

Almanac

Tuesday, April 23, 1985

Published by the University of Pennsylvania

Volume 31, Number 31

IN BRIEF

Open Expression: the Committee on Open Expression's investigation of the February 13 demonstration in Senior Lecturer Murray Dolfman's classroom finds a violation of the Guidelines; see report, p. 3.

DLAM Settlement: A dispute in the Division of Laboratory Animal Medicine has been formally settled, with two supervisors removed from DLAM assignments; the director to attend awareness sessions; and caretakers to train as veterinary technicians. Full text of the Statement of Understanding is on page 6.

Research Tapes: In the wake of a PETA announcement that copies of 60 hours of videotape stolen last summer from a Penn research lab would be sent to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Penn was informed by USDA late last week that several cassettes have been received. USDA has not advised whether it has received copies of all of the tapes. "We are awaiting further word from USDA," said General Counsel Shelley Z. Green.

Crowds in View: In addition to Penn Relays' 40,000 spectators this Saturday, the campus area is expected to have added congestion from two other events April 27: The inauguration of Drexel's eighth president, Dr. William S. Gaither, starts at 10 a.m. and has events running through mid-day. A march of animal rights activists from the Civic Center to College Hall has been announced for noon. Members of the University are advised by the Office of Public Safety to plan routes and schedules around the possibility of heavy traffic and dense parking at the eastern end of the campus.

Assault: A student walking home from a campus library at 2 a.m. Monday was forced into the subway-surface stop at 36th and Sansom where she was robbed and sexually assaulted, University police report. After the unidentified male assailant fled, the victim used an emergency phone at the station to reach University Public Safety, and was taken by Ruth Wells to Jefferson Hospital where she was examined and released. The case is now under investigation by the Sex Crimes Unit of the Philadelphia police and by SEPTA police. On page 6, Ms. Wells gives information on escort services as part of a general safety advisory prepared earlier.

INSIDE

- SCAF Report, p. 2; Elections, p. 3
 - Committee on Open Expression, p. 3
 - Funding SAS: Complaint/Response, pp. 4-5
 - Speaking Out: DLAM, p. 4
 - DLAM Statement of Understanding, p. 6
 - Exam Rules, Safety Reminders, p. 7
 - For Comment: Alcohol Policy, p. 7
- Insert: *Ways of Knowing*



The election of Dr. Roger Soloway of Medicine (*left*) as chair-elect of the Faculty Senate signals the move-up of this year's chair-elect, Dr. Anthony Tomazinis of City Planning (*center*), to the chair. Dr. Jacob Abel (*right*) becomes past-chair in the changeover, which takes place at SEC's last meeting tomorrow; and the three men then constitute Senate's committee on consultation which meets regularly with the President and Provost for information and to advise. *See tally of votes, page 3.*

Senate: Unanimity and Division at Spring Meeting

At the April 17 spring Meeting the Faculty Senate adopted unanimously the reports of its Economic Status Committee and Committee on the Faculty (re faculty involvement in five-year plans), but divided 32-23 on a floor motion involving the Dolfman case.

Economic Status: To her published report (*Almanac* April 2), Dr. Janice Madden added data on salaries and increases for Penn and peer institutions (to be published), showing a competitive lag despite real-dollar growth. She also outlined some benefits questions affecting total compensation: loss of eligibility for aid elsewhere when using the Penn tuition-away benefit, and federal taxation of graduate-level tuition benefits starting in July. EconStat is following a Personnel Benefits study of "cafeteria" style benefits, she said, adding that if changes are contemplated the Administration should (a) grandfather past benefits levels for current faculty and (b) give advance notice with time to study and debate proposals.

Five-Year Plans: Dr. Albert Lloyd summarized his report (April 16) calling for faculty input into each of the Schools' five-year plans, and Provost Thomas Ehrlich reiterated his response in the same issue. From the floor, members applauded Former Senate Chair Phoebe Leboy's protest that deans should be listening but were absent.

SCAF/Dolfman: After Dr. Seymour Mandelbaum's report (page 2), Senate discussed the settlement of the Dolfman case and its ramifications for academic freedom. Dr. Peter Gaeffke submitted a resolution from the floor for Senate to . . .

. . . reaffirm our commitment to freedom of thought and to free expression of opinion in this University.

—express our opposition to the imposition of any special, nonacademic requirements for teaching in this University.

—reaffirm our conviction that it should be the responsibility of the faculty to act on all personnel matters concerning the faculty of this University.

—restate our belief that due process in adjudicating conflicts on campus is the best and the only way that guarantees justice for all concerned, including items of concern to minorities.

Speakers in favor of the motion linked racism awareness training to thought control, and Dr. Morris Mendelson of AAUP said it could be "the hole in the dike" for erosion of academic freedom. Speakers against portions of the wording gave examples of accepted limits and requirements for teachers; and Dr. Mark Stern, who has conducted awareness training, said the training cannot control thought but deals in "knowledge and data about racism's impacts." Deputy Provost Richard Clelland questioned part three. After Senate passed Dr. Daniel Hoffman's amendment to drop parts two and three—and eliminate the final phrase as redundant—Dr. Mandelbaum said Senate was now voting on a pity, not on an issue such as (among others) " . . . the Dean of the Wharton School should not require Mr. Dolfman to take racism training." Dr. Murray Gerstenhaber then introduced Dr. Mandelbaum's example as a substitute motion which failed, 32-23. Dr. William Pierskalla, Deputy Dean for Academic Affairs at Wharton, said the Dean was not requiring Mr. Dolfman to attend.

The membership passed, by voice vote with few "nays," an action to . . .

. . . reaffirm our commitment to freedom of thought and to free expression of opinion in this University.

—restate our belief that due process in adjudicating conflicts on campus is the best and the only way that guarantees justice for all concerned.

Other Reports: Preliminary reports by Dr. Laura Hayman on fraternities/sororities, Dr. Irving Kravis on Senate rules, and Dr. Jean Crockett on behavioral standards (not given at Senate) are scheduled for future publication. Final versions will be for-action in the fall.

Chair's Report, Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility 1984-85

The Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility met only twice this year. Both meetings were in the fall and dealt principally with the case of Dr. Gary Schmidgall. Our deliberations resulted in a letter to President Hackney subsequently published in *Almanac* on December 4, 1984. There has been no reply from the President but we understand that the administration has accepted our financial recommendation but not our proposal that Dr. Schmidgall retain his status as an assistant professor during 1984-85.

Dr. Schmidgall's appeal to the committee revealed that there was a gap in the *Handbook*. There was no rule specifying the rights of a successful grievant whose appointment had expired but who had not yet been properly evaluated for tenure. We specified what we thought was a sensible procedure to follow in the particular case before us but agreed that a well-conceived general rule should be added to the *Handbook*. With the advice of Robert Gorman, Professor of Law, Jacob Abel drafted a rule and shared it with Shelly Green, General Counsel of the University. Her reply was not satisfactory to the Chair of the Senate but negotiations on a revised version have been delayed by the press of other business. Professor Abel still hopes, I believe, that he will succeed in developing with the administration a draft which can then be reviewed by the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility and other relevant groups. For the moment, therefore, we serve by waiting.

The Committee has also been sitting in the wings during a spring semester which has been alive with issues of academic freedom and responsibility. While I have been active on several fronts, I have wanted the Committee to maintain a distance from controversies until a specific issue had matured sufficiently to require our collective judgment. I think it appropriate, however, to share with you my personal perspective on both the events of the past months and on what may very well be a difficult fall.

I first discussed the Murray Dolfman case with Almarin Phillips, the Chair of the Wharton School Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, in late February. We subsequently met with Jacob Abel on March 1, and discovered that we shared a common perception of three faces of the emergent case:

1. While public events focused on College Hall, the Wharton School was the primary arena in which a decision would have to be made. The President and Provost had little if any formal authority to shape the course of events.
2. While there had been a great deal of talk about "due process," the rules on suspension and termination for just cause applied explicitly only to members of the standing faculty. We were in the unhappy position of simultaneously inventing a process and defending its legitimacy.
3. The Wharton School Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility had agreed to investigate the Dolfman case in response to a request from the Dean. A public meeting was already scheduled for March 12; we were all concerned lest that meeting endanger the detached role of the Committee as a court to hear a charge from the Dean or an appeal from Mr. Dolfman.

We agreed to advise The Wharton Committee that the school should act as if Mr. Dolfman were a member of the standing faculty should the Dean press for suspension or termination for just cause during the current contract year. In order to preserve the Committee's status in the event of such an action, we suggested that it merely "report the facts" of the case to the Dean and avoid judgment.

There was, of course, no "just cause" action. The Committee gave Dean Palmer a tape of the March 12 meeting with a simple letter of transmittal. He quickly made it clear that he wanted an assessment of events against a standard of academic responsibility in order to inform his decision about Mr. Dolfman's 1985-86 contract. The just cause provisions did not apply since he did not intend to bring any action within this contract year.

The committee's report and the Dean's action are now matters of public knowledge. I don't want to comment on the details of the case since some issues may come before the Senate committee. Two rather general points do, however, seem to me to require comment since they are likely to appear in several different guises in the year ahead. (I emphasize again that the comments are mine and not those of the Senate committee as a whole).

1. Primary Responsibilities

I believe that the Wharton committee was wise to respond to the Dean's request for an assessment of the case. The alternative seemed in mid-March to be a public dispute over responsibilities—a dispute which would not have served Mr. Dolfman, the School, or any aggrieved party. I hope, however, that no academic freedom and responsibility committee faces a similar request in the future. Deans and departments share the principal responsibilities for attending to the behavior of individual faculty members. They carry the burden of investigation, counseling, public statement (if such is required in unusual cases) and personnel action. If the role of academic freedom and responsibility committees is enlarged so that they share (or even largely assume) these burdens, then they cannot act as courts of appeal. Enlarging the role of the committees or of other similar agencies threatens to weaken—while overtly seeking to bolster—the ties of academic responsibility.

2. Awareness Workshops as Official School Activities

The Dolfman case encouraged a commitment to the development of racial and sexual awareness workshops in the school. I am persuaded—as, I suspect, is the central administration—that requiring such workshops would engender enormous faculty resistance. I assume that the sessions will be voluntary.

I am, nevertheless, deeply troubled by the prospect of planning the workshops or choosing a trainer. My disquiet will not be stilled by merely staying away. We are, I believe, a community bound by a narrow but precious set of values. We resist—for good reason—extending those values or collectively exploring their implications lest we shatter our fragile peace. No one who has read the report of the Wharton committee on the Dolfman case can now believe that it provides us with a simple opportunity to renew a commitment to shared values. Instead, it tests and extends those values and divides us. The Wharton committee judged that Murray Dolfman's use of a powerful Jewish image of liberation in a particular context and a particular style should not be "condoned." I doubt that even the strongest proponents of that judgment want department or school faculty meetings to articulate—let alone vote upon—the generative principles which justify the decision. Indeed, I suspect that many would find even a discussion of such principles in a departmental or school faculty meeting threatening.

The genie is, however, out of the bottle and will not be put back easily or perhaps at all. I hope that we will attend to the issues raised by the workshop proposal seriously. School faculties should consider the deep implications of mounting or commissioning even a voluntary workshop. It is not too late to refuse official sponsorship and to encourage instead diverse unofficial discussions.

If faculties decide to go ahead with official sessions, I hope that academic freedom and responsibility committees will monitor the sessions closely. A complementary monitoring effort may also proceed at the Senate level. At the end of the year we should all be able to appraise in a new way the execution of the workshops, their appropriateness and their efficacy. I start with a guess that—if they are done at all—they will be well-done, inappropriate and ineffective. I am, however, open to surprise on all three dimensions.

—Seymour J. Mandelbaum
Department of City and Regional Planning
April 17, 1985

Votes Tallyed in Senate Election	
<i>Chair-elect</i>	
Dr. Roger Soloway	544
Dr. Louis Girifalco	449
<i>Secretary-elect</i>	
Dr. Edward Peters	530
Dr. Daniel Vining	408
<i>SEC At Large (4 Elected)</i>	
Dr. Mary C. Glick	564
Dr. Adrian Morrison	529
Dr. Daniel Malamud	526
Dr. James Ross	490
Dr. Elsa Ramsden	436
Dr. Ralph Smith	434
Dr. James Muhly	407
Dr. Horst Daemmrich	370

Salute

I salute the more than a thousand members of our faculty who participated thoughtfully and determinedly in the elections for the Senate's leadership for the second year in a row. Taking into account that our faculty is always on the move with a substantial number of its membership traveling to the four quarters of the globe at any given moment this level of participation indicates clearly the deep desire of our faculty to be part of the process that selects the Senate's leadership.

I also salute all the colleagues who accepted the call of their fellow colleagues and participated in the election as candidates. I congratulate the six who were elected for service this year and I thank the other six for being an integral part of the process. By the very nature of the process the

faculty has chosen the group that they would like to see in service this time around, deferring in effect the services of the other candidates for the future. Each candidate individually deserves our collective thanks.

The elections were also conducted in a spirit of a collegial contest, with only minor incidents of extremist accusations. As one who has seen the results in some detail and noticed the criss-crossed voting patterns it seems rather clear that no one of the candidates was really rejected. Instead, it was the constraints of the elections themselves and the complex personal perceptions and inclinations that produced finally the list of six selected out of the group of twelve excellent candidates. Congratulations and thanks are therefore due to all candidates, and voters, too.

—Anthony R. Tomazinis
Chair-Elect, Faculty Senate

Report of the Committee on Open Expression (On Demonstration in a Classroom February 13)

On 12 March 1985, at the request of a member of the University community, the Committee on Open Expression (COE) began an investigation of whether a violation of the Guidelines on Open Expression occurred on 13 February during Mr. Murray Dolfman's two afternoon classes. The committee's jurisdiction to conduct such an investigation is described in sections II. B, 8-9 which defines the committee's role as follows:

8. Evaluating and characterizing incidents which have resulted or may result in a member or members of the University community being charged with a violation of the guidelines. The committee shall not attempt to decide whether the individuals involved have in fact committed the acts charged, but rather whether the acts in question constitute a violation of the guidelines. This interpretation of the guidelines shall be conclusive in any disciplinary proceedings that may ensue.
9. Investigating and reporting on incidents alleged to have involved an infringement of the right of open expression of a member or members of the University community.
 - a. Such investigations may be initiated at the request of any member of the University community. If the committee decides not to proceed with a requested investigation, it shall give its reasons for not doing so to the requesting party.
 - b. The committee shall attempt to discover and recommend remedies for any failures in communication that may have caused or contributed to the incident.
 - c. As a result of such investigations, the committee may decide the guidelines have been violated. Under such circumstances, all evidence gathered shall be provided to the judicial investigating officer, along with any conclusions the committee may draw based upon such evidence.

Consistent with past practice and in accord with section II. C-3 of the guidelines, the committee declared its proceedings confidential.

Having concluded our investigation, the committee unanimously finds:

1. The Guidelines on Open Expression were violated on 13 February 1985 during Mr. Dolfman's two afternoon classes. In particular we find violations of Section II. D-2, specifically subsection 2a which states: "Demonstrations should not be held inside libraries or private offices, or inside classrooms or seminar rooms in which meetings or classes are being held or immediately scheduled." The committee determined that Mr. Dolfman's 2:00 p.m. class was disrupted by a demonstration and cancelled because of that demonstration. His 3:00 p.m. class did not begin because of the continuation of the demonstration.
2. The demonstrators were never warned that they were violating the guidelines, nor were they ever asked to leave the classroom. The lack of an appropriate warning may well have contributed to the continuation of the demonstration into the 3:00 p.m. class hour.
3. The failure to warn the students that their demonstration violated

the guidelines resulted from a general lack of communication between representatives of the Office of Student Life and those of the Wharton School. In particular, the designated Wharton School administrator present at the demonstration lacked knowledge of the provisions of the guidelines and the Vice Provost's representative did not effectively assume the appropriate role nor utilize the authority needed to maintain the right of open expression as stated in sections II. A and B of the guidelines:

- A. It is the responsibility of the vice provost for University life (hereafter referred to simply as the "vice provost") to protect and maintain the right of open expression under these guidelines.
- B. Observation of meetings or demonstrations, when deemed necessary by the vice provost to protect and maintain open expression, shall be the responsibility of the vice provost, who may delegate such responsibility. This delegate shall have full authority to act in the name of the vice provost under these guidelines.
4. There is a general lack of knowledge of the guidelines within the University community among students, faculty members and administrators.

As per section II. B-9b cited above, the committee recommends the following remedies for the kinds of failures in communication evidenced on 13 February:

1. An active continuous campaign should be undertaken to make the University community aware of the Guidelines on Open Expression.
 - 1.1 A brochure containing key University regulations, including the Guidelines on Open Expression, should be produced by the Office of the Vice Provost for University Life and distributed to all current administrators, faculty members, and students. The brochure should also be distributed on an annual basis to all new administrators, faculty members, and students, as well as to the chairs of all student organizations.
 - 1.2 *The Daily Pennsylvanian* and the *Penn Paper* should publish the Guidelines in its entirety at the beginning of the fall term. This is to be in addition to the annual coverage which has been provided by the *Almanac*.
 - 1.3 The Committee on Open Expression should conduct an information session on the guidelines each fall for the appropriate University Life staff and the representatives of each school.

Given our finding of violations of the guidelines, all evidence as well as our conclusions have been provided to the Judicial Inquiry Officer, as stipulated in Section II. B-9c.

Ira Harkavy, Chair
Susan Cohen *Edward B. Irving, Jr.*
Roselyn Eisenberg *Maurice Lefkort*
David Frank *Stephen Lerner*
Marion Friedman *David P. Silverman*
Henry Hiz *David Sorokoff*

Funding SAS's Future by Malcolm Campbell

I'm enough of a closet anarchist to delight in the fact that the *Almanac* recently published two issues* numbered 23, then omitted number 24 and proceeded to number 25. I am concerned, however, that the duplication of issue numbers will lead some *Almanac* readers to overlook, as I did initially, issue 23 of February 26 and thus miss the comments of Professor Kravis published therein concerning the planning document "Investing in Penn's Future." There should be no need to rehearse the points raised in Dr. Kravis's statement, the most important critique to date elicited by the "Building Penn's Future" manifesto. Indeed, the gracious and constructive response of President Hackney to Dr. Kravis's discourse in the same issue augurs well for further, much-needed discussion.

With all due respect, the fund-raising efforts of the Administration on behalf of SAS and the sums generated to date, however generous, however laudable, are grossly inadequate. The millions raised in support of SAS must be compared to Harvard's special campaign of *hundreds* of millions *solely* for Harvard College (the equivalent of our SAS). Of course the difficulty of the effort before us must be acknowledged: there are Sisyphean dimensions to the task faced by SAS's development office. Furthermore, it is generally true that as prospects are surveyed from sciences to social sciences to humanities, the difficulties of securing development funds ascend in quantum leaps. The further removed intellectual inquiry is from some form of practical, commercial or governmental application, the fewer the donors and the smaller the sums likely to be forthcoming. (A standing joke among my colleagues in Renaissance studies is that it would be a grant-laden windfall for us if Italy turned communist or if oil were struck in Vatican City. In the meantime, much—in fact most—of the research carried out by faculty in this area is

unsponsored and paid for out of salary, which is especially ironic in view of the fact that it is precisely these faculty members who are among the lowest paid at the university.)

In his response to Professor Kravis, our President notes that he and the Provost spend more of their fund-raising time "on behalf of SAS than all other schools combined." This is commendable, assuming such effort is carefully targeted, but does the percentage of effort expended by the Development Office begin to approach this proportional effort? (Am I right that approximately 175 staff are involved in Development, of whom six are wholly concerned with SAS's needs?) Even though the sums accruing from redoubled fund-raising efforts for SAS are likely to remain modest, the effort should be made and supported by our administration because these small sums can make an enormous difference. New financial support that would be welcomed by a medical department, but actually little change its program or its national status, could dramatically transform any one of a number of SAS departments. There are reasons for this: the nature of a particular discipline, the processes of its research, and the facilities already in place in the University, the city, and the region that permit even modest infusions of new funds to be deployed with extraordinary efficiency and startling educational effect in many SAS departments that are difficult to market for development funds.

Clearly, the Kravis-Hackney exchange substantiates a mutually perceived need to devote increased effort to the funding of SAS. However, the objectives of these initiatives as defined by Dr. Kravis remain unaddressed, especially the questions of reversal of faculty salary slippage and support of current SAS faculty research as opposed to expansionist soft-money research which tends to lie outside the purview of SAS faculty and which often produces, as Dr. Kravis notes, "a residual deficit ... that is borne by the university as a whole." Thus, the end result of much current University-wide fund-raising represents at the very least a *de facto* form of competition for funds. But it is in the area of external affairs that Hackney's assertion that, "It is untrue ... that fund-raising by the professional schools diverts resources from SAS," must either be given an excruciatingly narrow interpretation or

*Readers who maintain a back-issue file should alter the February 26 issue to #24.—Ed.

Speaking Out

Unsatisfied Re DLAM

I have been considerably disturbed by the recent coverage by *The Daily Pennsylvanian* of the allegations of racial discrimination against the animal caretakers in DLAM, the Medical School animal facility. This facility has maintained for me a number of experimental animals for several years, and I am in close contact with Dr. Shalev, Bob Appell and Joe Dupree, against whom the charges have been made. I have discussed with them from time to time certain instances of poor care of my animals by the caretakers, and have had frequent contact with them during transportation in one of the University vans for several years now. Never in any of these encounters have I heard either man make racial remarks. I felt that these experiences justified serious questions about the validity of these charges.

I have been aware that over the years several of the animal caretakers have filed grievances with their union claiming harassment and racial discrimination. These charges were not supported either by the union or by the Office of Labor Relations of the University (Director: George Budd).

These latest charges were initiated by one of the caretakers who apparently also went to the union (Local 473, Firemen and Oilers) claiming racial discrimination by his supervisors against him. The union again did not recognize this claim, nor did the Office of Labor Relations.

As I understand it, this caretaker then went to the *DP* which sent him to the Ombudsman, who referred him to Ms.

Helen O'Bannon, Senior Vice President. Since then, charges of racial discrimination have been repeated over and over by the *DP* without substantiation. Ms. O'Bannon was quoted in the *DP* implying mismanagement, racism or both in DLAM. Neither Budd nor O'Bannon has given Dr. Shalev, Mr. Appell or Mr. Dupree opportunity to respond adequately to these charges of racial discrimination and mismanagement nor has there been evidence that they examined the books to substantiate the basis for disciplinary action against the animal caretakers involved. Moreover, without properly investigating both sides of the problem, Mr. Budd publicly asked Dupree and Appell to resign, an action in which due process is clearly lacking. These men have been tried by the Administration in the pages of *The Daily Pennsylvanian*. They been accused of attitudes and behavior which are unproven, but will form a negative mark on their records for future employment.

The latest chapter in this deplorable episode was summarized in the *DP* of April 17, 1985, and makes unbelievable reading for those who think we are running a University. Among other things it was stated that the Administration did not conduct a full investigation of the charges because it would stir up further charges and countercharges! Mr. Budd now ingenuously explains that Dupree and Appell "have not been found guilty of anything;" nevertheless, they have been removed from their jobs, and Dr. Shalev will be expected to attend a workshop for interpersonal awareness, instead of spending his

time, every minute of which is needed, in taking care of the animal facility. The President is quoted in the *DP* as saying that he was "very glad the situation is resolved to everybody's satisfaction." This writer is one person who is not satisfied, and I suspect there are many more.

There is another factor here. In addition to the harassment of Dr. Shalev, Mr. Appell and Mr. Dupree by the Office of Labor Relations and the Senior Vice President, Mr. Budd and Ms. O'Bannon have demoralized these individuals and have been successful in breaking up the organization of DLAM which has been functioning well in recent years in its primary job—maintenance and care of experimental animals. For example, Dr. Shalev has recently been successful in obtaining an NIH grant to upgrade the diagnostic facilities at DLAM. They have been invaluable to me, and I am sure to other investigators. The research grants funded by NIH and awarded to Dr. A. C. Rosenquist and me are dependent on this animal facility. Hence one of the primary purposes of this university—research—has been undermined by this careless, meddling behavior of the Office of Labor Relations.

Those who should be removed from their jobs are Budd and O'Bannon. Here is mismanagement indeed.

—James M. Sprague
Joseph Leidy Professor of Anatomy

Ed. Note: Right-of-reply was offered to Mr. Budd and Mrs. O'Bannon. See also DLAM settlement agreement, p. 6 of this issue.

else be challenged. As a member of this faculty since 1961, I am well aware that a long-standing tradition implicit in the fund-raising activities of our professional schools has been the assumption that the alumni of our colleges (now SAS) who also took degrees in our professional schools were—and still are—assumed to be prospective donors to the professional schools *and exclusively so*. Furthermore, given this climate of opinion, it is scarcely surprising that the alumni of our professional schools frequently have been approached without regard for distinctions between their vocations and avocations, even when the latter aspect of their lives has been clearly a consuming passion. Let me cite two specific cases which are now past history. (1) If a successful graduate of one of our professional schools devotes his/her life to being a patron of the fine arts, it would seem logical to have taken this fact into account when offering an honorary degree and seeking this individual's financial support, but both degree and proposal for support were focused exclusively on the individual's vocational field—and both were refused. (2) If a professional school alumnus expresses interest in supporting a humanities-oriented project, it would seem short-sighted to have created a blue-ribbon negotiating committee that did not include a single representative of the SAS department most central to his/her proposal and to have concentrated on presenting technological and medical developments to the prospective donor—yet a negotiation not dissimilar to this took place at Penn in the recent past.

Obviously, many alumni with several degrees from Penn are only interested in their professional schools, and obvious, too, is a fact that most

alumni holding only degrees from our professional schools are primarily interested in those schools. But there are exceptions, and the exceptions are potentially individuals of both wealth and vision who see—as we should—that the activities of the faculty and students in SAS are complementary to the professional schools. The support of these alumni for SAS would supplement—not detract from—their support of their professional schools.

Finally, there is a vexing issue that must be faced. I refer to one of the worst impediments to SAS fund-raising and one that takes a severe toll on analogously vulnerable sectors of the University such as the library system, the University Press, and the Museum: the University's "indirect costs" taxation of *all* funds collected (gifts, restricted and unrestricted funds, subventions, endowments, memberships, etc.), with precious few exceptions, at a *minimum* of 28%. The inflexible levying of the 28% indirect costs gouges small-scale gifts from modest donors, individuals, societies or corporations, who provide funds without regard to special advantage either through the marketable results of sponsored research or attendant favorable publicity; it follows that the 28% overhead charge most severely impinges upon the fund-raising capacities of those sectors within (and without) SAS that are perhaps the most difficult ones for which to fund-raise. Exceptions to the 28% minimum indirect cost procedure need to be considered. Flexibility and creativity in this area could do much to encourage "Investing in Penn's Future."

The author is Professor of History of Art in SAS.

Response to Professor Campbell by Ross A. Webber

I finished reading Malcolm Campbell's letter with disappointment that we have not been more effective in communicating to faculty on the state of Arts and Sciences fund-raising. Since some of Professor Campbell's letter is a bit obsolete, I shall describe the situation as I see it.

The development staff in the School of Arts and Sciences is the largest in the University that I totally support on my departmental budget. The staffs in two other schools are larger, but half or more of the staff in these schools have been added at the relevant Dean's expense. In no other school than SAS does the central administration pay for virtually the total development effort.

Professor Campbell asserts that only 6 out of 175 department personnel are solely concerned with raising money for SAS. The ratio is actually much more favorable. My department has approximately 60 development professionals. In addition to those assigned directly to SAS, 25 to 30 of these people work in behalf of Arts and Sciences, along with other University concerns. For example, the Corporate and Foundation Relations staff in the Franklin Building devote a large amount of their time to proposals on behalf of various Arts and Sciences departments. In addition, Annual Giving staff communicate continually with College alumni. These Annual Giving and Benjamin Franklin Society unrestricted contributions (along with those from other undergraduate alumni) form the core of the University subvention pool from which SAS benefits. All of the central departmental resources, including research stewardship and editorial services, back up SAS fundraising efforts.

Two examples of supposed misdirected donors are described in Professor Campbell's letter. My staff was not able to identify either case because they apparently occurred long before the tenure of current development personnel. Nonetheless, even if the events transpired as described, I think simple misjudgment is a more plausible interpretation than the conspiratorial tone suggested. Individual fund-raising is not a science. Rather, it is a sensitive process in which one must make judgments as to what University areas will attract an alumnus' support. The potential donor's undergraduate and graduate areas, career, and other activity are assessed in an effort to find the best connection between alumnus and the University. Interest and involvement precede a gift. And yet, even the most experienced development professionals make mistakes. For example, a Wharton alumnus was recently solicited in behalf of a recreational facility in which he had shown a lifelong interest. To our surprise, he immediately indicated that his primary interest was in brain research. He subsequently made a magnificent gift to the Medical School.

It is well to remember that we do not absolutely control where a donor chooses to direct his or her gifts. Very few of the major alumni gifts are unrestricted or entirely directable by University leadership. The art is to match our priorities with the interests of donors.

In defining a solicitation strategy for an undergraduate alumnus, our intention is to treat them as Penn alumni whose interests are not necessarily restricted to his/her major or school. Thus College, Wharton and Engineering undergraduate alumni are not assumed to be only interested in something within their schools. We endeavor to present them with all of the University's priorities. Of course, many do communicate to us rather quickly their desire to focus on a specific area in their undergraduate school, especially if it is close

to their profession or business.

We absolutely *do not* give automatic priority to the Graduate School among dual-degree Penn alumni. Rarely is a Penn Law or Wharton Graduate alumnus who attended college elsewhere interested in any other dimension of the University. But, if that graduate alumnus possess a Penn undergraduate degree, we try to present them with the whole University agenda before focusing on a specific area. More often than not, the donor's interest turns to something that touched his undergraduate life rather than his graduate program.

Finally, Professor Campbell complains about the taxes subtracted from gifts. Certainly, all of us would prefer that no charges be assessed against fund-raising successes. The unfortunate fact is that the bulk of gifts are restricted while the cost to elicit the gifts must come from unrestricted money along with the bills for heat and light, etc. that house the attractive research and teaching program. Five percent of most gifts are taxed to repay the University's internal loan that funded the Program for the Eighties. This does not go to the Development Department. The bulk of the charge, however, goes directly to the School's dean to pay for school administration expenses. A Dean has the option to return these funds to the affected department or program. Thus, the reality is that almost all of a gift to Arts and Sciences stays in SAS. It is not siphoned off by the central administration.

Most donors do not complain about these charges because they are not aware of them. In all candor, my experience is that most donor complaints stem from a faculty member (or coach) who intentionally brings the policy to a donor's attention, often in the hope that the donor could pressure someone in the University to exempt the gift from the charge. Personally, I wish Penn could find another vehicle for providing the University with unrestricted funds, but the current approach is not a debilitating handicap for fund-raising.

The multi-million dollar Harvard College Campaign to which Professor Campbell refers does not cover only Arts and Sciences. Rather, it encompasses all of the elements at Harvard that touch undergraduates. In this sense, it roughly parallels our *Building Penn's Future* agenda, not the SAS fundraising effort. Harvard, of course, at the undergraduate level is a bit simpler than Penn; it contains no business school, no nursing, and insignificant engineering. Therefore, Harvard's Arts and Sciences benefits from greater academic homogeneity among its alumni.

No one in my office is satisfied with the level of fund-raising in behalf of the School of Arts and Sciences. In a subsequent *Almanac* article, I shall describe the successes and difficulties of SAS efforts. Suffice it to say at this point that the School of Arts and Sciences usually ranks fourth among the 12 schools at Penn. Because of its size and centrality to Penn, it ought to stand first or second (Medicine would be extremely difficult to exceed because of the public's interest in health care). With strong leadership from a new Dean of SAS and generous participation by the faculty, all of us in the central administration are committed to the cause.

The author is Vice President for Development and University Relations

Memorandum of Understanding on Division of Laboratory Animal Medicine

Preamble

The University's Administration has been actively seeking an understanding of the allegations raised by members of the collective bargaining unit in the Division of Laboratory Animal Medicine through the Ombudsman and *The Daily Pennsylvanian*. Meetings have been held under its auspices with the DLAM collective bargaining unit and the supervisory staff.

During the course of discussions with the involved parties it became clear that the members of the collective bargaining unit believed that the workplace rules had been arbitrarily enforced, that supervisory authority had not been well defined, and that respect for the dignity of the individual had somehow been lost. They believed that the supervisory actions were racially motivated.

On the other hand, the supervisory staff believed that it was acting in accordance with University and School policies and the terms of the collective bargaining agreement as they responded to the many criticisms both internally and externally of the quality of animal care and the physical condition of the workplace. This, in their opinion, required that the rules of the workplace and terms of the collective bargaining agreement be stringently enforced. They did not believe that their actions were racially motivated.

There were no simple answers to either position since the parties held steadfastly to their views. Thus, there was the prospect of continuing dissension and lack of harmony in this critically important Division that supports School of Medicine research. If an exhaustive investigation could prove the right or the wrong of the contentions, then it would be the proper course to follow, but the Administration is of the opinion that little would be accomplished by such an effort other than to harden positions and create further bitterness, charges and counter-charges. After considerable discussions, the Administration believes that the supervisory staff did not act from racial motives but did use a management style that gave the appearance of being insensitive.

The parties concluded that there must be a new beginning in the relationship between the supervisory staff and the members of the collective bargaining unit. This will require compromise and acts of good faith by all of the parties.

Items of Understanding

Accordingly, the University Administration, the School of Medicine, and the members of the collective bargaining unit wish to establish, under Dr. Moshe Shalev's leadership and the terms of the collective bargaining agreement, improved working relationships and a standard of animal care consistent with that defined by appropriate professional and federal agencies by taking the following actions:

1. That effective April 15, 1985, Mr. Robert F. Appell and Mr. Joseph Dupree shall no longer be assigned to DLAM. These actions are taken without prejudice to Mr. Appell and Mr. Dupree but recognize that they could no longer supervise effectively because of the working environment tensions with which they are identified.
2. That interpersonal awareness discussion and workshops shall be made available for all DLAM staff on a voluntary basis. Dr. Shalev, in the interest of improving the working relationship, will participate.
3. That all applicants for supervisory and administrative positions will be screened in accordance with University policy for interpersonal skills and attitudes essential to maintaining a positive work environment in which people are treated with dignity and respect. The Office of Affirmative Action would be actively involved in this screening process.
4. That an individual suitable to both the School of Medicine and the DLAM staff will monitor the interpersonal activities within the Division of Laboratory Animal Medicine until June 1, 1986. The candidates under consideration are: Dr. Jacqueline E. Wade, Administrative Director, Afro-American Studies and Dr. Helen O. Dickens, Associate Dean,

Minority Affairs, Medical School.

5. That supervisory authority and responsibility in the Division of Laboratory Animal Medicine shall be explained to the members of the collective bargaining unit, particularly with respect to the role of Veterinary Technicians.
6. That participation in the training programs sponsored by the American Association for Laboratory Animal Science shall be encouraged. The completion of this training program shall be recognized with regards to promotion. The cost of participating in this training program shall be borne by the Division of Laboratory Animal Medicine.
7. That all disciplinary memoranda or letters in the files of members of the collective bargaining unit in the departmental office of DLAM with a date of April 15, 1984, forward to April 15, 1985, shall be removed from the said member's files.
8. That all members of the collective bargaining unit currently in the classification of Animal Caretaker shall be upgraded, effective April 15, 1985, into the classification of Animal Laboratory Technician. This upgrading is done under the following understandings:
 - a. That all members in the classification of Animal Laboratory Technician shall perform all of the duties associated with the classification of Animal Caretaker.
 - b. That any Animal Caretaker who is upgraded to Animal Laboratory Technician and in their first year of employment, shall be paid in accordance with the terms and conditions of Article IV, RATES OF PAY, applicable to newly hired Animal Laboratory Technicians, as set forth in the Collective Bargaining Agreement dated June 1, 1984.
 - c. That this upgrade does not effect any other term or condition set forth in the Collective Bargaining Agreement dated June 1, 1984, or any understandings applicable thereto.
 - d. That because of this upgrade of Animal Caretakers to Animal Laboratory Technician, the Union, Local 473, International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers, agrees to and herewith withdraws the grievance of Michael Smith concerning the denial of promotion from Animal Caretaker to Animal Laboratory Technician.
9. That there shall be no retaliatory action against the members of the collective bargaining unit for their participation in the matter associated with this Memorandum of Understanding and/or any individual that supported the members in this matter.

Statement of Resolution

The parties acknowledge and agree, by their signatures below, that any and all of the allegations raised by the members of the collective bargaining unit have been investigated, discussed and resolved, consistent with the spirit of compromise and good faith, and with a view towards assisting in a new beginning in the relationships between the parties involved.

Signatures

For the University: George W. Budd

For the Staff of DLAM:

Jean Wilson

Lisa Contino

Michael Smith

Stanley Robinson

Ellean Berry

For the School of Medicine: Dr. Harry J. Halley

For Local 473: Will Copeland, Chief Steward

Dated on this 16th day of April 1985

FOR COMMENT

Rules Governing Final Examinations

1) No student may be required to take more than two final examinations on any one day during the period in which final examinations are scheduled.

2) No instructor may hold a final examination except during the period in which final examinations are scheduled and, when necessary, during the period of postponed examinations. No final examinations may be scheduled during the last week of classes or on reading days.

3) Postponed examinations may be held only during the official periods; the first week of the spring and fall semesters. Students must obtain permission from their dean's office to take a postponed exam. Instructors in all courses must be ready to offer a make-up examination to all students who were excused from the final examination.

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

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

6) No classes (covering new material) may be held during the reading period. Review sessions may be held.

7) All students must be allowed to see their final examination. Access to graded finals should be ensured for a period of one semester after the exam has been given.

In all matters relating to final exams, students with questions should first consult with their Dean's offices. We encourage professors to be as flexible as possible in accommodating students with conflicting exam schedules.

— Thomas Ehrlich, Provost

Vice Provost James Bishop invites comment, to 112 College Hall/CO, before the May 1 final meeting of University Council.

Proposed Alcohol Policy

Introduction

The University of Pennsylvania seeks to encourage and sustain an academic environment that both respects individual freedom and promotes the health, safety and welfare of all members of its community. In keeping with these objectives, the University has established the following policy governing the possession, sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages on the University campus, and conforming to the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (See attached summary of the Pennsylvania Liquor Code). Consistent with its educational mission, the University sponsors programs that promote awareness of the physical and psychological, social and behavioral effects of alcohol consumption. The University also assists its members in finding alternatives to alcoholic beverages for promoting social interaction and stress reduction, and it provides services and resources for community members who experience alcohol-related difficulties. Together, Penn's alcohol policy and programs are intended to encourage its members to make responsible decisions about the use of alcoholic beverages, and to promote safe, legal, and healthy patterns of social interaction.

Policy

1. The University permits lawful keeping and consumption, in moderation, of alcoholic beverages on its property by persons of legal drinking age (21 years or above).

2. The use of alcohol by members of the University community and external groups on University-owned property and at University sponsored-events is governed by the following provisions:

a. University funds may not be used to purchase alcoholic beverages that will be served to persons under the legal drinking age.

b. Individuals or groups sponsoring University events should take reasonable measures to ensure that alcohol is not sold, served, or made available to persons who are under the legal drinking age, or to persons who are obviously inebriated.

c. Publicity for University social events directed primarily toward students should not include advertising the availability of alcohol at these events.

3. Persons in charge of various University facilities should, in consultation with students and others, develop and implement guidelines consistent with this policy, for the use of alcoholic beverages in specific facilities.

4. While the University recognizes that alcohol plays a role in some social activities, it deplores its misuse and abuse. Alcohol consumption will not be considered an excuse for misconduct, but rather an aggravating factor to the misconduct in question.

Resources

University Services

Any member of the University community experiencing alcohol-related problems or anyone concerned about another having such difficulty is strongly encouraged to consult any of the resources listed below. (Asterisk indicates strictly confidential services.)

A. For students:

* University Counseling Service	3611 Locust Walk/CA	898-7021
* Student Health Service	1 Maloney, HUP	662-2865
* Student Health Psychiatry	1 Maloney, HUP	662-2860
BACCHUS Office of Student Life	110 Houston Hall	898-6533

B. For faculty/staff:

* Faculty/Staff Assistance Program	1220 Blockley/S1	898-7910
------------------------------------	------------------	----------

Off-Campus Resources

The following organizations may also provide assistance to members of the University community or their families:

Alcoholics Anonymous	Central Office and Information Center	
	311 South Juniper Street	
	Philadelphia, PA 19103	545-4023
Al-Alon Family Groups	4021 Walnut Street	
	Philadelphia, PA 19104	222-5244

Alcohol Concerns Committee

The Alcohol Concerns Committee provides to members of the campus community information about alcohol-related issues, educational programming, and supportive resources. Direct inquiries should be addressed to the Committee at the Office of Student Life, 110 Houston Hall, Ext. 6533 or 6081.

Summary of Relevant Provisions of the Pennsylvania Liquor Code

The Pennsylvania Liquor Code controls the possession and sale of alcoholic beverages within the Commonwealth. According to the Code:

1. It is a summary offense for a person under twenty-one years old to purchase, consume, possess, or transport any alcohol, liquor, or malt or brewed beverages.

2. It is unlawful to sell or give liquor or malt or brewed beverages to any minor (under twenty-one).

3. It is unlawful to transfer or to procure unlawfully a Liquor Control Board card.

4. It is a crime to misrepresent one's age knowingly and falsely to obtain intoxicating liquors or to represent that another is of legal age for such purpose.

5. It is also unlawful to hire, request, or induce a minor to purchase liquor.

6. Sales without a license or purchase from an unlicensed source of liquor or malt or brewed beverages are prohibited.

7. It is also unlawful to possess or transport liquor or alcohol within the Commonwealth unless it has been purchased from a state store or in accordance with L.C.B. regulations.

Correction: The date of the talk, *Swelling and Deformation Behavior of Soft Connective Tissues: Theory and Experiment* by Professor Alan Grodzinsky, has been changed to **April 24** at 3:30 p.m. Towne Building.

CONFERENCES

27 *Meeting of the Penn Renaissance Seminar*; topics include "Sir Philip Sidney and his Queen," "The Mapping of Elizabethan Book Illustration and How it Changes What We've Known," and "Boccaccio's Dante." Coffee at 9:30 a.m., talks begin at 10 a.m., 6th floor, Van Pelt Library. Information: Professor Augusta Foley at Ext. 5626 or Dr. Georgianna Ziegler at Ext. 7552.

EXHIBITS

27 *The Return of the Native*; new exhibit of native trees at The Morris Arboretum. Hours: 10 a.m.-4 p.m. daily. *Through June 30*.

30 *Chinese Water-Color Painting by Cecilia Chiang*; The Faculty Club. *Through May 3*. Information: Ext. 6039.

Penn Photo Contest Winners; Art Gallery of The Faculty Club Lounge. *Through May 24*.

FILMS

Neighborhood Film Project

All films shown at International House, \$3 general admission, \$2.50 for members, students, senior citizens. Information: 387-5125, Ext. 222.

24 *Celso and Cora*; 7:30 p.m. *Also April 25 at 7:30 p.m. and April 26 at 4 p.m.*

26 *Nicaragua: No Pasaran*; 7:30 p.m. *Also April 27 at 8 p.m. and April 28 at 7:30 p.m.*

28 *Video On Dance On Video*; 9 videos exploring the relationship between video and dance; 2 p.m.

PUC Movies

24 *2001: A Space Odyssey*; 8 p.m., Irvine Auditorium, \$1.75.

26 *2010*, 7:30, 9:45 p.m. and midnight, Irvine Auditorium, \$1.75.

FITNESS/LEARNING

Career Planning & Placement

30 *How to Make Penn Work for You*; Tuesday Group for Women Administrators; 1 p.m., Benjamin Franklin Room, Houston Hall.

F/S Assistance Program

24 *Stepping into a Step Family*; Social worker Laura Schneider will discuss issues and resources for blended families; noon, 1227 Blockley Hall.

Microcomputer Services

25 *Apple II Family User Group Meeting*, 4 p.m., Room 305, Houston Hall. Information: 662-1070.

U.S. Savings Bonds: A Campus Drive

Penn is holding a two-month U.S. Savings Bond Drive, which started April 1 and ends May 31 under the auspices of the Treasurer's Office.

Since the U.S. Bonds switched to a variable, market-based interest rate structure in November 1982, a spokesman for the Treasurer's Office said, major institutions such as Penn are now actively recommending them to employees and holding drives such as this one. Mailings to individual employees emphasize the payroll deduction system, the small-investor appeal of the \$25 start (for a \$50 bond), and the fact that there is no pre-set ceiling (current rate is 10.94%) so series EE bonds can rise as high as others. But, as pointed out, there is a guaranteed minimum rate: Regardless of prevailing U.S. Treasury Securities yields, the EEs yield 7.5% if held five years. (Cashed sooner, they yield from 5.5% after one year to 7.5% after four-and-a-half. For accessibility of savings, the bonds

can be cashed as soon as six months following purchase through most banks.)

"Before November 1982," said the spokesman, "the old bonds were stuck with a most noncompetitive fixed-interest rate—a maximum of 8.5% at a time when consumers could earn as much as 15% on certain deposits at their local banks. The new series EEs are pegged to 85% of the average yield of five-year U.S. Treasury Securities, if held five years. And, the 7.5% guaranteed minimum is a real safeguard should market rates drop sharply."

The packet now being mailed gives faculty and staff more information, plus a card to fill out for activating payroll deductions. For questions on the payroll procedures, contact Payroll Director Val Gossman at Ext. 1443. Additional details on the bonds themselves are available at the Federal Reserve of Philadelphia, Savings Bond Section, at 574-6176 Mondays through Fridays from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.

SPECIAL EVENTS

27 *The H'mong in Philadelphia: A Forum*; public forum presenting cultural performances, discussion panels, and the Philadelphia premiere of a 30-minute videocassette in H'mong and English. 1-6 p.m., International House, \$3. Information: 387-5125, Ext. 219. (H'mong United Association and the Folklife Center of International House).

TALKS

25 *The Structure of Sanskrit Mystical Poetry*; Dr. Barbara Stoler Miller, professor of oriental studies, Barnard College, Columbia University; 2 p.m., Room 305, Houston Hall (Seminar on Non-western Literature).

The Impact of DRGs: Professionals' Response; Dr. William Rial, immediate past president, American Medical Association; 4:30 p.m., auditorium, Colonial Penn Center (Leonard Davis Institute Research and Policy Colloquium Series).

Golden Nugget's CEO Steve Wynn Discusses his Career in the Hotel and Casino Industry; 4:30 p.m., Room B-1, Meyerson Hall (Wharton Entrepreneurial Club).

Writing the First Play; panel of distinguished playwrights and representatives from the Foundation of the Dramatists Guild including: Mary Rodgers, Terrance McNally, Ted Tally, Wendy Wasserstein, David E. LeVine; 5 p.m., Harold Prince Theatre, Annenberg Center; \$3. Information: 222-5000 (Philadelphia Festival Theatre for New Plays).

Basic Research in a Competitive Industry; Dr. William Brinkman, vice president for research, Sandia National Laboratories; 4:30 p.m., 1203 Steinberg Hall-Dietrich Hall (Department of Public Policy and Management).

Drug and Neurotransmitter Receptors in the Brain; Dr. Solomon H. Snyder, distinguished professor of neurology, pharmacology, and psychiatry, and director, department of neuroscience, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine; 5 p.m., Lecture Room 10, Leidy Labs (David Mahoney Institute of Neurological Sciences).

26 *The Concept of Anthropological Economics and its Applications*; Professor Philippe J. Bernard, Ecole Polytechnique, France; 11 a.m., Room 285, McNeil Building.

Spatial Averaging in Elevation Estimation of Multiple Coherent Signals; Dr. Stanislav Kesler, associate professor, department of electrical and computer engineering, Drexel University; 11 a.m., Room 216, Moore School (Valley Forge Research Center Seminar, Electrical Engineering Dept.).

Comparing the Performance of Public and Private Family Planning Agencies in Colombia; Laura Roper, Ph.D. candidate in political science; 4 p.m., Anspach Lounge, Stiteler Hall (Political Science-International Relations Faculty-Graduate Student Colloquium Series).

27 *Discussion with Choreographer Bella Lewitzky and Multi-Media Artist/Composer Donald Knaack*; 1 p.m., Zellerbach Theatre, Annenberg Center. Information: 925-6303 (Dance Affiliates, Annenberg Center, Philadelphia Dance Alliance).

29 *Culture and Medicine: Interaction in the Underserved Community*; Dr. David Satcher, president, Meharry Medical College; 4:30 p.m., auditorium, Colonial Penn Center, 3641 Locust Walk (Ninth Annual Nathan Mossell Lecture, School of Medicine and the Leonard Davis Institute of Health Economics).

30 *Involvement of Arterial Chemoreceptors in the Pathogenesis of Experimental Hypertension*; Dr. Jack Prybylski, Henry Ford Hospital, Detroit, Michigan; 12:30 p.m., Physiology Library, Richards Building (Department of Physiology).

The Unification of Fundamental Forces; Professor Abdus Salam, Nobel Laureate, director, International Center for Theoretical Physics, Trieste, Italy; 4 p.m., Auditorium A1, David Rittenhouse Labs (Henry Primakoff Lecture Series).

Deadlines

The weekly update deadline for calendar entries is at noon, a week before the Tuesday of publication. Send to *Almanac*, 3601 Locust Walk/C8 (second floor of the Christian Association Building).

Almanac

3601 Locust Walk/C8
Philadelphia, Pa. 19104
(215) 898-5274 or 5275.

The University of Pennsylvania's journal of record and opinion is published Tuesdays during the academic year and as needed during summer and holiday breaks. Guidelines for readers and contributors are available on request.

EDITOR Karen C. Gaines
ASSISTANT EDITOR Marguerite F. Miller
ACTING EDITORIAL ASSISTANT Howard M. Gensler
COMPUTING/EDITORIAL AIDE P. Grace Hernandez
WORK STUDY STUDENTS Kevin M. Dougherty
Michelle Friedman
Michael S. Markowitz
John J. Neumann
Leonard S. Perlman

ALMANAC ADVISORY BOARD Chair, Jean A. Crockett; Jacob M. Abel, Carol P. Germain, Henry T. Hiz, Alfred J. Rieber, Eliot Stellar, Arnold W. Thackray, Anthony R. Tomazinis, for the Faculty Senate; ... William G. Owen for the Administration; ... Carol Carr for the Librarians Assembly; ... Edwin Ledwell for the Administrative Assembly; ... Joseph Kane for the A-3 Assembly.