu/computing/remote/help_chart.html.

The University of Pennsylvania Police Department Community Crime Report

About the Crime Report: *Almanac* normally publishes all Crimes Against Persons and Crimes Against Society from the campus report in each week's issue. Also reported are **Crimes Against Property** with full reports on the Web. For the most recent week's crimes (August 19 to August 25) see www.upenn.edu/almanac/crimes-ABI.html. Prior summer 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. 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.

18th District Report

For the report of incidents and arrests which were reported between **August 19 to August 25, 2002** by the 18th District—covering the Schuylkill River to 49th St. & Market St. to Woodland Ave—see www.upenn.edu/almanac/crimes-ABI.html

CLASSIFIEDS—UNIVERSITY

RESEARCH

The Neuropsychiatry Program at the University of Pennsylvania is looking for individuals with **schizophrenia** and/or their family members for brain-behavior and genetic research. If interested, please call (215) 662-7388.

Troubled by Overeating at Nighttime? Do you get up at night to eat? The University of Pennsylvania's Weight and Eating Disorders Program is conducting a research study of the Night Eating Syndrome. Study participants will receive assessment and treatment. To be eligible you must be 18-65 years old, be overweight, not have an occupation requiring nightshift work, and not be currently in a weight reduction program. For more information, call (215) 898-2823 or log on to www.uphs.upenn.edu/weight.

Postmenopausal Women Needed

Postmenopausal volunteers needed for a research study examining estrogen use, memory, and the ability to smell. \$50 will be given for approximately 3 hours of participation. Women 55 or older. For more information please call (215) 662-6580.

Almanac is not responsible for contents of classified ad material.

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

CLASSIFIEDS—PERSONAL

FOR RENT

Furnished studio apartment to rent in Society Hill area. All utilities included. Immediate occupancy. Contact (215) 413-3601.

Furnished house, couple going on Fulbright, avail. Oct. 1. Built 1803, 3 bdrms, sep. living, dining & sitting rooms, study, 2 1/2 baths, garden, fireplace, a/c, dw, w/d, \$2300 mo. + util. 10 min. W. Phil. #40 bus. 9-12 mos. lease, call (215) 923-7789.

AVAILABLE

Writer, publishing credits include Pearson Education, SAP America, Wharton Alumni magazine. Available for writing projects, research, proofreading and profiles. sheryl.simons@wharton.upenn.edu

Almanac is not responsible for contents of classified ad material.



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 Natalie Stevens
STUDENT ASSISTANTS Chris McFall, William Yeoh
WPHS INTERN Jamar Benyard

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, PPSA; 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).

Home on the Web

Almanac is available on the web at www.upenn.edu/almanac/. Pictured at right is *Almanac*'s homepage and an explanation of what is available online from our website.

- 1 Search for *Almanac* articles from back issues since July 1995. Use quotation marks around a phrase to narrow the search: "summer camps" yields 11 documents as compared to 853 documents for summer camps.
- 2 Go to the University of Pennsylvania's home page.
- 3 Get latest *Almanac* issue.
- 4 Get latest AT PENN Calendar.
- 5 *Almanac Between Issues* —Archive of breaking news items that didn't happen in time for publication.
- 6 Archive—issues and calendars both in HTML and PDF format from July 1995 to the present, and select items before 1995.
- 7 Submission guidelines and deadlines for the issue, the calendar, Speaking Out letters, and subscription info.
- 8 The time and current temperature in Philadelphia. Click on weather logo to get weather information for other cities.
- 9 Links to some of the most wanted items from prior issues including: Academic Calendar, Crime Reports, Emergency Closings, Recognized Holidays, and Salary Guidelines.
- 10 *Express Almanac*: Subscribe to receive an e-mail message with links to Breaking News, the latest issue of *Almanac* or the AT PENN Calendar.
- 11 Links to helpful Penn web sites.
- 12 The latest Breaking News is at the top of the page with a link to the whole article
- 13 A cover story from the latest issue with a link to the full story.
- 14 Link to the latest issue's cover stories.
- 15 Print a digital replica in PDF format using free Acrobat Reader.
- 16 Links to more highlights of the latest issue.
- 17 Links to essential Penn specific information including: Business Services, Campus Media, Directories, Facilities Services, Governance, Human Resources, the Library, Mail Services, and Penn Police. There are also links to major, off-campus news web sites including: *Philadelphia Inquirer*, *New York Times*, *Washington Post*, *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *U.S. News & World Report*, and *CNN*. Want to enjoy campus in your spare time? The "Arts & Leisure" section contains links to many of Penn's art galleries, the University Museum, the Morris Arboretum, Penn Presents, as well as Recreation and Athletics.

• Why is this issue of *Almanac* individually addressed?

We do this once a year to notify faculty and staff that Penn's journal of record, opinion and news is back in weekly production; *Almanac* comes out each Tuesday during the academic year, except during breaks.

Normally *Almanac* is distributed in bundles to University buildings, where each department chooses its own system for further distribution. To find out how the system works, try the departmental secretary first, or the head of the school or building mailroom.

If all else fails, mail your label to *Almanac* (see address above), or fax it to us at (215) 898-9137, adding your campus phone number so we can direct you to a source of help.

Almanac is also available online—for easy reference at www.upenn.edu/almanac—add a bookmark in Netscape or add our page to Favorites in Explorer.

• Can't wait to read the latest news?

You can have *Express Almanac* delivered by e-mail; just subscribe to *e-almanac*, at no charge.



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/



Visit *Almanac*'s website at
www.upenn.edu/almanac