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Introduction

The Student Committee on Undergraduate Education believes that a vibrant intellectual community is vital to the University of Pennsylvania. To achieve this central goal, we recommend that the University reflect on its past educational strategies and consider our proposed initiatives as a basis for future planning.

Curriculum is the core of our program. In SCUE's 1985 white paper, the Committee examined Penn's curriculum, as well as other educational options. Five years later, SCUE again evaluates the curriculum and its relationship to honors programs and international study.

SCUE envisions stimulating academic discussion flowing from Penn's classrooms into the University community. We examine the support systems for this academic foundation including orientation to the Penn community, advising, and residential living.

Moreover, we have broadened our perspective, focusing on the dynamic relationship between the knowledge gained from within the classroom and its application to real-life experiences. Specifically, we examine the expansion of learning beyond the classroom setting to encompass the educational prospects afforded by community service and the exploration of Philadelphia.

The "One University" concept in its broadest interpretation underlies all of the sections. Throughout our analysis, we make recommendations that will link the academic programs of the four schools as well as integrate the academic and non-academic facets of
the University. These interconnections will enrich the intellectual experience for undergraduates at the University of Pennsylvania.
Orientation to the Penn Community

The commencement of higher education, like any new experience, requires an extensive orientation which helps the individual adjust to unfamiliar surroundings; this process of introduction and acclimation requires a well-defined orientation program. Such a program is necessary for new students arriving on the Penn campus. University life is different from anything these newcomers have ever experienced. In addition to living on their own, students will encounter an academic and intellectual atmosphere dissimilar to their previous environments. Students will be exposed to rigorous classes without much of the guidance they received in high school. They will be introduced to new concepts and new ideas, as well as people from all walks of life and all parts of the world. Many new students have a limited sphere of previous experience; it is imperative that the University assume the responsibility for the orientation of these students to their new community so that they may maximize the benefits derived from their years at Penn. The Student Committee on Undergraduate Education calls for New Student Orientation to be an integration of both academic and social activities, orienting students to the entire University Experience.

The Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) has compiled a list of essential components for an orientation program. The 1986 document CAS Standards and Guidelines for Student Services/Development Programs delineates the goals of an effective orientation program. Such a program must “aid new students in
their transition to the institution; expose new students to the broad educational opportunities of the institution; and integrate new students into the life of the institution.” In addition, “this process should serve both the student and the institution. The structured entry process aids students in understanding the nature and purpose of the institution and their relationship to the intellectual, social, and cultural climate of the institution”. SCUE believes that these ideas can be appropriately applied to Penn's orientation process.

Students should be able to easily integrate the social and academic aspects of university life without perceiving a separative boundary. There should not be a distinction between social life and intellectual life on campus per se. Since a successful orientation program will shape a student’s outlook of his* undergraduate years, an improvement of the entire orientation process is essential to prepare students for a positive and beneficial Penn experience. If students are presented with a program which emphasizes the importance of academics and the pursuit of knowledge, they will be more aware and accepting of such an ethos during their four years at the University.

Students selected to attend this institution, while intellectually curious, are yet unprepared to fully utilize Penn’s offerings. The orientation process should present the school’s expectations of new students and familiarize them with all of Penn’s options and opportunities. The intellectual atmosphere should be emphasized as readily available and presented as a natural characteristic of life at

* "He" and "his" are not used for gender referral; rather, they are substantive terms referring to the Penn student.
Penn. Students begin college only vaguely aware of the purposes of their undergraduate education; the orientation period is therefore a unique opportunity to help students formulate perceptions, mold expectations, and begin developing personal goals for their Penn years.

The creation of such a program is an ambitious and precarious endeavor. In planning this orientation, a balance must be maintained between socially and academically oriented programs; overprogramming will be counterproductive and must be avoided. Academic programs must not seem contrived but should instead be presented as a natural part of the entire Penn experience; they must be introduced forcefully, yet carefully. Unfortunately, students have not always perceived Penn as having an intensely challenging intellectual environment. Penn's intellectual atmosphere has not yet been fully developed. The University of Pennsylvania has the resources, the faculty, and the caliber of students to create a more intellectual atmosphere, and the goal of orientation should be to assist both the students and the University in meeting their respective potentials.

The Orientation process can be divided into different phases, each of which requires separate attention and a special set of functions and objectives:

I. The Application Process
II. Acceptance to Penn/Pre-frosh Programs
III. Arrival to Campus -- New Student Orientation Begins
IV. Continuation of Orientation Programs
V. The Upperclass Experience

I. The Application Process

Students are introduced to the University of Pennsylvania through materials sent from the Admissions Office. In addition, they learn about University life from students leading campus tours. Prospective students must be given accurate information so that they can first make an informed decision in choosing to enroll at the University and second, experience the "Penn" that is portrayed in the literature. Since a student's perceptions are shaped as early as the application process, there must be a positive correlation between that which Penn claims to offer and that which Penn actually does offer.

Several counter-examples from Admissions Office literature follow:

• "The University's respect for the ability and energy of its students is demonstrated by the options and opportunities available."

In reality, students complain that while Penn offers several "options and opportunities," students are often not aware of them until they are upperclassmen. Many of Penn's special programs require prior knowledge and advance planning. For example, students interested in studying abroad or in pursuing dual degree programs must be able to plan their schedules accordingly.

• "Penn is exceptional among American universities in several important respects... it is philosophically and functionally unified as One University. That means it builds bridges between disciplines....Penn students benefit from a system of education in which the liberal arts and professions enrich and build upon each
other. The interaction between Penn's four undergraduate and twelve graduate schools mirror the diversity of a world that is rapidly becoming interdependent."

Once students arrive, they realize that there are significant barriers preventing Penn from functioning as One University. If the University wishes to maintain the image of "One University", then there must be a greater integration of the entire system and a more comprehensive orientation to each of these opportunities. Penn offers impressive research facilities and interaction with talented faculty, as well as dual degree programs and interdisciplinary majors which permit just about any combination of study. All students must be made aware of these programs and resources during the orientation process so that they may plan to take advantage of all that Penn has to offer.

"Students of the University of Pennsylvania are expected to uphold the highest standards of academic integrity and mutual respect for the diversity of the University community."

Unfortunately, Penn students are unable to conduct their lives in such a manner if they are not aware of the University's expectations of them. Orientation is the appropriate time to introduce new students to intellectual and community standards; it will give new students time to think about unfamiliar ideas, which they will confront in their daily lives at the University.

"Penn's students become independent professionals through individualized study programs, research projects, and internships that make the most of Penn's resources and also through the vast range of additional learning opportunities in a city that is a major business, cultural, medical, and research center."
"Philadelphia is an exciting resource for students at Penn whether they go into Center City to attend a performance of the Pennsylvania Ballet, to have a Philly cheesesteak, to browse in the antique shops, or to integrate their education with work experience through an internship."

Students are unable to take full advantage of Philadelphia's resources if they are unaware of them. The present orientation schedule is inadequate to truly orient students to what the city offers; orientation should attempt to present students with a full range of Philadelphia opportunities.

All of the above statements made by the Admissions Office literature are quite reasonable and represent some of the University's fundamental principles. It is now the task of the entire University community to raise the school up to the level suggested in this literature, whether it be to actualize the "one University concept" by making programs between undergraduate schools more accessible to the average student, or to encourage students to partake in more of the programs that Penn offers. Many of these issues will be discussed at length in later sections of this paper. Penn claims to and does have a diverse student body, not merely in terms of racial, geographic and ethnic diversity, but also in terms of talents and abilities. Orientation programs should emphasize this diversity and embrace its existence on campus.

II. Acceptance to Penn/Pre-frosh Programs

Students are informed of their acceptance to the University by the first two weeks of April. They are then invited to campus to
sample a taste of Penn’s offerings during a period of two to three weeks entitled Locust Weeks. Students are given tours of campus and residence halls, attend special meetings with members of their respective undergraduate schools, visit classes and stay overnight with current students.

We encourage the University to further develop these programs to offer prospective students the opportunity to learn more about Penn before making a final decision. While it is true that a number of students come to Penn during Locust Weeks, many are unable to visit campus due to geographical distance or financial constraints. Programs for accepted students should be held around the country to allow students outside of the immediate Penn area to get a idea of the opportunities that Penn provides. Representatives from the Admissions staff, University administration, faculty and the student body should be present to offer different perspectives. We also encourage more informal programs for accepted students in areas around the country to be modeled after already successful programs such as those in California and New Jersey; gatherings should be held throughout the country before students arrive on campus. This will enable new students to meet people from their neighborhoods and begin forming a network of Penn people who they will know once they arrive.

III. Arrival to Campus -- New Student Orientation Begins

Students have already indicated their commitment to Penn by matriculating at the University; orientation represents the University’s prime opportunity to excite each student with what the
school has to offer. However, it must do so realistically. Realizing that there is a limited amount of information that a student can digest, the University must be cautious in creating a program of events. If orientation is over-scheduled, students will become scared, overwhelmed, or simply disinterested. From a logistical point of view, it is senseless to schedule 9:00 AM programs for students the morning after a late-night activity. Students will want to socialize with people from their residence halls when they return from evening programs, guaranteeing a lower attendance rate. At this point in the college experience, new students are an extremely receptive audience. They have not yet developed the apathy that tends to grow in students during later stages in the Penn experience; if they are overwhelmed, the message will be lost.

The entire orientation process must be personalized for each and every student. This period must reinforce the fact that each individual attending this school is special; that is, every student needs to feel that he deserves to be at Penn. It is therefore necessary to introduce programs that specifically address a variety of student needs, for example, workshops on study skills or coping with roommates, and support sessions for special interest groups on campus. For this diversity to continue and expand, programs must be designed to address and include a wide range of interested students.

It is at this time that students need to be introduced to the concept of faculty-student interaction. They need to be exposed to an environment where this interaction is acceptable and, moreover, is considered to be the norm rather than the exception. Having been
acclimated to this ethos at an early stage in his college career, a
student will not feel awkward entering a professor's office during
office hours just to chat, or asking a professor to lunch any time of
year. For such an environment to be presented to students, faculty
and administrators must be involved in orientation activities. They
should be present for a variety of events. For example, they can
serve as guides on the tours of Philadelphia and at special locations
(i.e. a professor of Art History giving a tour of the Philadelphia
Museum of Art). They can even serve as dealers during Casino Night.
If faculty and administrators are present at social events, students
will find interaction outside the classroom natural and stimulating.
We encourage the University to sponsor meals in the dining halls or a
barbecue on Hill Field with interested faculty members. Orientation
is also a good time to show off "the best of Penn" faculty through
formal lectures and informal discussions.

The President and other administrators of the University
should personally meet each freshman at programs designed
specifically for the students (in addition to the President's reception
gearered towards parents), whether at the President's home or another
suitable location. Though a seemingly insignificant event, shaking
the President's hand the first week of school for the new student
demonstrates the University's concern for its undergraduates. A
personal introduction to University officials is a positive experience,
which will allow students to identify with the University.

The Admissions Office should also play a significant role in New
Student Orientation. Office members have expressed willingness to
assist in welcoming students. This involvement would present the
Admissions Office with the opportunity to interact with the class they have selected. By meeting a significant portion of each class, they will gain insight for future admissions decisions, thereby fostering a connection between the admissions process and actual student life.

One problem facing orientation programs on the Penn campus is that of publicity for and attendance at events. Students must be given a clear explanation of the activities and procedures during their first few days on campus; if there is any confusion as to scheduling, students will be quick to simply stay at home or or find something else to do. Students need to realize the importance of these events and be offered some sort of incentive to attend. While it is not possible to coerce new students to participate in programs, an overall positive attitude on the part of fellow classmates and upperclassmen as well as programmers themselves will encourage new student attendance. Students should be brought from event to event by Orientation Volunteers, New Student Advisors, or Residential Advisors. Such a procedure provides them with an additional way to meet other students, including upperclassman. Furthermore, students will feel an obligation to attend events if they know friends are expecting them to be there. If programs for Orientation are informative, enjoyable, and worthwhile, students will be more likely to attend future events, thereby addressing the wider issue of apathy towards campus programs.

A good argument can be made for the establishment of a common freshman experience. Equality of opportunity throughout the entire orientation process will serve to bond the students
together. Effective programming will help expose students to differences among themselves in a positive, hands-on fashion. For example, students can be encouraged to read a specific book or view a selected movie. The reasoning behind such an activity should be explained to students so they can understand its worth. Such a common experience will provoke discussion among students and serve as a reference point in other programs, both in the classroom and in the wider campus setting. This type of experience should not ignore personal differences between individuals, but should help explore and understand these differences; the University needs to create a common experience which incorporates the uniqueness of each individual.

Course registration for new students should also be used in the orientation process. SCUE recommends that course registration for freshmen, currently a June event, be postponed until all students arrive on campus in the fall. The present procedure requires students to choose classes without any fixed structure or knowledge about the college experience. This method also places at a disadvantage those students who live too far away from campus and are unable to capitalize on pre-registration advising. Materials for registration should be mailed to entering students during the summer so that they can begin evaluating their interests. While those students who are able to receive summer advising should be encouraged to do so, all students should then be offered advising upon arrival and should be given the opportunity to receive guidance from faculty members and upperclassmen. Students should be able to attend a department fair, similar to SCUE's Course/Majors Fair, so
that they may learn about classes and subjects to which they may have had little or no previous exposure, for example, Urban Studies or History and Sociology of Science. Separate presentations held in each of the freshman residences personalize each program as well as help to integrate academics with residential life. University services such as The Tutoring Center, Writing Across The University, and Career Planning and Placement Services should be encouraged to introduce students to the resources that Penn has to offer to them.

During orientation, new students interpret the expectations that Penn will have for them as members of the University community. Therefore, the University must introduce students to such issues as academic integrity, diversity awareness, and volunteerism. It is not the role of Penn to force students to accept certain values as appropriate; rather, the University must present them so that students can evaluate their own beliefs and desires. There must be an open line of communication between students, faculty and administrators from the beginning which will encourage discussion and further development of these ideas.

IV. Continuation of Orientation Programs

Programs must have follow-up sessions for questions, reinforcement, and discussion throughout the year. Students are barraged with information in their first weeks at school which, at the time, may seem irrelevant. Sessions held later in the first year will give students time to evaluate their environment, allowing opportunities for discussion and debate. Ideas will become part of an evolutionary growth.
The Student Committee on Undergraduate Education suggests the establishment of a re-orientation to the University at the start of each new students' second semester. Students are expected to learn many facts when they first arrive on campus, and are undoubtedly expected to remember everything from the campus layout to their dorm-mates' names. A re-orientation would allow students the opportunity to interpret programs or concepts previously introduced. This would also be a good time to orient students to concepts beyond the basic logistical information which they learned in their first weeks at Penn.

When first arriving on campus, students need to learn the answer to "What?" and "Where?, whereas after they have completed a full semester, they will be ready to understand the reasoning behind "How?" and "Why?" The adjustment process is a continual one. When students return from Winter Break, they are willing to reconsider their first semester experiences and make adjustments for the coming semester. The program should begin by dividing students into smaller groups in which upperclassmen facilitate discussion. These groups should be the same as those used first semester during either workshop discussions or another activity. Each should be comprised of individuals from different residences on campus, giving students the opportunity to meet people beyond their own hallways. The group should serve as a support network, and students should, through discussion, evaluate experiences and prepare for the future.

After these smaller sessions, students should attend an information fair held during the first weekend after Winter Break,
similar to CUPID, but restricted to second-semester students. The purpose of this event will be for students to learn more about the opportunities available to them at Penn, whether extracurricular or employment related at a time when they do not feel academic pressure. Such a program would give them a second chance to take advantage of Philadelphia's cultural wealth without the extra pressures of the first few weeks of "the college experience" and before they have become completely mired in a college routine which may ignore such opportunities. Smaller information sessions conducted by University services should be held after this event. A re-birth of interest in the intellectual environment would be beneficial to both the students and the University.

An important component of the re-orientation process involves social activities. Social events provide an incentive to participate in educational forums. A freshman mixer or other social event should be planned after the information-related activity day to remind the students of Penn's commitment to making new students an integral part of the school while creating a festive atmosphere.

A re-orientation program would be run most successfully if students are given a full calendar of events just as they are in September. These activities will alleviate the feeling of let-down that many second-semester new students experience. It also emphasizes the idea that an orientation process is an on-going process and should therefore continue throughout the entirety of a new student's first year.
V. The Upperclass Experience

If done successfully, the entire orientation process should run in a smooth, cyclic fashion. If the new student has a positive experience, he will be willing to assist future students in assimilating into the University environment. The process can be viewed as a give-and-take relationship. Present students are the most valuable resources for new students because they have their own experiences to share and can offer advice regarding alternative options at Penn.

During orientation, new students must be the focus of attention for the entire campus. Therefore, upperclassmen who arrive on campus early should be assisting in a volunteer capacity. Upperclass volunteers should be representative of the entire Penn community. Orientation volunteers should assist for a period of more than a week or two. However, the upperclassmen’s role in the process should begin prior to actual orientation events. The involvement of more students in the planning of activities will generate and refine new ideas for programs and improve the orientation process. Planning should involve the entire Penn community, and begin one full year prior to arrival of the new students on campus.

In order to create a stronger intellectual environment, it is necessary to advocate that non-orientation activities do not conflict with the orientation process itself. One example is fraternity rush. Holding fraternity rush too early in the semester tends to overemphasize the social aspects of the Penn experience for a new student, and overshadow other opportunities that the University has to offer. Due to additional programming and suggested changes in the emphasis of orientation, fraternity rush should be postponed
until later in the new student's first semester. Postponing rush will give students time to explore additional options.

Any planning for an orientation to Penn must be tailor designed to be Penn-specific. It must address the school's special needs; it must pay attention to Penn's relatively large freshman class, the urban setting, and the financial constraints currently limiting such planning. SCUE calls for an improved definition of the individual roles involved in New Student Orientation at the University.

The freshman experience should encourage the exploration of an individual's uniqueness through both academic and extracurricular, campus and community, activities. The necessity for the University community to invest a significant amount of time and energy in improving the New Student Orientation to the Penn community cannot be stressed enough. Once a student has been at the University for an extended amount of time, he will fall into a pattern of behavior and become increasingly resistant to change. It is during the orientation period that the University's message will have the greatest impact on its students; thus, it is at this time that a special effort must be made.
Curriculum

The University strives to achieve a rich and vital intellectual environment. The classroom is at the core of this intellectual community. In the classroom, lectures and texts fill students with intellectual desire which emanates outward into the community. The knowledge derived from the classroom pervades both the social and academic aspects of a student's university experience. The governing laws and precepts that mold the classroom experience are found in the curriculum.

Curricula have existed since the beginning of organized education. Whether it be the trivium and quadrivium of the medieval renaissance or the present General Requirements of the College of Arts and Sciences, educational administrators have tried to determine the optimal components a college education. The famous French poet Valéry proposed, "the diploma gives society a phantom guarantee and its holders phantom rights." To give substance to a college diploma, a curricular philosophy establishes meaningful criteria for attaining a degree.

The Student Committee on Undergraduate Education advocates a curriculum that provides the student with the widest possible vision of the intellectual landscape. This landscape should not be obstructed by the academic walls of the four schools that divide students and faculty. SCUE believes that Penn's education should consider the broad spectrum of the national and international community. Our vision incorporates the inclusion of all viewpoints in shaping the educational presentations. The University should offer
its students an education rooted in the understanding of concepts, not simply facts and data. Furthermore, the communication of ideas requires a setting of small classes to foster faculty-student and student-student interaction.

The Foundation: Freshmen

A curriculum which encourages intellectual thought depends on the enthusiasm of the students involved. Without interested students who are committed to an intellectual community from the outset, no curriculum or means of instruction will succeed in fulfilling the intellectual vision of the University.

Freshmen are thus vitally important to the creation of our desired environment. Curricular initiatives will be successful with freshmen motivated towards intellectual discovery. Ideally, such students will be chosen through the admissions process. This motivation will continue to flourish as students are oriented to the Penn community through the programs previously outlined in this document.

From the academic perspective, every freshmen should be oriented to an intellectual classroom experience through a faculty-taught seminar in his first semester. SCUE commends the University and the College of Arts and Sciences' movement in this direction. In order to be fully successful, these seminars must be offered in a variety of disciplines taught by faculty members from all of the schools of the University. The courses should not attempt to be general surveys of particular disciplines. Rather, they should present the concepts and their applications within a specific field. Special attention should be given to making these courses exceptionally
inspiring; for example, topics of contemporary interest and innovations within a discipline are encouraged. These classes should be conducted in true seminar format. No more than twenty students should be registered for any class, and student discussion should be promoted. The importance of the quality both in programming and in teaching cannot be overstated. These classes will establish a student's future educational viewpoint. A positive experience can orient a student toward future intellectual exploration; a negative experience could turn a student away from intellectual inquiry for the remainder of his educational career.

Internationalization of the Curriculum

Through its curricula, the University must open its eyes to the global community. Today, the world is linked through sophisticated transportation and communication systems, and united by a universal political and economic environment. The vision of a global village approximates reality. While these changes may be tremendous for mankind, they present difficult challenges for American higher education. The University must educate its students to live and work in this more complex global environment.

The University must prepare its students to communicate with the rest of the world. Thus, an emphasis on foreign language study is essential. We applaud the Nursing School's inclusion of foreign language education within its requirements; however, we encourage the expansion of the requirement to include proficiency. SCUE encourages the Wharton School to require its students to attain proficiency in a foreign language. In addition, SCUE calls on the
Engineering School to explore ways of integrating foreign language study as a mandatory part of its curriculum.

However, foreign language education is only one aspect of preparing students for the global environment. Students must be exposed to all aspects of foreign cultures. Curricular initiatives should be created to demonstrate the foreign component of all disciplines. From accounting to clinical nursing and biology to urban studies, all disciplines should attempt to frame courses in the global perspective. In some departments, classes could be enhanced through instruction in a foreign language; in addition, courses concentrating on international issues of a discipline are needed. These courses should explore the diverse qualities of the world and study how particular disciplines are affected by these cultural, economic, societal, and political characteristics.

The best way to understand a foreign culture is to become completely submerged in it. Making an entire country one's classroom is a concept which has tremendous educational merit. Students can explore both their own particular academic discipline and the whole spectrum of studies while in a foreign culture. Therefore, the University should encourage undergraduates from all four schools and from every academic discipline to study abroad for a year, semester, or summer.

Presently, the Penn study abroad contingent consists primarily of humanities majors from the College of Arts and Sciences. The dearth of professional school students and College students in other disciplines is unfortunate. The student who goes abroad benefits immensely from the experience and the University community
benefits from a better educated citizen. Therefore, the four schools should initiate a serious effort to establish more Penn Abroad programs, especially the professional schools. The Nursing School's program at Hebrew University serves as a model of these programs. In establishing their program, the Nursing School invested time and energy sending faculty to Israel, inviting Hebrew University faculty to Penn, and developing a standard course of nursing study abroad. Programs like this will create more credit eligible courses for students planning to go abroad.

One University?

A vibrant intellectual dialogue cannot occur at a University segmented by walled provinces of learning. When presenting the University to prospective matriculants, the University emphasizes that, although there exist four undergraduate schools, Penn is a well-integrated academic center. The idea of "One University" is reinforced by addressing the issue on Penn's admission applications. However, a look at the present educational landscape of the University reveals towering walls of the schools enclosed around their own intellectual fiefdoms. While the University has made strides in the past few years to remove these walls, the barriers preventing interaction across all of the schools are still numerous and cumbersome.

The obstacles are most tangible to those students who choose to pursue two separate degrees at the University. Dual degree students describe with frustration the difficulties of surmounting those
obstacles. These students often receive conflicting information and advice from each different school. Curricula in some areas are often inadvertently constructed to impede dual degree study. Thus, SCUE recommends the establishment of a Committee on Inter-School Study. This committee should be composed of students, faculty, administrators, and advisors from all four undergraduate schools. They should review the problems and conflicts which involve dual degree study. They should also study ways to bring the faculties of the four schools closer together. The committee should attempt to sponsor colloquia for faculty to discuss related issues. The committee should also work to establish more interdisciplinary course offerings.

The Committee on Inter-School Study should serve as an advisory board to a proposed independent Office of Inter-School Study. This office, which would not be affiliated with all four undergraduate schools, should serve as a central advising office for dual degree studies. The staff members in the office should be familiar with the regulations of all four schools in order to assist students in completing degree requirements. In addition, the advisors should assist students in creating an intellectually coherent program in both schools. Because this office will be affiliated with all four schools, every undergraduate school will communicate with the office about its programs and requirements. The office should also publicize the options of dual degree study to the undergraduate community and establish a support group and network for dual degree program members.

Dual degree programs require tremendous commitments of time and energy. Often, students have a great interest in another
degree program, but cannot dedicate that time and energy to attain a separate degree. For these students, a formalized program which will allow them to take an organized group of courses for a minor should be established. Presently, the Wharton School offers Nursing School students a set of business clusters. These clusters are sets of six classes centered around a specific and coherent business area. We commend this initiative on the part of the Nursing School and Wharton School. SCUE urges the expansion of this system to other schools as well.

The Wharton School should offer those business minors currently available to the Nursing students, to students in the College of Arts and Sciences and the School of Engineering as well. If these minor programs have been approved by the faculty of the Wharton School, they should be officially recognized by the University and its other undergraduate schools. This minor would accommodate those students who have an interest in the business discipline but do not wish to commit themselves to seeking a second degree. Students pursuing the minor program would also have comply with the requirements of their home school.

Reciprocally, a system of minors should be established in the College of Arts and Sciences for the students of other schools. Students in the professional schools should have the option of having a minor in the College of Arts and Sciences. These minors should be established by the faculty of the College and officially recognized by the University and the other schools. These minors would allow students to do advanced study in a specific area of interest in the liberal arts. It may be argued that these minors would focus the
interest of professional students in the liberal arts too narrowly. Once again, students will have to fulfill the requirements of their home school in addition to those of the minor. This program will permit students to augment their liberal arts education with more focused study in an area.

Some may perceive these minor programs as a distraction from their home school. However, there is a real demand for this type of curricular diversity; an example of this desire is the number of College students taking Wharton classes and claiming unofficial "Wharton minors." Minor programs will give students an option to remain in their home schools and concentrate on their chosen discipline, while at the same time pursuing coherently structured advanced study in another area. However, students who so choose should not be discouraged from planning their own inter-school study.

The Role of the College

When viewing our model of University's educational landscape we see the liberal arts located in the center with the professional fields connected to this locus with a mixture of carefully cleared and partially covered pathways. The liberal arts, through their primary provider, the College of Arts and Sciences, are the core elements of the University and of the undergraduate educational experience. Therefore, we encourage the active and diverse participation of every undergraduate in its operations.
The General Requirements

We earlier discussed Valéry's observation of the "phantom" value of a college diploma. The question of what comprises a liberal arts education lies at the root of the debate regarding the General Requirements of the College of Arts and Sciences. The spectrum of educational alternatives, areas of study, and faculty interest is as broad as the human imagination. Therefore, developing a composite of the optimal liberal education becomes a serious challenge.

Our peer institution, Brown University, dealt with this issue by establishing limited criteria and allowing students to define their own ideal of a liberal arts education. This idea has significant merit. SCUE believes that students, as adult members of the academic community, should be given as much latitude as possible in pursuing their educational interests. However, we recognize that there exists a need to encourage educational development in diverse areas of study.

The General Requirements have a place at the University. They should be used to channel students into the diverse areas of the liberal arts. However, the Requirements must be wide and firm viaducts. Presently, the Requirements consists of slightly over 260 courses with over 100 in the Arts and Letters sector. We recommend a significant expansion of these sectors to allow students greater choice within a particular sector of the liberal arts education. Furthermore, we expect the sectors to be constructed with integrity of academic principle. Since the purpose of the sectors is to channel students into distinct academic areas, each sector of the General Requirements should have a well-defined, coherent, and openly
explained educational principle behind it. In addition, the relationship between each course in a sector and the sector's educational principle and goal should be explained to the student. No course should be included in a sector unless it relates to the educational objective of the sector.

A White Man's Vision?

An intellectual environment thrives only where all viewpoints are included in the academic discourse. Unfortunately, the development of a discipline or an area of thought is principally constructed from the viewpoints of its creators. The world of American academia and the University has been principally dominated by white males. Although great strides towards diversity have been made, even today, the University's faculty is still dominated this group. The ideas and concepts presented at the University are thus presented from a limited perspective. Although many University faculty members attempt to broaden their educational viewpoints, the perspectives of women and other minority groups are often not presented. In reaction to this, independent areas of study have been created to present different perspectives. Programs like Afro-American Studies and Women's Studies fill the void in the present University curriculum for alternative viewpoints.

Penn has long struggled to achieve diversity in all areas of University life. Correspondingly, its curriculum must present a range of viewpoints on all areas of study. However, there is a vast spectrum of different and opposing viewpoints from a large group of
minority and other interest groups. Consequently, we believe a mandatory class or set of classes offering different viewpoints cannot give the general University community the intellectual diversity it requires.

We recommend, however, that the University attempt to incorporate diverse viewpoints in all of its classes. Careful attention must be paid to the inclusion of such perspectives in class design. This ideal should be a University, school, and department principle. In the interests of intellectual freedom, this precept should not be mandated; there should be no diversity approval committee created, no diversity litmus test for new courses. Nevertheless, the University should continue to foster those disciplines offering minority perspectives. These areas of study have created whole new realms of knowledge and research from which the entire community can benefit.

Class Size

To create a stimulating intellectual environment, there must be a vibrant academic discussion and transfer of knowledge in the classroom. It is important that this transfer of knowledge travel through several different paths: faculty to student, student to faculty, and student to student. While the faculty to student exchange is the most important of these paths, the other paths are still essential. In large lecture classes, the faculty member gets little opportunity to receive feedback and student's opinions on the subject matter he presents. In addition, students lack the opportunity to gain from the knowledge, experience, and insight of their peers.
If we wish intellectual discussion to expand past the limits of
the classroom, we must first foster it inside the classroom. Students
must be given an opportunity to explain their views on the subject,
test their theories, and challenge the material presented with their
own logic. Denying such an activity creates academic skepticism and
promotes intellectual apathy in the minds of students.

Seminars, led by a faculty member, best facilitates intellectual
interaction. In a setting with under twenty students, all the paths
for the transfer of knowledge can be utilized and true intellectual
discussion can take place. Therefore, we recommend the expansion
of the number of seminars presently offered at the University.
Particular attention should be paid to designing seminar classes for
the introductory level of major programs.

For many courses, the demand for classes makes the seminar
format cost prohibitive and well beyond the University's means.
Large lecture classes with dynamic professors can be quite effective
in some cases. We stress that large classes need not be empty
educational experiences. A large class, if administered as
recommended in this paper's Teaching section, can be an interesting
and intellectually stimulating experience for students. However, an
outlet for intellectual discussion should be presented along with
these classes. We recommend that the University implement
recitation sections for any class with an enrollment of over eighty
students. The discussions in the recitation should relate to and
expand on the information presented in the class itself. The lecturer
should speak in at least one recitation section a week to gain
meaningful feedback on the material presented.
Honors Programs

Departmental Honors Programs

Departmental honors programs have traditionally provided students with a unique opportunity to engage in and contribute to the intellectual discourse within their fields of study. Both the process and the product of departmental honors programs are valuable to the undergraduate experience. Departmental honors provides students who have excelled in their subject area with the opportunity to carry their work one step beyond the undergraduate level, applying the basic skills acquired in their major studies to a specific area of the discipline. In addition, departmental honors programs encourage students to become closely linked with their major departments, thus stimulating student interaction with faculty members and graduate students, as well as with other undergraduates who share related interests. Thus, such an endeavor can contribute to an undergraduate's appreciation for a discipline in its entirety.

A recent proposal has been made to provide students in the College of Arts and Sciences with a mandatory research-based class as the culmination of their undergraduate education. This course would center around the completion of a thesis in a senior's major discipline. Such a program would benefit the students involved; however, the value of this mandatory capstone experience is questionable for three reasons. First, those students who would not have pursued a thesis under non-mandatory conditions will fail to appreciate the work as an intellectual exercise, instead resenting it
and viewing the process as another requirement. Second, such a proposal would lead to a strain on the University’s research and faculty resources. Finally, requiring the program would demean its value and hinder those students truly interested in pursuing thesis work from benefitting from their thesis work. For these reasons, SCUE does not support the institution of a mandatory capstone experience.

While uncommitted students should not be required to engage in thesis work, those interested in pursuing an honors program in their respective major departments should be strongly encouraged and guided in their efforts. The criteria for both eligibility to departmental honors programs and completion of the honors track must be examined by each department to ensure fairness and consistency within each program.

Currently, grade point averages serve as the main criterion for most established departmental honors programs. While a student’s grade point average clearly designates those who have excelled both overall and in their major fields of study, it fails to identify those students who have strong intellectual and disciplinary interests but have received lower grades due to extraordinarily challenging course loads or extracurricular activities. It also fails to distinguish those students who may have received mediocre grades during their first semesters at Penn but who have steadily improved throughout their college years. For this reason, SCUE suggests that several criteria be considered in accepting students to departmental honors programs. Students who have maintained the required grade point average should be admitted automatically. Other individuals must be
reviewed on a case-by-case basis. In evaluating these students, department members must consider faculty recommendations, especially those prepared by department colleagues. In addition, previous work by the student in his particular area of interest should be acknowledged. By using these more subjective methods of evaluation, department members may more accurately assess both the interest and the ability of a student, and students who appreciate the significance and intensity of a thesis will be admitted to the program.

Departments should create programs which attract, not deter, interested students. Upon acceptance to their major programs, students should receive a description of honors opportunities. In this way, each student will be able to evaluate his desire to write a thesis and plan his academic schedule accordingly. In addition, criteria for admission to the honors program must be publicized so that students may be realistic in their expectations. Furthermore, the responsibility of finding a thesis advisor should not be a prerequisite for acceptance to the thesis program. Instead, departments should choose honors students based on their demonstrated ability and, after acceptance, should aggressively assist each student in finding an advisor within the department. If a student is committed to and capable of completing a thesis, he should not be denied the experience because of a lack of faculty interest.

Not all students are willing or able to commit to the rigorous process that culminates in a thesis. However, some may wish to pursue a research program of interest or a modified version of this process. Therefore, students must be made aware of other unique
and individual academic alternatives, for example, independent studies. An independent study differs from a thesis in its availability, duration, intensity and organization. Such a program provides an alternative to a traditional thesis. Another avenue that should be developed to encourage undergraduate research is the creation of formalized, research-based classes within each department. These classes could provide interested non-honors students with the opportunity to explore a major-related topic in depth in a classroom environment. Neither of these non-honors alternatives conforms to the concept of the mandatory senior capstone experience, and neither program qualifies a student for honors recognition. However, if the University supports widespread undergraduate research, as evidenced by the recent proposal, it should address both attention and resources to publicizing and expanding opportunities for undergraduate research programs.

The General Honors Program

An analysis of Penn's general honors program requires an understanding of the program's holistic effects on the University. Discussion on SCUE has produced there are strong arguments both for and against general honors; a review of its value does not produce any definitive conclusions. Examination of these arguments, however, creates a conceptual framework from which an optimal honors program can emerge. Because the best possible honors program can only develop from an understanding of this framework, potential positive and negative effects must be expounded. Specific recommendations can then be made in light of this examination.
The traditional principle for a general honors program has been that every student deserves to be pushed to his intellectual limits. According to this reasoning, exceptional students deserve special educational opportunities and resources. Underlying this principle is the belief that the most intellectual students are the most qualified to bring the knowledge they receive to others or to use their knowledge to benefit society. If this concept holds true, then having a general honors program can create a communal benefit.

However, having an honors program requires an unequal distribution of academic resources. If the University's limited resources are reserved for a select few, then the larger Penn community receives a curtailed academic experience. In the extreme, this redistribution can reduce the effectiveness of the University's academic resources, outweighing the potential communal benefits of general honors.

Designating honors students based on intellectual curiosity also creates a logistical problem: because the level of academic achievement among Penn students is high and its range narrow, the University faces great difficulty in identifying its most "intellectual" candidates. Objective criteria can act only as a rough guide in the designation process; selectors must resort to a subjective judgment.

The difficulties in the designation process lead students to lack confidence in the validity of selection. If the privileges of honors seem undeserved, then those who are not designated honors come to resent those who are. Honors can thereby excessively partition the campus community.
Significant benefits accrue to those designated general honors students. Honors classes are small, intellectually rigorous, and discussion-oriented. Such an environment stimulates collegial interaction and challenges both students and faculty to realize their potential.

Using general honors to provide these special opportunities coincides with the University's desire to attract top-notch students. In this way, general honors functions as a recruiting tool. Having such a recruiting tool helps Penn compete with peer institutions, especially those in the Ivy League. In addition, many of the students recruited through general honors contribute an intellectual bent that might otherwise not exist at the University. The presence of these students can invigorate the entire student body.

While honors has the potential to attract students who enliven the intellectual life on campus, recruitment can also have a dampening effect on the intellectual environment. Recruiting through honors programs, when some peer institutions do not, can create the impression that Penn is a second-tier school whose general education fails to satisfy intellectually curious students. The prestige brought by drawing students away from other schools and improving the statistical representation of the University may be outweighed by these implications.

As a recruiting tool, general honors has a hidden cost: if students choose Penn solely because of general honors, they may gain a feeling of superiority over their non-honors peers and disdain for their non-honors classes. This elitist attitude justifiably angers other students. Such emotions may also be stimulated simply by the
existence of an honors program. Regardless of the cause, honors has the potential to create a combative atmosphere which is not conducive to the spirit of One University.

SCUE believes that, in order to promote the One University concept, an optimal general honors program should maximize the opportunity of honors designees to pursue their intellectual curiosities while minimizing the barriers to sharing and applying this knowledge to the larger community. Emotional barriers will be reduced when non-honors students feel the selection process has been fair and honors students recognize their community responsibility. Toward this end, the honors program must be elite without becoming elitist. Honors students should be recognizable for their diligence in class, their interest in learning, and their willingness to share knowledge with other students.

A simple modification to the current general honors program would help to overcome the resentment deriving from a lack of confidence in the program's admissions process. At the end of freshman year, each general honors student's commitment to the program should be reviewed. Those who demonstrated interest in the program throughout the year would automatically be invited to the upperclass program. Those who had not shown interest would have to apply to the upperclass program under the normal procedure and would not be given any preferential treatment in selection.

Developing channels within the general honors program through which honors students contribute directly to the Penn community will foster the sense that honors programs benefit the community as a whole. Piloting programs within general honors that
will eventually be generalized to the campus community provides an opportunity for honors students to help create a better intellectual environment at the University. This experimentation already exists on a modest scale within the Benjamin Franklin Scholars (BFS) program; many general honors faculty members view honors classes as a laboratory in which to test new teaching approaches. However, the concept of the honors program as a laboratory has not been taken far enough.

For honors programs to provide maximum value to the University, their unique position as experimental programs must be exploited to the fullest. Implicit within the concept of experimentation is perpetual change. Programs that have proven their value should be moved out of the honors program, no longer administered by the honors office. The honors program would then be free to take on new challenges, working with honors students to create new programs which would be brought to the community at large.

For an honors program to effectively carry out the experimental process, it must combine constant feedback from students with a direct means for moving successful programs out of the honors office. Currently, communication with students is maintained by the excellent advising for which the BFS office is known. However, the BFS office has no route by which to channel its successes to the rest of the University.

Creating channels through which successful programs can move from the BFS office to the broader campus community depends upon changes in attitudes both inside and outside the office. If the BFS
program assumes a responsibility for innovating programs that will benefit the entire University, then the general honors office will share the successes of its pilot programs as they arise. This publicity will create a campus-wide feeling that general honors is a tremendous resource for information on program development.

A program that the BFS office has proven successful is the coordination of undergraduate research with professors. The skills that the BFS office has acquired and the systems that it has used should serve as models for creating the broader undergraduate research opportunities system. Working with the developers of a university-wide research office will initially put some strain on BFS. However, once general honors has spun-off the research program, the office will be able to take on a new endeavor, for example, attracting guest professors to teach general honors classes.

The ultimate goal of a general honors program must be to benefit both non-honors and honors students. In this way, the negative effects of a general honors program will be mitigated. Experimentation, in conjunction with increased information about the general honors program, will encourage the development of a more stimulating intellectual environment and reduce the barriers between honors and non-honors students. This improved environment will benefit the entire Penn community.

SCUE believes that an optimal honors program can be created within the framework of experimentation. Piloting programs encourages the sharing of academic resources, thereby limiting the inequity that an honors program can cause. Although pilot programs must continue to benefit honors students directly, these students
must realize that they are part of a process designed to benefit the entire undergraduate community. Honors students' recognition their role will reduce the elitism that an honors program can create. Experimentation within honors creates an exciting learning environment which will permeate the entire University as successful programs evolve.
Undergraduate Research

Education must not only take place in a classroom where knowledge is transmitted from one person or group to another. The educational process consists of seeking new knowledge and exploring the wide area of the yet undiscovered. The dual nature of a university as an educational and research institution has long been established. Penn's research accomplishments are quite impressive. However, undergraduate involvement in faculty research and undergraduate research has not yet been recognized as a significant part of the University's educational mission. The research facilities and resources of the University are also of great importance to undergraduate researchers. To create the desired intellectual environment, undergraduates must have the opportunity to be academic explorers and find their own solutions to academic puzzles.

Involvement in Faculty Research

Throughout the University, the faculty is involved in pioneering research projects. Innovative exploration contributes to creating a vital intellectual environment at the University. The questions raised and solutions discovered by researchers should proliferate and enliven academic discussions held on campus. Currently, undergraduate involvement in research consists of little more than reading about a professor's findings in the Daily Pennsylvanian. In other cases, a professor leaves class early or cancels class to dash off to a conference or research library leaving students ignorant of the content of their professor's research. Professors must discuss their own research in their classes to
give students an understanding of the research conducted at the University.

Furthermore, undergraduates can participate in faculty research in a variety of capacities. On a personal level, student participation assists the faculty member and also provides the student with unique educational benefits. On the community level, student involvement speeds up the progress of research and enhances the collective knowledge of Penn's undergraduate population.

The University should make a greater effort to collect and organize a thorough record of current research projects to facilitate undergraduate involvement in the research process. With this listing of projects, faculty should include their requests for student assistants. The University should then publicize these opportunities. This process is already being performed effectively on a limited scale through the General Honors Office. We commend the office for this endeavor and hope that it can be replicated on a University scale. More positions, for both work-study and non-work-study students, should be created to allow a larger portion of the undergraduate community to participate in the research process.

Undergraduate Independent Research

Although much of the attention of the academic community focuses on the research of faculty scholars, undergraduates are constantly exploring new areas of thought in the form of theses, term papers, case studies, and other projects. Independent intellectual exploration is integral to the enrichment of the intellectual environment. To construct a community of scholars, students must be inspired to seek out new knowledge, construct and test hypotheses, and formulate their own conclusions. In this manner,
students will actively contribute to the expansion of the collective intellect, rather than being passive receptors.

The University should encourage the use of independent student research as an educational tool in all levels and in all disciplines. The faculty should incorporate independent research opportunities into their classes. Unfortunately, many departments have neglected independent undergraduate research. As with many initiatives, the integration of independent research in the freshman curriculum is essential.

The University's Nassau and Rose Funds for undergraduate research are excellent means of rewarding significant and challenging work. These programs should be expanded and more specialized programs based on their model should be created throughout the University.

Research Facilities and Resources

The University offers its undergraduate researchers a variety of resources found throughout the campus. It is important for the University to remain committed to elevating the quality and quantity of information resources at the University to the highest level. Furthermore, it is equally important that the University makes these resources accessible and user-friendly in a proper environment for study and use. The University must also be committed to constantly improving the quality and quantity of laboratory facilities and workstations accessible to undergraduates.

The University offers a wide array of informative resources from which the researcher may choose, including books, periodicals, government publications and computer databases. Although the University's collection of these resources is extensive, the world is constantly changing and the
world's body of knowledge is expanding. Therefore, the University must continue to invest funds to keep the University's holdings comprehensive and current.

The University's vast holdings cause some problems for a researcher. For example, "What information sources to utilize?" and "Where to begin?" The research librarians at the University are excellent guides to the various information sources in their areas. However, the problem goes deeper into the whole process of research. Many students simply have little understanding of how to conduct research at Penn. The University must formulate programs to publicize the informative resources and educate students on the uses and operating procedures of these resources.

The cornerstone of the University's research facilities is Van Pelt Library. This mountain of knowledge serves as the hub of almost any research endeavor. It is important that this facility be accessible to students at a large range of hours every day, including weekends. The inclusion of computer word processing and information systems in the library will greatly enhance the user's ability to conduct research. The University should offer both semi-interactive and quiet study areas on the lower level (Rosengarten). In addition, the University should attempt to create more spaces or allow greater access to existing places for group project discussions in the library.

Aside from Van Pelt, the University has a rich assortment of school and departmental libraries. It is essential that these facilities be open to all University community members. We pride ourselves on being "One University" which encourages a free interchange of thoughts and ideas between schools and disciplines. Restricted access stifles discourse and constructs walls between schools and their scholars.
Center for Undergraduate Research

The important research component of undergraduate education appears as a maze of different programs, facilities, and resources. Undergraduates need tour guides to show them a way through this maze. The present advising system is not sophisticated enough to give significant guidance through the research process. In addition, the reference librarians, while being excellent resources for specific problems, cannot adequately cope with the broad spectrum of problems facing undergraduate research. Therefore, SCUE recommends the establishment of a Center for Undergraduate Research to specifically address the problems surrounding this issue. The Center should be sponsored by the University and located in the Van Pelt Library. Due to the library's centrality, the Center would be easily accessible to students while they are involved in a research process.

The Center should act as the collector and repository of the list of faculty research projects discussed above. Thus, the Center could promote student involvement in faculty research and advise interested students regarding available projects. Since this program has proven effective in the General Honors Office, that office should serve as a model and reference source in the establishment of this program.

The University should use the Center to publicize the various research resources at the University through the classrooms and the campus media. The Center should be responsible for educating students about the proper procedures for using the various research resources through literature, workshops, and presentations.
A primary role for the Center is to advise students on which resources to use and on how to use them. The staff of the Center should be knowledgeable in resources at the University. Staff members should also be aware of the resources throughout the City of Philadelphia. Knowledgeable research advisors can recommend specific research options and give instructions, if necessary, for their use. Staff members could be divided into specific areas of study to offer more specific guidance. It should be noted, however, that the Center should only serve to augment the guidance given by the student's professor; professorial guidance should still play a major role in the research process.

**Teaching**

For the classroom to become the center of intellectual life, the transmitter of knowledge and the moderator of the intellectual discussion should be knowledgeable on the subject matter, communicate effectively, and respond to student concerns and interests. Simply put, to establish a vital intellectual environment at Penn, the University must be committed to excellence in teaching as well as research.

Students attend class to be challenged by new concepts. If a lecture is confusing, disorganized, or inaccurate, the educational process will stagnate, polluting the intellectual environment. Excellence in teaching does not require theatrics or special effects in the classroom; excellent teaching demands a commitment and a desire to impart knowledge on students.
Teaching in the Tenure Process

An effective way to ensure excellence in teaching at the University is to grant tenure to professors with superior teaching skills. We applaud the University's recent steps to increase the role of teaching in the tenure process. However, we conclude that this message has not been effectively communicated to the entire University community. Schools and departments must increase efforts to bring teaching and research closer to parity in the tenure process.

Presently, SCUE believes that teaching quality is only beneficial or detrimental at the margin of tenure decisions. If the University is committed to providing a quality education to its students, excellent teachers cannot be continually denied tenure. We cannot afford to lose those professors that can communicate knowledge the best.

Evaluating Teaching Excellence

We believe that students can be the best judges of teaching excellence. Students must evaluate faculty members on their ability to communicate ideas, not their entertainment skills. Students can most accurately decide if the information and concepts are being effectively transmitted. We commend Penn Course Review's program, originally established by SCUE, which allows students to evaluate their professors. Every school, department, and teaching faculty member must participate in the student evaluation process. These evaluations must be used in all tenure decisions. To make this process even more valuable to the tenure review, departments should be encouraged to put department-specific questions on the student evaluation forms. The departments should attempt to focus their questions as to elicit fair and objective responses
from students. Departments will rely on the forms if they are able to fine tune the questions.

Another means of evaluating teaching is through peer review by a faculty member's colleagues. Although some departments currently utilize peer review, many still have not incorporated it into their decision process. SCUE believes that peer review of teaching must become a part of every tenure process. Peer review is not an infringement on academic freedom. Faculty members from the same discipline are trained to know what concepts should be presented and attuned to how they should be taught. That a faculty member's research is reviewed by his peers, indicates that his teaching should also be so reviewed. Additional evaluations of teaching that should be utilized are syllabus review, student interviews, and alumni interviews and letters. However, regardless of what other measures are used, student evaluations must be used to evaluate faculty members' teaching abilities.

The Responsibilities of Teaching

SCUE has considered what specific duties should be expected of an excellent professor. Professors should possess the knowledge to effectively teach a class and communicate knowledge to the students. However, there are other procedures and duties that professors should follow.

For an intellectual community to evolve, students must understand the interrelated nature of their classes. On the first day of class, the professor should explain the nature of the class as it relates to the various disciplines to which it is connected. Students must clearly understand the
academic importance of a class. Every professor should offer a syllabus for the class to his students. This syllabus should be made available for a prospective student's inspection in the department's office during the advanced registration period. The professor, in the syllabus, should explain the reason for the inclusion of a particular source or text and its significance to the discipline in study. A clear and careful delineation of student responsibilities and requirements along with their importance in grading should also be presented at the beginning of a class.

The intellectual environment should spread beyond the classroom experience as discussed above and as later sections of this report will address. Accordingly, student interaction with professors should not be restricted to the classroom. SCUE firmly reiterates that faculty members must have office hours and abide by them religiously. These office hours should be created to accommodate both the professor's and the students' schedules. Professors should be urged not to schedule office hours which will correspond with a popular class sequence (e.g. office hours on Tuesdays and Thursdays both at noon; a person who has a class during the first hour will probably have one during the second, as well). However, student interaction with faculty members after class should not be confined to the office hour. The University, faculty, and students should work together to bring students and faculty closer through a wide range activities and settings.

Teaching Awards and Rewards

Although we should expect and demand teaching excellence from all of the faculty, there are some faculty members who are truly exceptional examples of the highest degree of teaching excellence. For these select
few, and those who would like to emulate them, the University must provide a form of recognition. The University should offer a tangible bonus to reward such exemplary teachers.

The University's Lindback Award and the School of Arts and Science's Ira Abrams Award are both ways of acknowledging extraordinary teachers. However, the University should expand the programs to extend these opportunities to all of the schools and some departments.

On the University level, we recommend the creation of a Chair for Excellence in Teaching. This chair should be placed as a priority on the current Campaign for Penn and funded through a gift to the University. This chair would sponsor a program to select a minimum of six exemplary teachers each year and award these professors a bonus of no less than $10,000 each. This initiative would make the teaching awards program more substantial and significant in the minds of the University community.

While we firmly believe that the emphasis on quality of teaching should rest on the individual professor level, the University should consider targeting teaching excellence on the departmental level. If the importance of quality teaching can become a recognized aspect of the department's ethos, the quality of instruction by the individual professors in the department will certainly improve. Therefore, the University should study ways to evaluate departmental teaching excellence and reward that excellence through substantial means.

Technology and Teaching

With the advent of the computer age, professors have more than just chalk and a blackboard to help them convey their ideas to students. They now have a variety of computer-related and computer-driven educational
tools that can both improve their presentation and also help impart knowledge through interactive learning.

Programs exist which allow the professor to control and vary the display based upon inputed variables and scenarios; these would be effective in all disciplines from mathematics to international relations. These improved displays may help to keep students interested in large lecture presentations. The interactive computer education systems have wide ranges of applications for undergraduates. At Penn, computer labs have been added to assist in the instruction of foreign languages. SCUE believes that investments in both computer-assisted presentation and instruction should be aggressively pursued by the University.
Advising

The structure of a sound advising system presents each form of advising to the student at the proper stage of his Penn experience. If properly guided, students emerge from Penn with a sense of intellectual direction. Their ideas have been shaped not only by a well-constructed academic program, but also by the mentors who have guided them. No one service alone is capable of shaping a student's academic career. All forms of advising -- school, faculty, peer, departmental and career planning -- when integrated into a cohesive network, allow students to explore the vast array of academic options open to them at Penn and in the future. The goals for each advising service across the four undergraduate years are outlined in a chart following the discussion below.

The advising program of the Nursing School illustrates the success of an integrated network of services. Each student has a faculty advisor whose accurate and current logistical knowledge enables the advisor to assist students in planning their schedules. In addition, the advisor attempts to develop a personal relationship with the student which fosters the evolution of a mentoring process. A feedback system exists so that students dissatisfied with their advisor can be reassigned. Students thinking of entering dual degree programs or transferring out of the Nursing School meet with advisors specifically trained to handle special scheduling requests. Programs are sufficiently advertised through the use of mailboxes and the Student Nurses at Penn organization (SNAP). SNAP also provides a forum for peer advising. Although the success of the
Nursing School advising program is facilitated by the comparatively small student population and focused curriculum, it should serve as a model for the other schools.

The advising infrastructure of the University would be bolstered by applying the advising constructs utilized in the Nursing School to the other schools' advising systems. On the most basic level, the logistical information offered by advisors must be current and accurate. With the proper information, an advisor can assist a student in establishing a satisfactory academic program. However, even with well-informed advisors, problems can arise. Feedback committees, comprised of students and administrators, provide flexibility to an advising system. Through these committees, problems will be expediently identified and new program ideas will have a forum for presentation.

A key element of the Nursing School program is the orientation process. Early in their academic career, students are acquainted with the advising resources available to them both within the Nursing School and across the University. Advisors can alleviate the confusion students associate with advising programs by aggressively approaching all students in their freshman and sophomore years. A booklet containing detailed explanations of the advising services offered by each school and answers to common questions such as "What do I do if I want to transfer to a different school?" should be developed and distributed to students by their Residential Advisors freshman year. The booklet, in conjunction with ample advertisement of other advising office programs, will enable students
to utilize the proper advising services throughout the remainder of their college years.

The preceding suggestions provide a solid foundation for the advising structure of the University as a whole. The components of the advising systems of the College of Arts and Sciences, the Wharton School and the Engineering School must be examined to discover the mechanisms by which each school can maximize the quality of its individual advising system.

**The College of Arts and Sciences**

The advising program of the College of Arts and Sciences suffers from a failure to integrate the available advising services into a cohesive structure. Currently, students erroneously believe the College Office should be their sole source of advising. Creating a network between the College Office, faculty, departmental, peer and career planning advising services will increase student utilization of valuable resources.

The Faculty Advising program of the College of Arts and Sciences has the greatest potential to provide a mentoring service to students. Interaction with faculty advisors fosters the growth of ideas. Faculty members can introduce students to various aspects of intellectual culture thereby preventing them from becoming ensnared in one academic ideology. An intellectually curious student population contributes to a more stimulating classroom environment for both students and faculty.

For a mentoring ethos to evolve, faculty members must initiate and maintain contact with the student during the freshman year.
Often, intimidated students, particularly freshman, hesitate to meet with professors. Consequently, the mentoring process stagnates. Faculty advisors should meet with their students at least once a semester outside of the pre-registration period as a means of providing a forum for discussion. Once students understand that faculty advisors can assist them in exploring the vast educational opportunities at Penn, they will contribute to the mentoring process initiated by their advisor. Ideally, each student should be paired with a faculty member who shares his field of interest. A student is more likely to develop and discuss research or independent study projects with a professor who understands his ideas and shares his curiosity. The faculty advisor could concentrate on the mentoring aspect of advising if departmental advisors served, in part, as logistical advisors.

Departmental advising is an untapped resource of invaluable advising services. Students often plague College Office and faculty advisors with questions that could be more satisfactorily answered by departmental advisors. The English Department, for example, has a particularly effective advising system that should serve as a model to all departments. The strength of the program is derived from its continuity. The department chair and assistant chair advise all majors and potential majors on course and concentration selection. Advisors offer more accurate advice if they are acquainted with a student's academic progression. Accordingly, files containing grades and the "minutes" of each advisory meeting are kept for all majors. In addition, students who wish to pursue a specific interest in a thesis or research setting are referred to faculty members whose
interests coincide with those of the student. Such student-faculty interaction is the ideal culmination of the mentoring process.

Major forums would further assist students in defining their goals. During the spring semester, each department should hold a forum for potential majors. The opportunity to address questions to current majors and faculty members allows students to obtain the specific information they need to make an informed selection. Forums will prevent the frustration students experience when they barrage College Office advisors with major-specific questions that would be more successfully addressed by members of the department.

Major societies augment departmental programs by providing a setting where majors can interact with one another. Students can assist fellow majors in selecting courses and concentrations. Furthermore, interaction among students of similar interest enhances the intellectual environment at Penn. Graduate students in the major should be included in these societies to help undergraduates bridge the gap between present and future studies. Outside speakers and professors could provide a shared intellectual experience to students whose views of the field often differ from having taken different classes. Such societies have been successful interactive settings in the History and Psychology departments.

The College Office will become an efficient and dependable source of academic guidance when advisors encourage students to utilize parallel services. The College Office need not hire more advisors to alleviate the burden of overcrowding. If students know which service best addresses a particular problem, they will spend
less time in the wrong office. The use of mailboxes for the dispersal of information from all advising offices, including Career Planning and Placement, will further facilitate the informative process. If the students who arrive at the College Office belong there, advisors will have time to not only answer questions, but also to discuss options.

Advising in the College Office should be required for certain segments of the student population. Juniors who have not declared a major should be seen by College Advisors. These students may need nurturing to develop a sense of intellectual direction. Additionally, students changing their major must meet with an advisor before finalizing the process. Even if the student has carefully thought out changing the course of his studies, an advisor can help the student solidify his plans while ensuring the completion of requirements in the desired time frame.

The Wharton School

Students in the Wharton School receive substantial advising through the integration of departmental, peer and administrative advising, but would benefit from increased interaction with faculty members. Even though the Wharton School does not support the implementation of a faculty advising program, other forums for faculty-student interaction must exist. Professors should discuss their research and academic interests in the classroom and during departmental forums to allow students the opportunity to express intellectual curiosity. The "pre-professional" nature of the Wharton curriculum diverts some students' attention from the intellectual foundation of their studies; believing that the job market is the place
where the Wharton education culminates, these students seek advice about their future primarily from Career Planning and Placement. By introducing alternative programs and options to students, professors can impede the ideological fixation experienced by some students.

The School of Engineering and Applied Science

The Engineering School's dependence on faculty advisors as the primary source of academic advising has lead to student dissatisfaction. Although faculty advisors are required to meet with students to discuss scheduling options, in some instances, the advisor merely signs the student's form. Both advisor and student are at fault for the misuse of a potentially good system. In general, neither party attempts to establish a mentoring relationship. Implementation of Deans of Advising and revitalization of the Faculty Advising Program are needed to combat the weaknesses in the school's advising program. Deans of Advising will alleviate the difficulties that arise when students cannot reach their faculty advisor or the advisor is unable to answer the students' questions. If students meet with advisors outside of the pre-registration period, a more personal relationship has a chance of taking root.

Residential Peer Advising

Recent suggestions to create residential advising systems have ranged from plans which would locate professional "advising coordinators" in each residence to those emphasizing more formal peer advising systems between upperclassmen and freshmen.
Competent residential advising could effectively diminish many schools' advising problems by orienting first-year students to campus life, their curricular requirements, and the advising services located throughout the University. More importantly, these goals can be accomplished without decentralizing professional advising services into the residences.

Students, especially freshmen, should be both formally and casually advised by all parties within the residences -- faculty, graduate students, residential advisors and upperclassmen. Advising by faculty-in-residence should center on their specific talents and intellectual rigor; they are extremely qualified to relate views of their fields of interest and expertise and post-collegiate options and experiences. Utilizing faculty to give logistical and administrative advice, however, does not utilize their unique intellectual attributes. Moreover, Residential Advisors and Graduate Fellows are often too overburdened to effectively advise numerous freshmen. These groups should counsel first-year students within the functions of their positions and not have academic advising as one of their central roles.

The basis of a stronger residential advising system consists of an upperclass peer advising program. Freshman Advisors from all four undergraduate schools would live in first-year residences, have a list of advisees within their school, and perform the functions of present peer advising programs. In addition, a vital new function for these peer advisors would be to act as a source of introductory information and advice for undergraduates in other schools. Thus,
each advisor would serve as an information broker to all curious undergraduates in his residence.

While these students' responsibilities as advisors and their complementary training would vary according to school, it is imperative that all four undergraduate schools, not only the College of Arts and Sciences, attempt to implement such a residentially-based advising program in tandem. Although there may seem to be duplication with some schools' present "peer advising" programs, the novel function of providing preliminary advice to all students necessitates the presence of energetic peer advisors from all four undergraduate schools.

Career Planning and Placement

Career Planning and Placement is the University's greatest source of information on how to tie present studies to future options. However, few students learn to utilize the service until their junior year when more time needs to be spent solidifying plans. The evolution of Career Planning and Placement into a properly advertised advising resource will allow students to use all four years at Penn to develop career or graduate interests.

The current advertising of programs is flawed by its inconsistency. Only a portion of a target student population receives the mailings. Sometimes information does not reach a student until after an event has taken place. An ill-informed student population misses opportunities to develop coherent academic programs; therefore, Career Planning must effectively approach students through mailings and presentations. Reminders about workshops
and summer internships must be sent to students in time for them to benefit from the information. School mailboxes would be the best place for the dispersal of information. The utilization of mailboxes by the College of Arts and Sciences would greatly assist Career Planning in reaching students.

A student's first introduction to Career Planning should be through the advising booklet suggested earlier. In their battle to find a social niche, many first-year students neglect the opportunity to attend orientation presentations. Accordingly, refresher presentations should be held in upperclass dormitories to ensure that students understand the services offered by Career Planning. A particularly effective means of acquainting students with the varied services of Career Planning would be to have a "Post-Penn" fair on Locust Walk analogous to S.C.U.E.'s Course Majors fair. Since many students do not go into the Career Planning Office, they do not benefit from such publications as the "Pre-Health Guide" or the "Resume Guide." These publications are too important to be limited in their distribution. Through the information students receive from the fair, they will understand the scope of their undergraduate studies and the processes by which graduate studies and careers become reality. Once students receive information, they can formulate intelligent questions for advisors.

When students do arrive at the Career Planning office, they must be able to find the information they need. Currently, students hesitate to go to Career Planning citing the poor organization of the office as an impediment. An information center could be established in the reception area containing explanations of services as well as all
recent publications and mailings. A separate area should be set aside for students to research summer job opportunities to prevent office congestion and the ensuing confusion.

Aside from dispersing information, Career Planning occupies an important place in the advising infrastructure of the University. Advisors suggest courses of study and assist students in developing and attaining future goals. If Career Planning follows the departmental model of advising, students will be better directed toward these goals. Advisors for specific undergraduate preparatory academic programs must keep records of the students they advise. Students could register as "pre-med," for example, either at the Post-Penn fair or in the CPPS office. These students should be placed on mailing lists so that they can receive all pertinent information that is not sent in general mailings. Students without distinct career goals and students interested in graduate as opposed to professional programs feel excluded from Career Planning. Undergraduates need to be assured that Career Planning's services extend to the entire student population.

**Office of Inter-School Study**

Despite the many programs the University offers to assist students in planning all stages of their academic career, an additional service could be developed which would eliminate many advising problems. Students whose academic concerns transcend the scope of a particular school should be advised in an office outside of the four schools. The advisors in this new office will answer questions concerning dual degree programs, transferring to another school
within the University or outside of the University, interdisciplinary programs that cross schools and study abroad possibilities. If advisors concentrate on these specific scheduling options, fewer students will receive erroneous information. Establishing a separate office to handle such concerns will eliminate confusion regarding which school or office should be consulted for answers to unusual questions. Waiting time will be diminished as fewer students will be competing in each school for limited time slots.

An advising infrastructure, if properly designed, supports the intellectual development of students. Students can formulate the most rewarding academic programs by utilizing advising services in conjunction with one another. Accordingly, individual advising services must define their role in terms of an integrated network. The efficacy of the overall program depends on a strengthening of the services of the component elements and the organization of an informative process. Once students know which services exist and when to use them, they will benefit from the intellectual guidance offered by the University.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>School Advising</th>
<th>Faculty Advising</th>
<th>Peer Advising</th>
<th>Career Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>• Encourage fulfilling requirements • Present scheduling options (i.e. dual-degree) • Distribute advising booklet</td>
<td>• Assign by interest • Stress mentoring aspect of interaction • Encourage an open-minded approach to academic planning • Review schedules</td>
<td>• In-residence advisors orient students to university advising system • School peer advisors assist students in planning schedules • Encourage participation in workshops</td>
<td>• Identify special interest students • Aggressively advertise programs and stress options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>• Advertise major workshops • Refer students to specific departments for major advising</td>
<td>• Assist students in selecting major. • Discuss ideas for independent study or research in field of interest</td>
<td>• Help students shape major choice • Direct students to proper advising services</td>
<td>• Identify special interest students • Refresher workshops • Hold &quot;Post-Penn&quot; fair each spring semester to present future options to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>• Mandatory meetings with students who have not selected a major or who are changing their major</td>
<td>• Discuss &quot;future&quot; requirements (i.e. major classes, resume, internships) • Encourage research or independent study • Check courses to ensure students on track to complete requirements</td>
<td>• Check courses to ensure students on track to complete requirements • Be available to answer questions</td>
<td>• Heavy advertising of all pre-professional and pre-grad school programs, summer job internship workshops, resume workshops, fellowships, etc. • Continue to identify special interest students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>• Check requirement status before fall term</td>
<td>• Assist students in attaining future goals</td>
<td>• Recruit peer advisors to serve on advising office feedback committees</td>
<td>• Continue informing students about career/graduate studies options</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residential Living

The establishment of a collegial living environment is essential in creating and enhancing a vibrant intellectual community at Penn. Although residences are not primarily academic centers, they cannot be void of intellectual vitality. Intellectual activity outside of the classroom complements and amplifies students' quest for knowledge; the residences provide a unique setting in which to combine academic and extracurricular exploration. We thus agree with the Working Group on Undergraduate Education's philosophy that the residences should be a vital fifth locus where students and faculty can foster intellectually stimulating and integrative activities.

SCUE urges the implementation of the Working Group's recommendations with one exception: the inclusion of non-residential components in student dormitories. A dynamic intellectual community will develop in the residences from its members' initiatives and their use of good facilities and services like study space, lounges, seminar rooms, electronic equipment, and so forth. Thus, the University should strive to include diverse groups -- faculty, graduate and professional students, and undergraduates -- within the residences while ensuring there is adequate space, facilities and core services in each dormitory. The present college house system is a shining example of the results of this fusion of actors and atmosphere. The presence of numerous advising offices, academic offices, and research centers in the residences will not facilitate the growth of a more cohesive and intellectual community of residents. We also believe there exists a danger in decentralizing
such services at an already factionalized campus. Our proposed residential advising system is one example of how the existing groups within residences can improve a system without such widespread and unnecessary changes.

Residences must meet the changing needs of Penn's diverse student body at all times throughout students' undergraduate years. Freshman residences must fully engage entering undergraduates into the University's intellectual climate while allowing students ample opportunity to shape their own experiences. Upperclass living must also guarantee students a positive experience by offering a greater variety of residential options. Upperclassmen deserve the same quality of living experiences as freshmen. Currently, many juniors and seniors believe they will have better living experiences in off-campus houses or apartments; the fact that sixty percent of them do live off-campus proves that the present upperclass residential experience is grossly deficient. We believe an implicit goal of upperclass living should be to prevent as many students as possible from moving off-campus and becoming multiply disengaged from campus intellectual life.

Freshman Living

The freshman residential experience is generally a positive one. Students share their learning experiences with many other freshmen and are effectively oriented into Penn's social network, while various support systems and environmental factors assist in the creation of functional communities within freshman residences. However, the
plethora of intellectual and cultural opportunities available both on and off campus is often not adequately conveyed to freshmen.

As key figures in many first-year students' experiences, Residential Advisors and Graduate Fellows must set the example in incorporating freshmen into Penn's academic and intellectual climate. The Residential Advisors must educate new students regarding existing intellectual opportunities and must plan intellectually-based group programs for their floors. At the same time, they must encourage each freshman to discover and explore his own interests.

Upperclassmen who do not hold official authority roles also live in all freshman residences. This upperclass presence is vital for first-year students; upperclassmen play a major although primarily informal role in advising and orienting freshmen to the University's policies and procedures. SCUE believes this system would be improved if more upperclassmen had defined positions in improving community life in first year-residences. One example of this movement is the recently established house manager system, another is our proposed peer residential advising system as previously discussed in this paper.

Students in the Harrison House Freshman Project have a radically different experience than their freshmen peers. They are geographically separated from other freshmen and the demands of apartment-style living are quite different from traditional dormitory life. Additionally, Harrison House sorely lacks lounges, study space and facilities in comparison to other freshman dorms. We believe the University should have as a priority the provision of collegiate dormitory space, not apartment space, for all of its freshmen. No
freshman should live in a high rise; there are sufficient other freshman living options to ensure that all students can have a successful experience without providing this option. The dominance of the high rises in Penn's upperclass residential experience provides ample opportunity for students to live in high-rise apartment buildings. Furthermore, those freshmen who truly desire apartment-style living can find similar options in low-rise buildings and some college houses. With minor changes, the other first-year residences can effectively absorb the number of freshmen currently living in Harrison House.

Some areas and floors of the Quadrangle currently have a high concentration of upperclassmen. If the numbers of upperclassmen in the Quadrangle were more limited but better distributed, more freshmen could be placed in the Quad at the expense of upperclassmen without decreasing the vital interaction between the groups. We therefore propose that the Quadrangle be made more exclusively a freshman residence and that a much higher percentage of the remaining upperclassmen have functions that specifically aid freshmen, such as House Managers and Residential Peer Advisors. These suggestions will allow more freshmen to live in the Quad while continuing to provide an opportunity for those upperclassmen who wish to be engaged in contributing to the freshman experience.

Upperclass Living

Very few students have memorable living experiences in the high rises. Many students feel that more and more undergraduates are moving off campus, and each year hundreds of sophomores,
having insufficient living alternatives, are herded into the high rises. Indeed, the rapid expansion of the Community Living Program and the annual deluge of applicants to the thriving College House System are proof that upperclassmen desire a residential and intellectual life generally absent from a standard high rise floor.

In our 1985 White Paper on Undergraduate Education, SCUE recommended the establishment of the Community Living Program. Today, we view the continued expansion of community living to be the primary short-term solution to the intractable problems of the high rises. Groups of friends living on the same floor greatly ease the environmental transition from a freshman residence to apartment living and has been rewarding to many participants. This program must accommodate all students who desire such small communities.

Living/Learning programs have also been extremely successful at breaking down the impersonal barriers of the high rises. Students, faculty and administrators are urged to collaborate on the creation expansion of these programs.

However, despite the success of these programs, the high rises have numerous systemic dysfunctions which cannot be overcome without substantial investments in renovation. Accordingly, we advocate a long-term approach to improving the upperclass residential experience. First, a series of traditional dormitory structures should be built as soon as possible. The benefits of well-planned dormitories that stimulate and facilitate intellectual exchanges are apparent from Penn's best residences as well as other
universities' successful residential systems. The ideal location for the construction of new residences would be Superblock.

In addition, substantial renovation and redesign could transform groups of high rises floors into upperclass college houses. Combining apartment-style living with faculty presence, better facilities and programs and other characteristics that have been proven successful would actuate an energetic and creative community of upperclassmen.

These changes would eventually enable upperclassmen to continue their generally rewarding freshmen living experiences while providing them with a sufficiently diverse range of upperclass living options. While these measures require substantial investment, the development of numerous types of quality residences for freshmen and upperclassmen will further invigorate the campus atmosphere and mark an important step towards the creation of a unique intellectual environment.
The Campus Center

The Campus Center offers one of the most exciting opportunities to improve student life at Penn in the nineties. It is a long overdue and avidly awaited building that can effect positive change on the Penn campus by acting as a center of communication and information. The center will facilitate communication among all members of the university community through consolidation of existing resources. In turn, consolidation will foster greater use of the resources because people will find them easily accessible. The combination of both social and study spaces will enhance intellectual life outside the classroom and encourage interaction between all members of the Penn community, thus stimulating the communication necessary to make the One University philosophy a reality.

With the construction of the Campus Center, the administration demonstrates its commitment to addressing student needs. However, this building should not be the sole student space on the Penn campus; instead, it must lay the foundation for the development of other student spaces. Like the Campus Center, these spaces should offer students the opportunity to pursue social and extracurricular activities along with their intellectual interests.

In accordance with the Campus Center Advisory Committee, SCUE emphasizes the need for "necessary spaces" in the Campus Center. The growth in demand for student offices, study areas and recreational facilities has far out-paced construction in recent years.
The building of the Campus Center has the potential to remedy this situation. The strain on current facilities has been exacerbated by the lack of consolidation of student space. The Campus Center will be a hub of student activities.

The Campus Center's most important role is that of a center of communication. Communication can be facilitated in a variety of ways. Centralization of student offices provides student leaders with an opportunity to network with one another. In addition, networking will be fostered by the location of the *Daily Pennsylvanian* staff within the Campus Center; reporting will be facilitated by the *Daily Pennsylvanian's* proximity to its student sources. The newspaper functions as a key element of communication on campus and should be a vital part of the campus center.

Most importantly, the Campus Center will provide all students with an area for open communication with one another. In this setting, undergraduates, graduates, alumni and faculty can learn from each other. In providing a place for dialogue, the Campus Center makes its most significant contribution to the intellectual environment at Penn; by virtue of shared space, ideas are also shared. Because of its proximity to Graduate Towers and the Law School, the Campus Center provides the ideal location for graduate and undergraduate student interaction. Similarly, foreign students will be drawn in from International House. Additionally, the Campus Center is an easy walk from the Faculty Club, and with the proliferation of services located in the new building, it can be expected that faculty too will 'hang out' at the Campus Center. As a
catalyst for this interaction, a special events committee (possibly a subcommittee of SPEC) should be established to organize gatherings at the Campus Center, such as a student-faculty coffee hour. As part of this vertical integration plan, we also advocate the inclusion of a campus pub. SCUE does not support underage drinking nor do we ask the University to encourage a boisterous atmosphere. Such a place would provide a safe, relaxed environment which would attract the diverse groups of people that the Campus Center will serve while stimulating intellectual discourse.

If communication is one half of the Campus Center’s role, the other is that of an information center. The Center must provide students with student support services as well as information about upcoming academic, social and cultural events. SCUE suggests the inclusion of bulletin boards for each matriculating undergraduate class and for each of the university’s graduate schools. Furthermore, College students should be given mailboxes in the center, much like those that now exist in the Wharton, Nursing and Engineering Schools. As part of the One University program, Wharton, Nursing and Engineering mailboxes should be moved to the Center. These mailboxes will give students personal impetus to frequent the building. The inclusion of student support services in the center is also key to its success as part of an information network. A fairly complete list of support services was included in the Campus Center Advisory Committee’s report; in addition, an auxiliary Public Safety outpost should also be established in the center as part of this network. The consolidation of information and services will result in a spiral effect that increases their use.
In this network of communication and information, academics must play a key role. The Campus Center should bring together spaces for study, socializing and extracurricular activity. The Vice Provost for Libraries has requested that a reserve room be included in the campus center. Such a place is necessary to encourage academic study in a social environment by acting as an alternative to Rosengarten. In addition to this larger study space, smaller study rooms like the tutorial rooms in Van Pelt Library provide for group work that increases social and intellectual interaction among classmates.

Because the Campus Center cannot be physically located in the heart of the campus, both structural and psychological bridges must be built to join it to the existing centers. For example, associating the Campus Center with Annenberg will help to integrate the Campus Center with the current hub of campus. This relationship will provide needed space for performing arts groups. The Campus Center Advisory Committee is correct in its assertion that Annenberg must give student performing groups priority over professional groups during peak periods. Performance space is a necessity and the student center will fail in one of its primary functions if the lack of space is not rectified.

Funding for the Center remains controversial. One proposal suggests that if adequate funds cannot be raised, the Center should be built in stages. The Student Committee on Undergraduate Education vehemently opposes such a suggestion. The purpose of the Campus Center is to centralize communication and provide student groups with necessary facilities. Accordingly, completing part of a
building would only contribute to the decentralization of and lack of communication between student groups. The Campus Center is essential for communication, intellectual discussion and social activity. A partially completed building would reveal a lack of commitment to these things. Money collected from the "Campaign for Penn" fund drive could be earmarked for the Center to make the complete plan a reality.

The importance of security in conjunction with the Campus Center can not be overemphasized. Students must feel confident both walking to and from the Campus Center and once inside it. Currently, security within Houston Hall is lax and presents a persistent problem for students, especially at night. It is reasonable to assume that without strict security measures, the comfortable surroundings of the Campus Center will attract people who are not members of the Penn Community. The inclusion of retail stores in the Campus Center prevents restricted access during business hours. However, once the stores have closed, access to the Center must be restricted so that students can enjoy a secure atmosphere. Services such as a walking escort service and a regularly scheduled escort van departing from the Center will also encourage students to use the building comfortably at night.

During the writing of the Campus Center Advisory Committee's report, only four students sat on the committee. These students were all upperclassmen who will be unable to follow the project through its developmental stages. In order to correct this situation, each class and each school should be represented on the
development committee. This will help all students to form a long-term commitment to the Center.

As the Campus Center is integrated into University life, some campus traffic will be redirected. Students from the Quad will move across Thirty-Sixth and Thirty-Seventh streets to get to the Center. Hill House residents will use Walnut Street and High Rise residents will have the choice of using either Locust or Walnut Streets to get to the new building. The desirability of King's Court and English House as residences can be expected to increase because of their proximity to the Campus Center. As a result, campus traffic will increase on Walnut Street; however, unless Walnut Street is also made into a pedestrian mall, we expect that Locust Walk and College Green will remain the focal point of the campus. In the long term, the Campus Center should act as a foundation of development, since it will not and should not become the only center of campus life. Other building blocks are and will remain necessary to help consolidate the Penn community. An example of such a space is the Underground Cafe in High Rise North. Such facilities will not compete with the Campus Center; rather they will continue to serve a variety of needs throughout the campus.

The Campus Center has enormous potential to contribute to the improvement of community life at Penn. However, the success of the Center will be largely determined before the physical foundation is set. In consequence, we must first strive to lay a mental foundation through the establishment and prioritization of our goals. Because the building is located to the north of the campus, in an area
relatively free of off-campus housing, the Campus Center must become a focal point of University life by virtue of the events and services located within its walls. Students must be presented with an aesthetically pleasing and safe environment that offers communication and information resources. In this way, the Campus Center will become a hub of University life.
Philadelphia Opportunities

The University promotes the city of Philadelphia as one of its greatest attributes from the moment high school seniors receive Penn's application until students actually arrive on campus as freshmen. Philadelphia is highlighted throughout the admissions application, glorified in various promotional videos, and cited as one of the reasons to choose Penn over other institutions of equal academic caliber. Despite such positive promotion, little is done to ensure that students discover the myriad of ways to utilize the city. Students are aware of only a limited number of avenues through which they can explore Philadelphia's resources. The problem is two-fold: appropriate programming does not exist, and students are not encouraged to use what is presently offered. Until the University undertakes the incorporation of Philadelphia's opportunities into all applicable areas of the University, these problems will persist.

When a student matriculates at the University of Pennsylvania, he should feel that he has become a member of the Philadelphia community. Students should complete their undergraduate years confident that they have become familiar with a different part of the country, gained a greater appreciation for the challenges faced by a large urban environment, experienced a new lifestyle and been exposed to people with diverse backgrounds. Even students who have not travelled far to come to Penn, should learn to view Philadelphia from a fresh perspective. Full integration of Philadelphia into the undergraduate experience makes this possible. Real-life experiences enrich a student's education by complementing
knowledge gained through academic pursuits. The University's location presents the opportunity for students to apply academic principals to their surroundings while enhancing their potential for personal growth.

The University must bolster its efforts to assist students in applying theory to practice. Currently, the support for city internships, field placement in courses, independent study and research projects in Philadelphia is limited on the undergraduate level. Programs cannot be successful unless they are properly publicized and encouraged. For example, students rarely take advantage of the internship offered by the Political Science Department, because few undergraduates know it exists. In contrast, the Urban Studies Department requires its majors to participate in a well structured internship program. This program should serve as a model for similar options in areas such as economics, regional science and civil engineering.

In areas of study where city internships are not possible, efforts should be made to relate theoretical knowledge to practical experiences. For example, Art History 101 sponsors recitation trips to the Philadelphia Museum of Art. Though a few departments such as Art History make efforts to utilize Philadelphia's resources, existing programs should be expanded and new ones created in areas where none presently exist. Certain upper level Wharton courses involve students in assisting West Philadelphia's small businesses. However, for the majority of Wharton students who do not concentrate in disciplines that offer such activities, practical applications of their knowledge remain unknown. Introductory
level classes in subjects such as management and marketing could easily incorporate readings on companies located in Philadelphia where students could supplement their knowledge through first-hand research. Fieldwork is essential, because the combination of theoretical discussions and practical experience results in a unique and meaningful educational experience.

Students at the University are not fully aware of the opportunities available in Philadelphia. Not only is there a lack of information, but students do not receive the proper incentives to utilize the city and thus broaden their undergraduate experience. The University must assume a leadership role in providing information and encouragement to students. This can be accomplished in a variety of ways.

For most students, professors serve as the main representatives of the University. Therefore, professors provide an effective means to convey priorities to students. If a professor suggests visiting a particular exhibit downtown, or attending an afternoon seminar, the event automatically gains credibility in the students' eyes. Instructors can be positive role models for students, encouraging their use of Philadelphia's resources while simultaneously providing valuable information.

To increase awareness of Philadelphia events, the University must create a comprehensive information center. This center should include current information on cultural events, recreational activities, and opportunities which may be relevant to academic pursuits. Ideally, the academic opportunities should be submitted by individual departments and faculty members. The information could
be displayed on a large wall calendar, a copy of which would be available to students. The center should also provide logistical details such as transportation and ticket information for cultural events. A central location, such as the proposed Campus Center, is necessary for accessibility. Moreover, visibility implies strong support from the University. In the meantime, the Funderberg Center will hopefully be a major step in this direction. Eventually, the University must provide a center designed for students in a location where they will encounter it on a daily basis.

Advertising events in the *The Daily Pennsylvanian* would further contribute to the dispersal of information. Creating an "Off-Campus Events" section next to the existing Campus Events section present this information in a highly visible format. *The Daily Pennsylvanian* could also provide more varied coverage of the City's opportunities on a weekly basis, possibly as a part of 34th Street. The University must allocate the necessary funds. As the on-campus information is submitted by student groups, city-wide events should be covered by the staff of the previously proposed information center.

Widespread publicity of events is vital if students are to take advantage of what Philadelphia has to offer. Individual departments should have bulletin boards displaying information on appropriately related upcoming city events. Departments should also incorporate information into newsletters that would be mailed to all majors and minors, given to professors to disburse in related classes, and made available both at the department office and at the previously proposed information center.
New students represent the most receptive audience to the messages the University chooses to convey. Accordingly, a Philadelphia information table should be a well-developed part of CUPID to expose students to Philadelphia's diverse offerings from the beginning of their years at Penn. Past efforts have been extremely inadequate. The people manning the table have not been knowledgeable about Philadelphia, and information has been limited to a small number of brochures. The information provided should include a calendar of major Philadelphia events, such as Super Sunday and coming art exhibits, city maps and comprehensive SEPTA guides, and a wide range of brochures highlighting Philadelphia's vast attributes. Furthermore, the table should be staffed with people knowledgeable about Philadelphia and able to answer questions concerning the provided information.

Another effective method of reaching new students is to provide them with a Philadelphia information packet during new student move-in. The packet should contain information describing the key sites of Philadelphia as well as directions and expected costs. Having the information distributed within first-year residences would give Residential Advisors a convenient way to open discussion concerning the available opportunities in Philadelphia.

Numerous Penn students spend their summers in Philadelphia working and taking classes. The existence of summer programs focusing on opportunities available in both work and pleasure would be an ideal means of highlighting what Philadelphia has to offer. CPPS should organize structured summer internship programs with companies, organizations, and agencies located in Philadelphia. At
the same time, the University should sponsor programs designed to expose Penn students to the wide range of cultural activities available during the summer. Such summer programs would be an effective means of encouragement, offering constructive opportunities in a low-pressure environment where they may be fully utilized.

In order to encourage valuable work experience during the school year, the University must drastically increase its support for off-campus work study. Hundreds of meaningful positions are available throughout the city, yet students are unaware of them. Departments and faculty members should be encouraged to provide students with opportunities to work off-campus or do an internship in a major-related field. For the program to be successful, the University must provide financial support to offset the costs incurred in working off-campus.

On the curricular level, steps should be taken to develop additional courses offering students the chance to have direct field experience within an academic framework. Internships for academic credit, such as those in Urban Studies, should be increased in number. A denial of this non-traditional form of learning is an underutilization of the University's location and its relationship with Philadelphia.

The benefits of the University of Pennsylvania's proximity to a major urban center are expounded upon in the school's recruiting materials, but little is done to help students reap these benefits once they arrive at the University. Philadelphia provides innumerable ways for students to complement classroom knowledge with learning.
obtained through work experience and related activities. Creating direct links between academic studies and the real world adds yet another dimension to the intellectual environment on campus as students are given the chance to understand various disciplines beyond the confines of the Ivory Tower. Therefore, Philadelphia's resources must be used more effectively to enable each student to benefit from an environment rich with opportunities. Intellectual growth can be enhanced through academic as well as professional and cultural experiences. Exposure to Philadelphia can enrich these three aspects of an undergraduate's educational experience; the University must play a more active role in ensuring that this exposure occurs.
Study Abroad Programs

As an increasingly popular curricular option, alternative study programs deserve careful evaluation. The Office of International Programs (OIP) assists students in selecting domestic and international Penn and non-Penn sponsored programs. When examining these programs, three issues need to be addressed. First, though innumerable options exist, the University favors Penn-sponsored programs by instilling inherent curricular advantages in these programs; the pre-approved credit aspect of the program enables students to complete Penn requirements while studying outside of the University. Second, discrepancies in the promotion of Penn and non-Penn programs lead students to select Penn programs without investigating any others. Third, students find it difficult to structure the course of their alternative study program around the requirements of the Penn curriculum.

The Transfer of Courses

One of the basic principles each student must consider when planning to study beyond the Penn campus is how to guarantee the transfer of credits. As stated above, there is a distinct difference between those programs sponsored by Penn and those which are not. Currently, the University has pre-approved the transfer of credits for approximately twenty "Penn sponsored" programs. This approval facilitates these study abroad opportunities, and leads to greater demand for Penn-sponsored programs.
However, for non-University sponsored programs, difficulties in transferring credit impede participation in these programs. Presently, credit must be approved on an individual basis by department and each student must take the initiative and complete a complex process of securing credit without any administrative assistance. Correspondence between departments concerning the approval of credits would simplify the process and reduce student confusion. Efforts should be made to correct these inequalities since many non-Penn opportunities have significant price, quality or locational advantages over Penn-sponsored programs for students.

Establishing and promoting, pre-approved, non-Penn programs would equate the opportunities afforded by each type of program. While transfer credits for every program Penn students participate in cannot be pre-approved, the authorization of a group of non-Penn programs by departments, as many as possible, would increase students' access to these programs. A database of such approved programs, as well as those in which students have participated in the past, should be available in the Office of International Programs. Once a program has been included on the database, it must remain there until the department decides to remove it. In addition, departments should advertise these programs as authorized and increase students' awareness of alternative study programs.

One separate issue which must be addressed is that of non-Western study. These programs have suffered from a lack of recognition and publicity. The University should examine and encourage non-Western study abroad in order to foster exploration of these historically neglected cultures. Many non-Penn programs
exist in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It is imperative that the OIP present a growing list of options for non-Western study regardless of whether or not it chooses to create new Penn programs in these regions.

The Office of International Programs

The Office of International Programs is a center replete with information which, if properly organized, will better facilitate participation in alternative study programs. First, the office should be moved to a more visible and accessible location, such as the Campus Center. Internal enhancements will also facilitate the use of the office. First, a librarian such as that within Career Planning and Placement should be available to keep general information current and to direct students to the appropriate resources. Considering that between 800 and 1000 undergraduates express interest in alternative study programs and require advising each year, more staff members should be available to counsel undergraduates. Finally, undergraduates are often confused by the fact that international students studying at Penn use the office as well. It would be helpful to designate an area of the office specifically for Penn undergraduates considering alternative study programs.

The office must improve their methods of advertising programs. Currently, many students find pertinent information on bulletin boards scattered throughout campus and are not aware that this information is distributed by the Office of International Programs. Students should learn about the office’s functions early in their academic careers; our proposed Advising Booklet would be one
effective source of introductory information. The office should also coordinate presentations each semester to assist students in researching and choosing alternative programs, and acquaint them with the services provided by the office.

Curricular Impositions on Study Abroad

The general and major requirements of the four undergraduate schools and their departments impose restraints upon students wishing to study outside the University. Many students do not fulfill enough of their requirements within their first two years to study away from the University during their third year. As previously mentioned, these concerns are heightened by fears of not being awarded credit for non-Penn programs.

Students should be alerted early in their careers that if they plan to study outside of Penn, they must attempt to fulfill as many requirements as possible during their first two years. Unfortunately, most students do not realize the importance of developing a coherent schedule that will allow sufficient latitude to study outside the Penn curriculum. The Office of International Programs and advisors in each school must emphasize the importance of fulfilling general requirements and choosing a major before selecting an alternative study program.

The University should make a concerted effort to increase awareness of the diversity of educational opportunities available both nationally and internationally. Non-Western programs should be especially emphasized. Improvements in the Office of
International Programs will assist students in planning alternative courses of study, as will simplifying the credit transfer system. By creating opportunities for integrated on campus study with programs outside the University, the intellectual experience of students will be greatly enhanced.
Community Service

The role of community service activities at the university level has largely been acknowledged in terms of emotional benefits to students, such as feelings of accomplishment, increased connections to the surrounding community, and a greater awareness of social problems. These results are important and beneficial, yet a primary focus on them detracts from the expanded role that community service activities that are tied to the intellectual life of the University can and should play. A different model of community service focuses on emotional benefits to students as well as on intellectual benefits to students, increased benefits to the people whom they serve, and a true fulfillment of the University's responsibilities of research, education and service, as stated in the University's charter. The following pages will explore this model and provide recommendations for its implementation.

Current community service activities at Penn involve such efforts as tutoring, working in soup kitchens, raising money for various foundations, and volunteering at nursing homes. These activities are valuable and provide for relief of immediate needs. However, students should be encouraged to develop more of a long-term problem-solving orientation; that is, they should begin thinking about and participating in the processes that will address the causes of socioeconomic problems as well as the symptoms. Community service might be extracurricular, but it should not be extra-intellectual. Students should be encouraged to make the connections between theories that they learn inside the classroom and the people and problems that they confront outside of the classroom. Without
the ability to make those connections, to apply what they have learned, the knowledge that they acquire is useless.

Before exploring how the University can facilitate the integration of service and intellectual growth, let us examine why the University should do so. Universities have a tripartite mission: education, research, and service. The third facet, service, can take a number of forms, including the production of knowledge and the development of knowledgeable citizens. Certainly the discovery of a cure for cancer, or any other technique to alleviate human suffering, is a service to the University community and to society; yet this type of service involves undergraduates minimally at best. Correspondingly, this section will focus on service that can be done by undergraduates while they are undergraduates, and references to the three missions of the university will include service in this context. We are not suggesting that participation in community service become mandatory; rather, we hope to see the community service at the University more respected, more intellectually stimulating, and more available for those who desire it.

It is through the integration of its three missions that the University best fulfills each; they should not be regarded as separate but as integrally interconnected. Let us look at the classroom first. By focusing, where possible, their research on the real-world problems of the surrounding community, University professors bring to life the abstract theories discussed in the classroom. Students are more engaged when they can see the relevance of what goes on inside the classroom to what goes on outside the classroom. For example, Penn students who participate in programs at nursing
homes can connect their experiences with the study of fragmented service delivery systems and changing family structures, while volunteers who serve the homeless could bring their experiences to bear on their urban redevelopment studies. Second, the surrounding communities could benefit from the recommendations from such an integration of research and education. Under the supervision of their professors, students who have studied an issue extensively in theory and examined program models that address the problems might be able to serve as educational resources for community members. Third, professors who engage in real-world, problem-based research, and who use that research to illuminate disciplinary theories for students, conduct better research for several reasons. Community members are not very likely to be honest with researchers if they know that they are merely subjects to be examined. If they know that they are partners in a process that will involve the use of research to serve their needs, however, they will be more willing to open themselves up to researchers. If Penn fails to channel a larger proportion of its research in this direction, it will relegate itself to the ranks of the urban observatories of the 1960's, which regarded cities and their inhabitants as laboratory specimens to be observed, not helped, and which failed to produce any valuable research. For all these reasons, the University should give serious attention to the synthesis of community service and intellectual growth through the integration of its three missions.

Although integrating research, education, and service facilitates students' intellectual growth, the degree to which this is true differs from discipline to discipline. Majors like Urban Studies provide
abundant opportunities for the integration of service and learning, while business students might be able to integrate skills acquired through their discipline with service, such as accounting students' helping people to fill out tax forms. Some disciplines, such as mathematics, may not be able to offer many opportunities for the connection of course material and community service. Recognizing these differences, this section will concentrate on those disciplines that do.

There are a number of steps that the University can take to fulfill its three-part mission. Faculty, the administration, and students will have different roles. First, there should be more classes that illuminate and encourage the development of the intellectual aspects of community service within the classroom. The innovation and impetus for the development of such programs must originate with the instructors themselves. We urge more professors to orient some part of their work around real-world problems, such as unemployment among minority youth, depletion of the rain forests, and national health insurance. Such work provides students with concrete applications of theories and concepts that are all too often lifeless and sterile. In particular, we urge professors to focus some part of their work and their teaching around communities in West Philadelphia. There are a number of reasons for this recommendation. Because the University is located in West Philadelphia, students and faculty could become involved in community research and service more easily if they focused on West Philadelphia rather than on Appalachia, Los Angeles, or Brazil. Additionally, if executed sensitively, service-learning programs could
deepen students' understanding of the larger community in which they live, provide services to community members, and improve the University's relationship with the surrounding neighborhoods. In some disciplines, a community-issue orientation will provide researchers with a human framework within which to test the validity of their theories. Because of the trust between researcher and subjects that service-based research fosters as discussed above, researchers will have the opportunity to develop and test their ideas for validity in real-world situations and with real people. Service-oriented research yields results that can withstand the rigors of intellectual discourse because they were tested in the more exacting arena of the real world. Additionally, because of the involvement and motivation that participation in such work promotes, students might be more willing than usual to devote energies to their professors' research and area of interest. The faculty as a whole should make explicit the connections between intellectual pursuits and real-world problems; they should encourage students to relate for themselves their course work and their service activities. Service-oriented research, and, in particular, that which focuses on the surrounding community, thus helps to reduce the artificial division between academic endeavors and life outside the university.

All departments and schools need to help their students develop an awareness of how their studies will impact on the larger society and on real people. Faculty members who do not wish or are not able to devote an entire course to community-based concerns can nevertheless help students to make the connections more concretely between class discussions and the events and people in West
Philadelphia and other communities. Discussions of this type can surely evolve from almost any class's syllabus; such discourse should not be seen as exclusive to a particular discipline or school. The faculty as a whole should make explicit the connections between intellectual pursuits and real-world problems; they should encourage students to relate for themselves their course work and their service activities. For example, seniors in the Engineering School could have as an option for their senior project the design of physical therapy equipment for nursing home residents and accident victims, or an energy efficiency analysis of low-income housing. Proposals such as these must receive as much respect and encouragement as those for solar-powered cars. Wharton students could act as consultants to small businesses in West Philadelphia, or perhaps give seminars on health insurance plans and filing income tax returns. If students are not encouraged and helped to apply their knowledge in real-world situations during their undergraduate years, they may find themselves unable to do so in the course of their professional lives; their theoretical knowledge will prove to be of little use. Integrating service, learning, and research provides one of the best ways to prevent this from happening.

In addition to devoting their classes or a portion of their classes to service-oriented research, faculty should make themselves available to student service groups. This facilitates increased faculty-student interaction while serving to help students examine their service efforts in an analytical, intellectual light. This and the previous suggestions are not meant to be expansions of faculty members' roles so much as a re-definition of their roles. We do not
wish to add service as a component of faculty responsibility; rather, we wish to integrate it as much as possible into their more explicitly acknowledged roles as instructor and researcher.

The administration also has some key roles to play in adding an intellectual dimension to community service. It must support faculty in encouraging service-oriented intellectual pursuits both inside and outside of class. Additionally, support for service could become an integral part of the Penn atmosphere. This does not have to mean that service becomes expected so much as respected. By publicly supporting community service as well the integration of intellectual pursuits and community service, the administration can cultivate the perception as well as the reality of the University as a place where those students who wish to do so can pursue the loftiest of intellectual achievements in tandem with the service of humanity. Benjamin Franklin's life provides us with one of the best examples of the integration of this goal; the University should keep his promise by helping to develop more examples.

The administration might also want to consider devoting a section of the admissions catalog to the many service activities at Penn. Making potential students aware of Penn's unique opportunities to integrate service and learning could only benefit the University.

Students have a great deal of responsibility for improving community service activities at Penn. First, students must become more aware of their potential to address the roots as well as the symptoms of social problems. They must begin to see the links between the work that they do in soup kitchens today and the
impact on socioeconomic policies and programs that they will have in the future. This may be facilitated by developing a more comprehensive perspective, one that minimizes disciplinary boundaries and the separation of the classroom and extracurricular activities. As discussed above, faculty are critical to students' success in this area.

Second, students must seek to develop a greater sensitivity to the people with whom they work. Here, too, the integration of intellectual with service pursuits proves key. Students who work with people of different races, economic backgrounds, and educational levels must realize that the social dynamics of such relationships are complex. The social theories and awareness that are (or should be) discussed in class must be brought to bear on the real-world situations in which student volunteers are involved. In light of the differences between themselves and community members, students must explore the possibility that their well-intentioned actions could be disruptive to the communities and people whom they wish to serve. Since this exploration is inherently academic, faculty, too, share the responsibility for students' development of an awareness of the effects of their service work. Additionally, students can evaluate theoretical concepts in light of their own experiences and observations, an opportunity that can greatly benefit students' analytical skills.

Third, the many students who participate in diverse service efforts must work together to develop a common focus. Student efforts alleviate a number of different needs and problems, but this diffuse focus may serve to isolate the groups from one another. This
is not to suggest that groups should relinquish their autonomy and merge, but rather to propose that student groups would better serve people by working together to develop mass consciousness of certain aspects of community service. First, the students' vision should focus on the communities with which they work not as impoverished wastelands in need of enlightened Penn students' generosity and omniscience, but on the community as needing some resources to augment its indigenous ones in its quest for empowerment. The role of the Penn student should not be characterized by noblesse oblige; rather, Penn students must become sensitive to the diversity of needs, perspectives, and values that exist within the West Philadelphia community, a community of which Penn is a part. Students must become aware of the the complex social implications of their involvement in communities that might be quite different from their own. With adequate sensitivity, Penn students can make valuable contributions to empowerment efforts in West Philadelphia as well as gain valuable insights and heightened self-esteem and self-awareness. Only by working together to develop and spread this consciousness can community service groups at Penn maximize their intellectual and emotional growth, as well as the positive effects that they wish to have on society. Some groups are currently working toward the development of a unified vision for community service groups at Penn. We recommend that other organizations that mobilize large numbers of students for service activities, such as fraternities, sororities, and residences, become involved in the consciousness-raising process. This effort must be as extensive as possible in order to insure success.
Students should come to recognize the interrelations of their diverse service pursuits and perhaps coordinate their efforts more closely so as to maximize their physical, human, and knowledge resources and, consequently, their effectiveness. This is not to suggest that the groups sacrifice any degree of autonomy, but to emphasize the advantages to the people whom they wish to serve of concentrating their efforts. By working together the various groups can see more clearly how their work fits into the larger whole; this awareness may lead students to begin exploring long-term solutions to the problems that they help others to solve.

Too often students' intellects and energies are downplayed in terms of their potential impact on real-world problems. While a student movement could not single-handedly eradicate poverty and inequality, students can make valuable contributions to their alleviation and eventual disappearance. What is missing is not students' desire to use their intellectual capacity in the service of others; it is the paucity of mechanisms and encouragement that would allow them to do so. By facilitating and supporting the integration of service, research and education, the University will actualize the tremendous potential that the Penn community has for effecting positive social change.
Conclusion

The SCUE 1990 White Paper is the culmination of a broad scope of ideas and proposals. We have attempted to present a discussion of the thought processes and justifications behind our ideas and to include variant opinions where appropriate. SCUE wrote this paper in the firm belief that the classroom sets the foundation for academic knowledge, but the pursuit of intellectual enrichment should not be confined to the classroom.

Our ultimate goal in publishing the White Paper is to spur discussion on topics relevant to undergraduate education. It is our intent that the University examine the issues presented in each section of the paper and commit to work with students for educational reform.

In accordance with SCUE philosophy, this paper is not an end in and of itself but the touchstone for future improvements. The Student Committee on Undergraduate Education awaits your comments and welcomes the opportunity to contribute to the intellectual growth of the Penn community.