Report on the Work of the Faculty Council on Undergraduate Education, 1984-85

In its second year of activity, the Faculty Council on Undergraduate Education continued to pursue initiatives that seek to bring more of the University's resources to bear on undergraduate education. The Council, chaired by the Provost and comprised of twenty faculty members and three students representing all of the University's twelve schools and the ex officio membership of the Vice Provost for University Life and the chairs of the key school curriculum committees, draws its mandate from President Sheldon Hackney's 1983 strategic planning document for the University, Choosing Penn's Future. The work of the Faculty Council has been re-emphasized in the latest planning document, Investing in Penn's Future, that focuses on undergraduate education as a priority area for support and improvement.

During its first year, the Faculty Council spent considerable time assessing Penn's existing strengths and resources in undergraduate education, studying programs at other institutions, and considering the larger context of the undergraduate experience itself in which academic concerns are only a part, albeit the most important. Not restricting its activity to deliberation, though, the Faculty Council undertook last year several specific initiatives including:

1. Development of a University-wide, interdisciplinary course in applied ethics.
2. Plan of a series of lectures for New Student Week organized around the theme "discovery and meaning in the arts and sciences."
3. With the advice of the faculty working groups and with the aid of informal consultations with individual faculty members, identified themes and course leaders to develop outlines for a series of new courses, that, as a set, would constitute an introduction to liberal learning at Penn for first- and second-year students.

These actions and other discussions set the stage for the Council's agenda this year. Regarding the first set of initiatives, the Faculty Council has:

1. Expanded, strengthened and re-offered the Ethics course. The Council sought to achieve greater continuity and organizational and intellectual strength for the course when it was offered again in Fall, 1984. This was achieved through the development of a customized text for the course, the involvement of a key faculty member as course coordinator to tie together the presentations of the visiting faculty (18 faculty representing 15 departments in 10 schools), and identification of a theme (ethical issues and dilemmas arising from gender-related concerns) that helped unite the weekly sessions.
2. Conducted the first "Discovery and Meaning" Lecture Series during New Student Week, 1984. Presenting "highlights from a community of great academic explorers," the Series introduced the Class of 1988 to five Penn faculty who shared with the students what they did, how they did it, and why. The lectures in the initial Series were: Leo Steinberg, History of Art; Henry Gleitman, Psychology; Al Rieber, History; Dorothy Brooten, Nursing; and Eli Anderson, Sociology. The lectures attracted an average of over 1000 students per session. "Discovery and Meaning II" will be offered for New Student Week 1985 and the Council is considering ways in which the Series can be carried on through the regular academic year.
3. Developed and implemented "The Human Experience" course set. Guided primarily by Irving Kravis, University Professor of Economics, this set of six courses (two each in the Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences) seeks to introduce students to the methods of inquiry and the scope of knowledge in principal fields of learning in the arts and sciences. The two Humanities courses ("Interpretation" coordinated by Wendy Stein and "The Self and Its Portraits" offered by Frank Bowman) are underway in the present term. During 1983-86, the other four, all of which are now being developed, will be scheduled. These include: "Stellar and Organic Evolution" presented by Ben Shen, Joseph Bordogna and Howard Brody; "The Organizations of Society" offered by Herbert Levine; and "Equality: An Interdisciplinary Approach" team-taught by Charles Kahn and David Hogan.

The Faculty Council recognizes the ambitious nature of this undertaking and the need to proceed cautiously. The immediate objective of the effort, namely, to design a course or two that would be offered on an experimental basis in Spring, 1985, has been achieved. The attractiveness and value of all of these courses might eventually lead to their being taken on an elective basis by a substantially larger proportion of the undergraduate population. If this is the case, the courses would be a significant step toward providing undergraduates with a common academic experience that would be shared by students across the University, no matter what their School or program.

Building on these initiatives and reflecting the range of concerns that it has addressed, the Faculty Council has also:

4. Developed programs supporting undergraduate research. Recognizing that research offers prime opportunities for involving faculty from throughout the University in undergraduate education in ways that build on Penn's special strengths as a research institution and noting that a research experience can make a significant contribution to a student's education, the Council seeks to encourage undergraduate research through:
   (a) the development of an Undergraduate Research Opportunities Bulletin.
   (b) the establishment of an Undergraduate Research Foundation.
   (c) the establishment of an Undergraduate Research Award Fund.

The latter has been accomplished through a $100,000 gift to the University for the expressed purpose of recognizing in a tangible way the value of undergraduate research for both students and faculty. Although details on these and other recommendations are forthcoming, both the Research Foundation and the Research Award Fund will be in place for the 1985-86 academic year.

Closely related to this effort has been the role of the Faculty Council in developing a successful $50,000 grant proposal to the Exxon Education Foundation to support academically-integrated, community-oriented, policy-directed research by undergraduates. This grant is administered through the Office of Community-Oriented Policy Studies, directed by Ira Harkavy, and will fund a program of summer internships.

5. Encouraged both the urban and international dimensions of the University: The former effort seeks to promote Philadelphia as a learning resource for undergraduates and is linked to the new faculty-student planning seminar on "University-City Relations." The latter is a multi-faceted undertaking that seeks to encourage foreign language and culture study, a recognition of the international dimensions of both the formal and informal curriculum, and study abroad.

6. Endorsed the development of a publication entitled The Academic Penn. As a counterpart to The Practical Penn, this publication will essentially be a user's guide to the academic resources and opportunities of the University that are available to undergraduates. The book will be prepared over the summer and distributed to all new students in the Fall.

At other sessions this year, the Council reviewed the Writing Across the University Program, academic advising, the SCUE White Paper on undergraduate education, and proposals supporting the establishment of interdisciplinary, interschool course arrangements, tentatively called "University Concentrations," that build on Penn's special strengths in the liberal arts and professional studies.

On these and other areas, the Faculty Council invites comment from the University community and encourages all those with innovative approaches to improving the quality of Penn's undergraduate experience to share them with the group.

— Paul Zingg, Coordinator, Faculty Council on Undergraduate Education
Report on the Work of the Faculty Council on Undergraduate Education, 1985-86

In its third year of activity, the Faculty Council on Undergraduate Education continued to pursue initiatives that seek to bring more of the University's resources to bear on undergraduate education and create a greater sense of shared academic experience amongst our students. The Council, chaired by the Provost, is comprised of twenty faculty members and three students representing all of the University's twelve schools and the ex officio membership of the Vice Provost for University Life and the chairs of the key school curriculum committees. Its mandate was set forth by President Sheldon Hackney in the 1983 strategic planning document for the University, Choosing Penn's Future, and was re-emphasized in Investing in Penn's Future which focused on undergraduate education as a priority area for support and improvement.

During its first two years (1984-86), the Faculty Council spent considerable time assessing Penn's strengths and resources in undergraduate education, studying programs at other institutions, and considered both the extracurricular and academic components of the undergraduate experience. These discussions set the stage for several specific initiatives, including:

1. An experimental University-wide, interdisciplinary course in applied ethics, offered in Spring 1984 and Fall 1985.
2. The Discovery and Meaning Lecture Series during New Student Week in 1984, 1985 and 1986 to introduce new students to the "process of discovery and the search for meaning" as they are exhibited in the research of Penn faculty.
3. The interdisciplinary "Human Experience" courses in Spring and Fall 1985, designed as a step towards providing undergraduates with a common academic experience to be shared by students from across the University.
4. Programs to support undergraduate research through:
   (a) An Undergraduate Research Opportunities Bulletin.
   (b) The Nassau Undergraduate Research Fund (financed by a gift to the University) to provide modest support for outstanding research proposals of undergraduates.
   (c) The Rose Undergraduate Research Award Fund (financed by a gift to the University) to recognize students and their faculty advisors for outstanding undergraduate research.
5. Encouraging the urban and international dimensions of the University through the Office of Community-Oriented Policy Studies and the University-City Relations Seminar.
6. Endorsing the development of a publication entitled The Academic Penn, an undergraduate's guide to the academic resources and opportunities of the University.

The ethics course and Human Experience courses (now coordinated by the College as part of the Freshman Seminar Program) have served as possible models for future curriculum development. The Discovery and Meaning series, Academic Penn and the forthcoming Emphases provide a variety of opportunities for undergraduates to orient themselves to the academic and scholarly resources of the University. Finally, the initiatives in support of undergraduate research will be fully launched by the initial selections of student projects and award recipients during the 1986-87 academic year.

Preprofessionalism

During 1985-86, the Council shifted its main focus from demonstrating the potential of curricular innovation to the University-wide issue of "preprofessionalism." When the education editor of the New York Times described Penn as "the East Coast's premier preprofessional institution," he highlighted both Penn's unique comparative advantage over other institutions and a serious problem in undergraduate and parental perceptions about the role of the liberal arts in preparation for professional study and careers.

In addressing this issue, the Council sought advice from each of the professional schools and a variety of professional associations in law, medicine, management, and other fields. It consulted with career and academic advisers and reviewed the growing research literature on the viability of liberal arts preparation for the preprofessional student. The Council concluded that:

1) Many students—and especially parents—misperceive the undergraduate prerequisites for admission to professional schools of management, law, and medicine.
2) Penn is unique as an undergraduate institution in the availability on one campus of courses offered by first-rank professional schools as well as an equally strong liberal arts college.
3) As a direct result, Penn has developed—and could further enhance—many academic options that allow students in both liberal arts and the professional schools to integrate the liberal arts and professional disciplines in their undergraduate experience.

Responding to these conclusions, the Council drafted and circulated to the entire University community for comment a statement on "Liberal Arts Preparation for Professional Study and Careers," which seeks to correct the common misconceptions of undergraduates and parents and to articulate the integration of liberal arts and professional disciplines as a hallmark of the undergraduate experience at Penn. After extensive revision based on the advice of faculty, staff and students, the document was distributed to incoming undergraduate students and their parents over the summer. Further distribution to continuing students and campus offices is planned for the coming year.

1986-87 Agenda

Building on the firm foundation prepared during the previous year, the Council plans to consider ways in which the perspectives outlined in last spring's statement can be better communicated and more effectively implemented throughout the undergraduate programs of the University. Among the issues for consideration this year will be:

1) Dual-Degree Programs. Many such programs already exist on campus. How well are they utilized? Do students and faculty participating in them receive adequate advise and support? Are new combinations desirable?
2) Cross-School Minors. Would it make sense to enhance our offerings that cross school lines? What are the obstacles to such initiatives? Should cooperative efforts with other specialized institutions or greater use of extracurricular enhancement be considered as ways to further the integration of liberal arts and professional disciplines?
3) Undergraduate-Graduate Combinations. Are joint admission arrangements for undergraduate and graduate professional programs at Penn desirable and workable? Are other forms of undergraduate-graduate combination possible as a means for enhancing the integration of liberal arts and professional education for undergraduates?
4) Common Undergraduate Experiences. Can additional or expanded lecture series, such as the successful Discovery and Meaning series during New Student Week, or other initiatives be undertaken to further enhance the sense of cohesion amongst undergraduates throughout the university and strengthen certain important commonalities and competencies that all students should derive from their undergraduate experience?
5) Research Initiatives. The ideal synergism of undergraduate teaching and scholarly research is often cited in opposition to the common view that these are competing priorities. Are there new and creative ways in which we can turn the priority of faculty research to the direct benefit of undergraduate education?

These are questions to be explored rather than programs to be implemented. In exploring them, the Council is eager to receive the advice of the entire University community. Comments may be directed to me (210 Logan Hall, Ext. 4719.) the Provost, or individual members of the Council.

—Stephen Steinberg, Coordinator,
Faculty Council on Undergraduate Education

See Page 5 for Undergraduate Research Funds
The following draft recommendations concerning the possible development of new undergraduate dual-degree programs have been prepared by the Faculty Council on Undergraduate Education. The Council is eager to receive comments and reactions from all segments of the University community, including students and faculty from both liberal arts and professional schools. Comments should be directed to the Council's Coordinator at the address below or to the Office of the Provost.

—Stephen P. Steinberg, Coordinator,
Faculty Council on Undergraduate Education, 210 Logan Hall/6304

Draft Recommendations for the Development of New Dual-Degree Programs

I. Introduction

Dual-degree programs in which students earn concurrent degrees in two schools of the University can be an effective and attractive mechanism for enhancing the interaction of liberal arts and the professional disciplines in undergraduate education at the University of Pennsylvania. By permitting students to integrate academic work from both the liberal arts and a professional discipline or from several disparate professional disciplines, dual-degree programs both broaden a student's intellectual horizons—without sacrificing depth—and permit enhanced undergraduate preparation for a career, profession or post-baccalaureate study.

Such programs also appear to be particularly attractive to the very best of Penn's potential students, who are both well-qualified and successful across a wide range of activities. These students will perform well in almost any activity they undertake, and because of their breadth and competence, they are often unsure as to the particular direction they wish to pursue during their undergraduate years. As a result, they often seek an unusually stimulating and challenging undergraduate academic experience.

These programs will help Penn matriculate increasing numbers of the very best students it actually admits. They offer such students concrete opportunities to explore a wider range of disciplines during their undergraduate years, as well as provide stronger mechanisms to enhance the integration across schools and disciplines of liberal arts and professional expertise. Especially when focused on emerging interdisciplinary topics, such as the interrelations between management and technology or the nascent discipline of cognitive science, a dual-degree program can provide an ideal vehicle to more fully realize the spirit of the Faculty Council's policy statement of last spring. Thus, dual-degree programs, by fostering the integration of liberal arts and professional learning, can become both the concrete embodiment of Penn's One University philosophy and the realization of its "comparative advantage".

II. Criteria

The Council's discussions of existing and potential dual-degree programs and other cross-school initiatives have defined a clear set of criteria for their successful design and implementation. In particular, the following elements must be present in any successful effort to enhance our offerings in this area:

* A strong faculty "champion" for each such dual-degree area, preferably a faculty member holding appointments in both schools and with sufficient release time to take a strong role in program development and administration, as well as student recruitment and advising.
* Continuing financial support for the administration of each such program, preferably from a central University source.
* A clearly defined topical focus for each dual-degree program which articulates the intersection of two or more academic and professional disciplines.
* Provision for an administrative and advising focus for each program in a program-specific office setting.
* Close liaison with the Admissions Office in the recruitment of potential students.
* Strong advising resources for students in each program.
* Specialized courses which provide students with an opportunity to develop and articulate the integrative dimension of each dual-degree program.
* Support from individual schools and central administration for the institutionalization of such programs.

It is our belief that the following recommendations meet these criteria and provide a framework for program and financial development in this area.

III. New Topically Focused Dual-Degree Programs

We believe that five topical areas warrant intensive development both for dual-degree programs and as interdisciplinary subjects which will be of major importance in the years ahead. Each of these areas is one in which the University has either traditional or developing strength. Each cuts across existing academic disciplines. Each can be approached in such a way as to draw upon both liberal and professional disciplines. Each has merit both as a subject of academic study and in relation to the non-academic career interests of our students. Finally, in most cases these areas can be conceived as the focus of several dual-degree options, i.e., they link the liberal arts with more than one professional school or join various combinations of undergraduate professional curricula. (They might also serve as a focus for the development of new cross-school, interdisciplinary "clusters" within existing single-degree programs.) The following then are offered as prime examples—subject to addition, deletion or refocusing—for future dual-degree development:

1) Cognitive Science: Though a formal dual-degree program already exists in Computer and Cognitive Science, this area is included here because the existing program lacks the commitment and resources needed for its success. There is little question that the University brings to this area a world-class reputation and resources which cut across many of our academic programs. At the same time, Cognitive Science presents an opportunity for students to move into the forefront of technological development while bringing to that activity many liberal and purely academic resources.

(continued on page 4)
2) International Area Studies: As our world has shrunk, the increasingly regional nature of international life becomes ever more apparent. Both as subjects of academic study and as specialties to enhance professional activity in business, engineering, health, and many other fields, area specific knowledge and an understanding of its implications for professional activities is becoming increasingly crucial. Despite extensive resources in these areas, the University has failed to make these resources available in a coherent structure which permits their integration with the professional needs of non-liberal arts undergraduates.

3) Aging: Over the next half century, our country will face a profound demographic crisis as the baby boom generation ages and survives well beyond earlier standards of longevity. The support, care, and enrichment of life for this huge aging population will be the major social issue in the years ahead. The University is already uniquely well-placed with resources of the Center for Aging and the interdisciplinary Master of Arts in Social Gerontology—to address these concerns and link them to a wide variety of liberal and professional degree programs. The impact of aging on our economy, on health care, on the utility of a highly technologized society, and an understanding of the social, humanistic, biological, psychological, economic, historic, literary, and ethical issues raised by the phenomenon of aging will be essential to those of our students who will have to cope with the impact of this phenomenon in both their personal and professional lives. (This area might be addressed under a broader title, such as “The Human Experience” or “Life Cycle Studies” to enhance its attractiveness to undergraduates.)

4) The New Economy: The last decade has witnessed the beginning of a long-term transformation in the structure, activity, and impact of financial and economic markets, institutions, and deregulation. In the years ahead this transformation will be of interest, as is already evident, to many who in previous generations would have had little concern with economics or financial news and practices. This transformation will affect not only business, but every professional, policy planner, government official, and citizen. The development of an information-oriented, high technology, service economy will alter not only the requirements of professionals in these fields, but also the professional activities of engineers, doctors, nurses, lawyers and generalists of every stripe. The linkage of finance, economics, and economic history for those who will pursue professional lifetime outside of a business or financial context will be extraordinarily attractive during the years ahead.

5) Public and Urban Policy: The University has historically had very strong resources in the areas of public, environmental, and urban policy. Though these concerns have receded over the past 15 years from their early blossoming during the 60’s and early 70’s, it is clear that our society is about to pay a price for this neglect. As we confront the long-term impact of deregulation, reductions in federal expenditures, aging of the nuclear power industry, the deterioration of our urban infrastructures, and the weakening of environmental regulation, we can anticipate that these concerns may once again move to the fore. The cross-school linkage of resources from the Wharton School, Arts and Sciences, Engineering, and Nursing, supplemented by the Graduate School of Fine Arts, the Law School, Medicine, and specialized institutes provides a vehicle for the reintegration of now dispersed and relatively inaccessible resources and the articulation of their linkages to a wide variety of career and academic pursuits.

Each of these five areas has been broadly conceived so as to provide a focus for a possible multiplicity of dual-degree options. For example, the cognitive science dual-degree program may involve a major in philosophy, linguistics, or psychology in the SAS portion of the dual-degree. Similarly, in international area studies, a student may wish to specialize in the Pacific Basin, the Middle East, Africa, or Latin America and to link this interest with a career in engineering, international business, journalism, or health care. A dual-degree program in aging might link the liberal arts with Wharton for a student interested in a career in health care administration or with nursing for students more interested in direct care activities. Because each of these areas lends itself not only to a dual-school approach, but to a multi-school and multi-disciplinary approach, we feel that it is most cost effective to consider each as a framework in which a wider variety of cross-school patterns of academic activity might be conceived, developed and carried out. In this way, a single administrative and advising support mechanism may be utilized to foster a wider spectrum of inter-school combinations.

IV. Administrative and Advising Support

Because of the importance of providing adequate administrative and advising support in order to realize the integrative dimension of such dual-degree opportunities, the Council makes the following suggestions as to mechanisms whereby such support might be provided:

1) The faculty director of each program should have an appointment in more than one school to facilitate the integration of each school’s activities in the content of the program and avoid the establishment of an independent and separate curriculum. Naturally, the secondary appointment of a director (in a School other than the one in which she or he has a primary appointment) may follow rather than precede the organization of a dual-degree program. It may also be appropriate to utilize a Trustee Professorship to help support a dual-degree program area. A start-up funding should be provided to enable students to undertake the expanded curriculum that may be necessary to fulfill dual-degree requirements. Especially, if the SAS bachelor’s degree program is enlarged to 36 course units. In short, we should allow students who pay for four years of education, to receive a fifth year free in the context of a dual-degree program. Alternatively, free summer session enrollment might be provided to such students. If these options are deemed infeasible, we should make an extra effort in this context to assure students of the adequacy of our need-based financial aid packages to support an extended or enhanced undergraduate program.

2) Because of the commonality of administrative problems experienced in all cross-school activities, it may be sensible to consider the creation of a central University office to provide administrative support for such programs, to house the part-time faculty directors and to provide a focus for advising services. Such an office could serve as an advocate for such students with the Registrar, Bursar, Financial Aid, and individual schools, and avoid the “capturing” of dual-degree students by one school or another. It would provide a point of liaison with Publications and Admissions offices to enhance our recruitment activities, and be able to focus on such ongoing issues as the integrative character of the programs and the need to avoid “pushing out” liberal arts courses in programs that have a dual professional orientation. Such an administrative entity could also serve to support various other interdisciplinary and inter-school initiatives, such as cross-school “clusters” and graduate/undergraduate combinations.

Any administrative structure for dual-degree programs must be carefully structured so as to create and preserve a strong identity for each program and strengthen the support of each participating school through its active participation. Thus various combinations of centralized support and funding with school-based program direction should also be considered to preserve the strong identity and motivation needed to make such programs successful.

3) Start up funding for this initiative must come from supplemental sources in order to prevent a depletion of existing school resources for advising and program administration. Financial support should initially be provided on a centralized University basis. However, continuing support might be allocated by each school based on the percentage involvement of their students after an initial start-up period of perhaps 3 to 5 years.

4) The program should be provided with funds to finance curriculum development, though new courses should be processed through the existing school curriculum committees.

V. Implementation

It is clear that the resources necessary to effectively implement an expanded dual-degree program strategy would require a significant commitment of finances on the part of the University and/or priority consideration in any forthcoming development campaign. It is especially desirable and practicable to attract new funds for this purpose, since dual-degree programs should be a powerful fund raising vehicle.

It is evident from the requirements laid out above that a minimum commitment on the order of $1,000,000 over a five-year initial period would be necessary to bring this initiative to a point where it might have a significant impact both on the perceptions of potential students and become the hallmark of Penn’s “cooperative advantage.” It is our belief that such an allocation of resources would provide a stimulus to interdisciplinary and school activities which have long been the focal subject of a great deal of University publicity. The opportunity to bring these opportunities to concrete realization should not be missed.

*ALMANAC May 12, 1987*
An Undergraduate Research Requirement

The University of Pennsylvania is first and foremost a major research university. But it is also an institution with a strong commitment to undergraduate education. The contiguity of these two commitments suggests that undergraduate education at a great research university should be different—in ways related to research—from a small liberal arts college or an institution with more limited scholarly resources. Thus a corollary to Penn’s commitment to the creation of knowledge is the need to find new and creative ways to capitalize on its research strengths to the benefit of undergraduate education. This is among the most difficult issues that a large research institution can face. It requires that we not only open up research opportunities to undergraduates, but also deal with the widespread perception of a fundamental conflict between research and teaching. The following proposal is offered in order to stimulate discussion of this issue and to suggest one way in which we believe the research and teaching missions of the institution can be better integrated.

In recent years, the Faculty Council on Undergraduate Education and the four undergraduate schools have attempted to reduce the perceived conflict between research and teaching by fostering opportunities for undergraduates to engage in research as part of their academic experience. This enables them both to learn what it means to pursue a scholarly career and to enhance their exposure “in depth” to a particular discipline. The Nassau and Rose Funds have been created to support and recognize this kind of activity. We are also exploring the creation of an Undergraduate Research Opportunities Bulletin that would be a resource for students interested in such experiences.

The Council believes that serious consideration should also be given to the expansion of undergraduate research requirements in order to facilitate students’ understanding of the research orientation and commitments of the faculty, to engender a clearer understanding of the intrinsic linkage between the creation of new knowledge and its dissemination to students and peers, and to provide a hands-on experience in the research process as an enrichment of undergraduate majors and individual career preparation.

Over the long term, such a requirement would further enhance Penn’s academic reputation, and we know this to be the single biggest factor in recruiting the best students. It would also ensure that students learn to approach and work with faculty during their undergraduate years and thereby that they know faculty when in need of letters of recommendation.

The Council feels strongly that increased emphasis on research will only achieve these objectives if it is embodied in a formal requirement. In part, this is motivated by the desire to convey that research is part and parcel of the process of mastery in a major discipline. It would also convey to students that research is a risky, open-ended business, with no guarantee of outcomes. Unfortunately, few undergraduates take those risks unless required to do so.

Such a requirement could take many forms. It could be—as it now is in many departments—a requirement for graduation with departmental honors. Alternatively, some form of research project or major writing project could be a requirement (such as now exists in SEAS) within the major for all undergraduates in all of the University’s undergraduate schools. The Council’s consensus is that the latter variant—a universal research/writing project requirement—is worthy of serious consideration. It would serve to emphasize the role of research within the University, as well as to ensure that no undergraduate leaves Penn without having written a major research paper or engaged in a similarly-sized research project.

In particular, such a requirement would necessitate improved advising during the underclass years to guarantee that needed prerequisites are taken in a timely fashion. It opens up the possibility of utilizing Freshman Seminars to stimulate an early awareness of research opportunities. There may also be a need to enhance our support mechanisms for the development, coordination and facilitation of such research opportunities.

The implementation of a research requirement is, of course, a matter for the individual schools to consider, and involves issues about its relationship to their individual curricula and the structure of individual major programs. Indeed, the Council feels strongly that its specifics are best determined by individual departments.

Finally, the costs of such a requirement are real and will require the allocation of appropriate resources. However, the Faculty Council on Undergraduate Education wishes to urge the consideration of such a requirement upon the Council of Undergraduate Deans and the faculties of the individual schools. The Faculty Council looks forward to a continuing discussion of such initiatives as well as a dialogue with faculty and students about the broader relationship between research and teaching at Penn.

From the Provost

On Confidentiality of Peer Evaluations

I am writing to inform the University community of our recent efforts to maintain the confidentiality of peer evaluation materials generated in the tenure review process.

In September 1986, in connection with a pending charge of discrimination, the Equal Opportunity Commission (EEOC) issued a subpoena seeking, among other things, confidential peer evaluations obtained by the University in the tenure review process; the information sought related not only to the individual complainant in the case, but also to five other faculty members. The University petitioned the EEOC requesting that it give weight to the constitutional and societal interests inherent in the peer review process and, after balancing those interests, modify the subpoena to exclude confidential peer review information from its ambit.

On April 10, 1987, the EEOC denied the University’s request that it consider the constitutional and societal values at stake before demanding confidential evaluations. Instead, the EEOC refused to engage in any balancing whatsoever and insisted upon absolute and total disclosure of the peer review materials. The EEOC stated that it would commence enforcement proceedings against the University unless it complied with the subpoena by May 4, 1987.

The University is committed to a policy of nondiscrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, sexual or affectional preference, age, religion, national or ethnic origin or handicap. We recognize that there may be cases in which, after the academic interest in confidentiality is balanced against the requirements of an investigation, disclosure to the EEOC is appropriate. We believe, however, that the Commission’s refusal even to consider the First Amendment interests before ordering disclosure threatens the integrity of the tenure review process. Accordingly, on May 1, 1987, the University filed in U.S. District Court a complaint seeking to limit the automatic intrusion by the EEOC on confidential peer review materials.

The matter was, of course, fully discussed with the Dean of the School involved, who in turn consulted with members of the faculty. The Dean and those faculty members concur fully with this approach.
The Faculty Council on Undergraduate Education was formed four years ago to focus the attention and contributions of all Penn's schools —graduate and professional, as well as undergraduate—on the need to enhance the undergraduate educational experience. In Choosing Penn's Future, President Hackney charged the new Council with developing curricular options, instructional mechanisms, common academic experiences, and other forms of "purposeful experimentation" towards this end. He anticipated that "the result may well be another Pennsylvania first: sound and exciting options that take advantage of the diversity and richness of our academic community and produce a unique educational experience."

During its first two years, the Council focused considerable attention on developing new curricular options, such as the "Human Experience" courses which have now been incorporated into the SAS curriculum, and expanding support for undergraduate research activities. In its third year, the Council focused on the broadly defined issue of preprofessionalism at Penn and produced a well-received statement on "Liberal Arts Preparation for Professional Study and Careers" which sought to correct the common misconceptions of undergraduates and parents, and to articulate the integration of liberal arts and professional disciplines as one hallmark of the undergraduate experience at Penn. In particular, the Council concluded that many students—and especially parents—misperceive the prerequisites for professional study in management, law and medicine; that Penn is unique as an undergraduate institution in its ability to bring the resources of first-rank professional schools to bear on undergraduate education in concert with a strong liberal arts college; and finally, that Penn could further enhance the integration of liberal arts and professional disciplines in the undergraduate experience. As a result, the Council took as its primary focus over the past year the study of ways in which this integration could be more concretely implemented.

Integrating Liberal Arts And Professional Disciplines in Undergraduate Education

The Council considered three major approaches to further enhancement of the perspectives discussed in its statement on the integration of liberal arts and the professional disciplines throughout the undergraduate experience at Penn. In each case, it reviewed information on current programs and activities at Penn, discussed the rationale and assumptions involved, and reached the following conclusions regarding the desirability and feasibility of each alternative:

1) Dual-Degree Programs. Many such programs already exist on campus, though only one—the Management and Technology Program—appears to have reached the level of coherence and administrative support necessary to be truly effective, both educationally and as a vehicle for attracting the very best students to the University. The Council was impressed by the potential for new dual-degree programs to enhance the interaction of liberal arts and the professional disciplines and to convey what is best about Penn's "comparative advantage" in possessing such strong professional and liberal arts resources on one campus. As a result, the Council has published a set of draft recommendations for the development of new dual-degree programs (Almanac May 12, 1987) which call for the development of new dual-degree initiatives in five topically-focused areas: Cognitive Science, International Area Studies, Aging (Life-Cycle Studies), The New Economy, and Public and Urban Policy. Each of these five areas was broadly conceived so as to provide a focus for a possible multiplicity of dual-degree options. The Council recommended a substantial commitment of resources over a five-year period to ensure adequate administrative and advising support which is crucial to the success of any such initiative.

2) Cross-School Minors. A less ambitious way of furthering the integration of professional and liberal arts study at the undergraduate level is the creation of "minors" or "clusters" which allow students in any of the undergraduate schools to develop a secondary specialization in an area drawn from one of the other schools. While there are practical obstacles to the effective implementation of such a strategy, the Council felt strongly that its original recommendation in 1984 that a program of "University Concentrations" along these lines be instituted was correct. The Council renewed its recommendation to the Council of Undergraduate Deans to pursue the implementation of such topically-focused clusters available across school boundaries.

3) Undergraduate-Graduate Combinations. In reviewing current submatriculation and dual-admission policies (i.e., simultaneous admission to both an undergraduate and a graduate or professional program), the Council was particularly impressed by the potential for the University Scholars Program to expand its current role. With the assistance of the Undergraduate Admissions Office, the Council hopes that the University Scholars Program can come closer to the original projections of its size (10% of Penn's undergraduates) and scope, and thereby provide enhanced opportunities for exceptional undergraduate students to be attracted to Penn for an integrated undergraduate-graduate research experience. The Council felt that other initiatives along these lines, such as a joint B.A.-M.B.A. admission arrangement, should also be considered, as they enhance the perceptibility by potential students of Penn's comparative advantage. In particular, the Council felt a need to create and distribute better information on the wide variety of ways in which Penn students can combine professional and liberal arts education at both the undergraduate and post-baccalaureate levels. Our existing undergraduate-graduate linkages are not well-publicized or very visible.

Other Initiatives

1) Undergraduate Research. Two undergraduate research funds have been created (financed by two gifts to the University) at the initiative of the Council: the Nassau Undergraduate Research Fund to provide modest support for outstanding research proposals of undergraduates, and the Rose Undergraduate Research Award Fund to recognize students and their faculty advisers for outstanding undergraduate research. Thus, with the first cycle of awards from these funds, the Council's continuing initiative to further undergraduate research opportunities has reached a new level of realization. In reviewing these initiatives and considering the frequently misperceived relationship between research and teaching, the Council concluded that the University's fundamental research orientation and its strong commitment to undergraduate education combined to suggest that undergraduate education at a great research university should be different—in ways related to research—from other kinds of institutions. A corollary to this observation is the need to further capitalize on Penn's research strength to the benefit of undergraduate education. One way of doing so, the Council believes, would be the implementation of a University-wide undergraduate research (or major writing project) requirement. The Council has amplified and expressed this proposal in a statement for comment by the University community (Almanac May 19, 1987) and looks forward to a future discussion of this opportunity. The Council feels strongly that implementation of a research requirement during the senior year of a student's major program is the most effective way in which to overcome student misperceptions and draw more effectively on our research strengths.

2) SCUE Initiatives. During the course of the year the Council considered two reports from the Student Committee on Undergraduate Education. The Council was unanimous in its enthusiastic response to these student-originated attempts to focus serious consideration and discussion on the undergraduate experience. Though the Council felt that SCUE's proposal for a series of Provost Smith Seminars needed further discussion and development, it was particularly impressed with the recent SCUE report on "The Teaching of Undergraduates at Penn: Analysis and Recommendations". The Council looks forward to working with SCUE next year to implement many of the recommendations embodied in that document.
The Weiss Gift: Penn is the Key

University alumnus George Weiss and his wife Diane are providing a fund to guarantee a college education for the 112 students at the Belmont School at 41st and Brown who graduated from sixth grade this year. The students must graduate from high school and be accepted into a two-year or four-year college or technical training school to qualify.

In making the announcement to the students, parents, and teachers, Mrs. Weiss held up a football as her husband had planned to do. "I'm tossing this ball to you. You have the chance to take it and run with it—it's up to you." Mr. Weiss, president of the brokerage firm George Weiss Associates, of Hartford, Connecticut, graduated from the Wharton School in 1965. Because of a back injury he was unable to present his program that he has dubbed "Say Yes to Education" in person at the June 19 ceremony.

While Mr. Weiss was an undergraduate and president of Kappa Nu fraternity he tutored local students in math. He has been an avid supporter of Penn athletics including Mike Christiani, captain of the championship football team in 1982.

Dr. Constance Clayton, superintendent of the Philadelphia Public Schools and a Penn Trustee, said at the Trustees' Meeting that he has dubbed "Say Yes to Education" in person at the June 19 ceremony.

The Weiss' gift is in the tradition begun by Eugene M. Lang, a self-made millionaire who in 1981, returned to his elementary school in East Harlem to deliver a commencement address and promised to make it possible for each student who graduated from high school to attend college.

$1 Million Gift for Talmudic Civil Law Chair

A $1 million gift from the estate of the late Caroline Zelaznik Gruss has been made to the Law School to establish The Caroline Zelaznik Gruss and Joseph S. Gruss Chair in Talmudic Civil Law and an associated program in Talmudic civil law.

"Talmudic civil law reflects universal principles of justice and protection of the rights of the most vulnerable. It has played a substantial role in the development of the Judeo-Christian heritage that serves as a foundation of the Common law," said Joseph Gruss.

Income from the endowment will be used to attract to the Law School a renowned scholar and teacher in Talmudic civil law, and to support three public lectures a year as part of the program associated with the chair.

The holder of the Gruss chair will be open to students throughout the University. Courses taught by the Gruss professor will be open to students throughout the University. The Gruss professor will also conduct special seminars and deliver public lectures on Talmudic civil law.

Dean Mundheim has convened an advisory committee to help him in the search for the first Gruss professor and in the development of an associated program in Talmudic civil law. The initial committee will be composed of Justice Menachem Elon of the Supreme Court of Israel; Rabbi Adin Steinsaltz of the Israel Institute for Talmudic Publications; Professor Theodore Meron of the NYU School of Law; Professor Aaron Twerski of the Brooklyn Law School; attorney Julius Berman of the law firm of Kaye, Scholer, Fierman, Hayes & Handler; and attorney Nathan Lewin of the law firm of Miller, Cassidy, Larroca & Lewin.

The holder of the Gruss chair will be a visiting professor who is in full-time residence at the law school, engaged in teaching and scholarly activities. of Hartford, Connecticut, graduated from the brokerage firm George Weiss Associates. parents, and teachers, Mrs. Weiss held into dialogue with faculty—giving them a firmer sense of the way in which research and teaching are intimately related at Penn.

4) Research and Teaching. A major focus of the Council's discussions during the past year was the relationship of research and teaching in the Penn community. There are both real and—to an even larger extent—perceptual problems that lead to the continuing sense among many students, especially in their early years here, that the research activities of faculty detract from their commitment to teaching. The Council feels that a solution to the problem does not lie in a debate about the relative merits of research and teaching, but rather in the creative use of Penn's acknowledged research strength to enhance the undergraduate experience. The suggested undergraduate research requirement is one way in which this can be accomplished. The greater integration of faculty members' research perspectives into the curriculum and activities into their undergraduate courses, as suggested by SCUE, is another approach which the Council views. The refinement of introductory courses to better reflect the state of current research and faculty interests, again as suggested by SCUE, is also desirable. But perhaps most important is the need to generate an ongoing and constructive discussion amongst faculty, students, and administrators on this issue. The Council has learned much from its own discussions in this regard and looks forward to engaging in such a continuing process.

The Council welcomes comments, suggestions, and recommendations from the entire University community. These may be directed to the Council's coordinator at 210 Logan Hall, Ext. 4719. We welcome and encourage your response.

—Stephen F. Steinberg, Coordinator
Faculty Council on Undergraduate Education
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ALMANAC July 14, 1987
Undergraduate Education at Penn: Progress and Prospects

The University of Pennsylvania has a tradition of strong undergraduate programs, as befits an educational institution in which one-half of the students are undergraduates. Notable forward-looking steps supporting learning at this level have included the formation of a unified School of Arts and Sciences in the early 1970s, continued broadening of the traditional Engineering experience, significant reinforcement of the Nursing offerings during the second half of the 1970s, and major revision of the Wharton curriculum in the 1960s.

The document Choosing Penn's Future, issued four and one-half years ago (Almanac: January 25, 1983), identified undergraduate education as one of three central areas for continuing campus-wide faculty and administrative concern: "Our policy is to make undergraduate education the responsibility of the entire University faculty ... bringing to bear the full range of the University's academic talents." With the confirmation of a new Provost and the approach of a major fund-raising campaign, it now seems appropriate to assess our progress to date and consider how best to structure future efforts.

Since this policy was enunciated, considerable progress has been made in improving the undergraduate educational experience:

1. An Undergraduate Education fund of $10 million has been created and used to support a wide variety of school-initiated enhancements. (See Almanac: April 21, 1987, for a detailed summary.)
2. The faculty of the School of Arts and Sciences has instituted a new set of distributional requirements, strengthened its curriculum development process, increased the participation of senior faculty in freshman seminars and undergraduate courses generally, and begun a training program for teaching assistants.
3. The faculty of the School of Engineering and Applied Science has introduced new courses in technology for all students, developed focused dual-degree programs, and strengthened its programs in oral and written communications.
4. The faculty of the School of Nursing has developed opportunities for students to participate in faculty research, enhanced learning experiences in communications, increased involvement of senior faculty in undergraduate courses, and promoted the integration of computer technology in Nursing courses.
5. The faculty of the Wharton School has expanded its teaching of communication skills to include both writing requirements and oral communications, has incorporated the teaching of ethics into the curriculum, has expanded and personalized the advising system, and has expanded its dual-degree programs.
6. All of the Schools giving undergraduate degrees have successfully completed the development of five-year plans which outline major commitments to undergraduate education in the years ahead.
7. The Faculty Council on Undergraduate Education, which brought together faculty and undergraduate deans from both the professional Schools and the liberal arts, prompted "purposeful experimentation" and creative thinking about the undergraduate experience at Penn. (See Almanac: July 14, 1987, for a detailed summary of the Council's recent work.)

While considerable progress has been made in focusing faculty and administrative attention on undergraduate education, it is clear from the experience of the past few years that success in this effort requires the continued and effective engagement of the Deans and faculties of all the Schools, particularly those giving undergraduate degrees. This becomes even more crucial as we turn from questions of general direction to the more concrete tasks of detailed planning, funding, and implementation.

Discussion of issues relating to undergraduate education has occurred in the past several years not only in the faculties of the four undergraduate Schools, but also in a faculty standing committee, the Faculty Council on Undergraduate Education. Instead of relying on a single standing faculty committee to discuss perspectives on undergraduate education, we shall appoint a number of cross-School committees to consider and recommend policy about various issues affecting undergraduate education. The efforts of these committees, together with School curriculum committees and the faculties of the four Schools giving undergraduate degrees, will both extend and intensify faculty involvement in undergraduate education. The coordination of these faculty efforts will occur in a new Provost's Council on Undergraduate Education. This Council, chaired by the Provost, will be composed of the Deans of the four Schools that give undergraduate degrees, their undergraduate associate deans or vice deans, the Vice-Provost for University Life, and others who have responsibilities for undergraduate education.

As in recent years, the Council of Undergraduate Deans, as a sub-committee of the Provost's Council and now chaired by the Provost, will meet on a more frequent basis to coordinate activities affecting undergraduate education. Thus, the new Provost's Council on Undergraduate Education and the Council of Undergraduate Deans, in cooperation with various faculty advisory committees as outlined above, will be the primary vehicles for examining possible improvements in undergraduate education. Of course, final decisions concerning curricula rest with the several curriculum committees and faculties of each School.

We believe that the new Provost's Council on Undergraduate Education can effectively promote an improved undergraduate experience at Penn. Many elements of such an experience have already been identified and now need careful and widespread consideration by the School faculties, departments, and Deans who bear the responsibility for their implementation. Among the established themes that may guide these discussions are the following:

1. The continuing recognition of the linkages of liberal arts and professional disciplines as the hallmark of Penn's "comparative advantage" as an undergraduate institution.
2. The centrality of research in the content of what our faculty teach and in the experience of students as they master an undergraduate major.
3. The importance of proficiency in self-expression, both written and spoken, throughout and beyond the college career.
4. The importance of the Freshman Year in integrating students into Penn's intellectual and social communities.
5. The renovation of the Quadrangle to improve the living conditions of our undergraduates and to provide facilities supporting an informal curriculum with increased faculty-student interaction.

Other critical questions remain to be addressed:

1. Should each undergraduate program include a "capstone" experience, perhaps a research or integrative writing project, to overcome a tendency toward fragmentation and over-specialization in certain programs?
2. Is it possible and/or desirable for every undergraduate to have the opportunity to pursue an individual research experience as part of his or her program?
3. Is it possible and/or desirable to establish comparable educational requirements in the liberal arts for all undergraduates?
4. How can we ensure adequate distribution of computer resources to both students and faculty?
5. What more should be done to improve the teaching abilities of teaching assistants and faculty members?
6. What further changes should be made to enhance the informal curriculum of lectures, advising, discussions, and other non-classroom activities that shape the intellectual life on campus, both inside and outside of the residential system?
7. How can we ensure that our advising resources not only help students move coherently from stage to stage of the undergraduate experience but also reflect Penn's unique vision of that experience? Moreover, should we attempt to increase faculty involvement in the advising process?

We have come far and yet have far to go. Ours is an ambitious agenda— to ensure that all aspects of our undergraduate programs are the most challenging and outstanding in the nation. We need the strengthened participation of the Deans and faculties of the School of Arts and Sciences, the School of Engineering and Applied Science, the School of Nursing, and the Wharton School. This effort will also require the help and support of the Deans, faculties, and staff of the other eight Schools.

We shall also need effective liaison with student groups such as the Student Committee on Undergraduate Education. Progress will come about only if there is a consensus based on widespread consultation. We pledge ourselves to that task and invite and urge your participation.

—Sheldon Hackney

—Michael Aiken