

Almanac

Tuesday, April 28, 1987

Published by the University of Pennsylvania

Volume 33, Number 32

Faculty Club Controversy

In a *Speaking Out* exchange on page 7, the Faculty Club Board of Governors urges members to attend the Annual Meeting at 4 p.m. Wednesday, April 29, indicating uncertainty of the Club's future if, on the following day, an agreement with Dining Services is not renewed. Senior Vice President Helen O'Bannon responds that she hopes the Board "will not vote itself out of existence at the upcoming meeting . . . [but] . . . if it does so, the University is committed to continue to operate a club."

Children's Center Reprieve

In a statement on page 7, President Sheldon Hackney announces an extension of deadline to September 15 for the Penn Children's Center to meet its enrollment target of 38 full-time equivalents, and a temporary commitment of \$50,000 to keep it afloat in FY1988 while long-term solutions are sought.

Serial Salutes

On May 7, Philadelphia Mayor Wilson W. Goode declares Archaeology Month; May 8 the University Museum salutes the We the People 200th with an exhibit called "Final Muster for a British Soldier" (it's about archaeological detective work); and May 9-10 the Museum stages the "Big Birthday Party," open to all, celebrating its own 100th anniversary.

Research Administration

Last week's *Almanac* reported that the Office of Research Administration would be moving May 4 into Suite 300, Mellon Building. Due to a change of plans the move will take place one week later on May 11.

School of Nursing Awards

Christine Crumlish, lecturer of adult health and illness, is the recipient of the 1987 School of Nursing Teaching Award. A faculty member at the School since 1985, Ms. Crumlish was selected for her excellence as a clinical educator while instructing undergraduates during clinical practice.

Linda Walsh, teaching assistant of nurse-midwifery, is the winner of the 1987 Teaching Assistant Award, for excellence in teaching advanced clinical practice in the professional nurses' role and instructing students on providing health care to the entire family.

Winners were selected by the School's awards committee from nominations submitted by students and alumnae. This is the fifth year for the Teaching Award and the second for the

Baccalaureate Speaker: Provost Ehrlich

This year's Baccalaureate speaker is a University figure who will, like the seniors, "graduate from Penn": Provost Thomas Ehrlich, who leaves July 1 to become president of Indiana University. (See more on him, page 3.) A Baccalaureate Concert will be held at 3 p.m., Sunday, May 17 in Irvine Auditorium preceding the Baccalaureate Service which begins there at 3:30 p.m.

Along with Commencement speaker Riccardo Muti of the Philadelphia Orchestra, the Provost will receive an honorary degree. Others receiving honorary degrees at the 231st Commencement Monday, May 18 at Franklin Field:

Dr. Robert Austrian, the John Herr Musser Professor Emeritus of Research Medicine and former chairman of the Department of Research Medicine at Penn, who has devoted his professional life to conquering pneumococcal pneumonia. After proving that bacteremic pneumococcal pneumonia remained a killer in the age of antibiotics, he identified the pneumococcal types which cause disease in specific groups of people and developed vaccines under the aegis of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases. A member of the faculty since 1962, he is a member of the National Academy of Sciences and winner of the 1978 Albert Laskin Award for clinical medical research and the 1979 Philadelphia Award.

Mr. Edgar Kaufmann, Jr., the architectural historian, museum curator, arts patron, philanthropist and teacher who is an authority on Frank Lloyd Wright, the Renaissance architect Lodoli, and Louis H. Sullivan and the Prairie

School. As a curator at the Museum of Modern Art and member of the committee for the Good Design shows, he was instrumental in defining the careers of such figures as Eero Saarinen and Charles Eames. Mr. Kaufmann was also one of the first to recognize and publicize effectively the importance of modern Scandinavian design. Mr. Kaufmann has been an adjunct professor of art history and of architecture at Columbia, Cornell, and other institutions.

Dr. Bernard Lewis, who last year became the first director of the Annenberg Research Institute for Judaic and Near Eastern Studies in Philadelphia. The former Cleveland E. Dodge Professor of Near Eastern Studies at Princeton has been a member of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton and corresponding member of the Institut d'Egypte, and professor of Middle Eastern history at the University of London. Awarded the Citation of Honor by the Turkish Ministry of Culture in 1973 and the Harvey Prize from the Israel Institute of Technology in 1978, he also holds honorary degrees from Hebrew University in Jerusalem and Tel Aviv University. His earliest work, *The Arabs in History* (1950), has been issued in five editions; his most recent is *The Muslim Discovery of Europe* (1982).

President Robert B. Stevens of Haverford College. A former professor of law at Yale and provost and professor of law and history at Tulane University, Mr. Stevens has been visiting professor at Texas, East Africa and Stanford, and a consultant to the UN, HEW, and U.S. Department of State. His books include *The Restrictive Practices Court* (1965), *Lawyers and the Courts* (1967), *In Search of Justice* (1968), ed. *Statutory History of the United States* (1970), *Income Security* (1970), *Welfare Medicine in America* (1974), *Law and Politics* (1978) and *The American Law School: Legal Education in America 1850-1980* (1983).

Teaching Assistant Award. Recipients' names are inscribed on a plaque in the School, and each winner receives a plaque at the Nursing School Graduation ceremony May 17.



Christine Crumlish



Linda Walsh

photos by Denise Angelini

INSIDE

- Senate Chair on Unintended Changes, p. 2
- SEC Resolutions on Harassment, p. 2
- The Deans' Tribute to Tom Ehrlich, p. 3
- Comments on Harassment Policy (Stern), p. 3
- MAY on Campus, pp. 4-5
- Council: Parking, Open Expression, p. 6
- President on Children's Center, p. 7
- Speaking Out: Faculty Club, p. 7
- Update, CrimeStats, p. 8

Pullout: SAS Five-Year Plan

Unintended Changes in Faculty Input as a Result of University Growth and Restructuring

In past columns, I have dealt with one of my favorite topics, the results of University growth and my perception that the central administration has become increasingly remote from the individual faculty: this article focuses on the same theme. In small colleges, the president usually knows each faculty member personally and has the time to be knowledgeable about each member's views on important topics. The size of such institutions allows individual faculty to participate in governance through this informal process even if no formal mechanism for communication exists. In many colleges and universities, and in particular in the Statutes of the University of Pennsylvania, certain rights are expressly reserved to the faculty not to the central administration, deans or administrators. Because of the growth of the University and our busy schedules, we have largely passively transferred these responsibilities to others who do our work for us and who have operated without general faculty input for the sake of efficiency. This development evolved over such a long period that few on the faculty remember what its collective responsibilities are. Only through my involvement at Senate Executive Committee and on the various Faculty Senate committees have I become aware of these duties.

The faculty is responsible for admissions, curriculum, promotion and qualifications for degrees. What does this mean? I interpret this as indicating that the faculty as a body should review and agree with policy in this area. That means that regular detailed reporting to the faculty should occur in these areas, and that these reports should be critically examined. This process should be ongoing at the level of both the University and the schools.

At our university in the past, the concept of "One University" was much publicized and made sense from the point of view of institution-wide coordination and esprit de corps. With decentralization of fiscal responsibility from the University to the schools, the "One University" concept is much more difficult to maintain and to achieve. Deans now

function with much greater responsibility and with much more autonomy from the central administration than in the past. The result is, in some schools, that deans may operate with less faculty input than does the central administration. In a number of Faculty Senate fora, I have heard the opinion expressed that the President and Provost largely operate in a vacuum. In fact, the President and Provost receive much more faculty input than many deans. The opinions of individual faculty members, of SEC and of members of Senate committees are relayed, if appropriate and followed through to resolution, at the bi-weekly meetings of the University Committee on Consultation. There is an opportunity for the President and Provost to ask for advice and for the Chairs of the Senate to request information and identify issues of faculty concern. In my opinion, these meetings have been very effective. Each of the participants comes to know the others very well and develops confidence in the information being interchanged. Similarly, the President and Provost meet with the faculty members of the Steering Committee of Council as well as student representatives.

It is my feeling that a number of schools would benefit from a similar mechanism. Either such a school process does not exist or the dean has not employed the present structure in this way. Interaction on the school level between faculty and administration could revitalize school faculty organizations and provide beneficial general faculty input into basic school planning and organization. Through this process, the faculty could be restored to its original and central role in governance. Everyone would be richer for this input.

Again, this is my personal point of view. I welcome your comments. In a future column I will deal with the consequences of the lack of input for each of us.

Roger D. Soloway

The following resolutions were submitted by the Senate Executive Committee to the President for inclusion in the University Policy on Harassment which he proposed (Almanac April 14, 1987). The resolutions reflect a great deal of discussion and thought and provide evidence of the careful attention that the faculty paid to these problematic areas. Every effort has been made to facilitate initiation of appropriate complaints while simultaneously protecting persons against unjust accusations.

Senate Executive Committee Resolutions on Harassment

March 23, 1987

1. Resolved that we recognize that problems of harassment exist at the University of Pennsylvania.
 2. For purposes of University policy, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) proposes a broad definition of harassment: any unwarranted behavior that stigmatizes or victimizes an individual that 1) involves a stated or implicit threat to the victim's academic or employment status, 2) has the purpose or effect of interfering with an individual's academic or work performance, and/or 3) creates an intimidating or offensive academic, living, or work environment.
 3. Harassment may be based on sex, sexual orientation, appearance, race, religion, national or ethnic origin, and other criteria that distinguish among individuals on any basis other than the proper performance of their function as teachers, employees, or students.
 4. SEC deplores all harassment.
 5. In dealing with harassment it is necessary to distinguish between:
 - incidents that may represent behavior which is undesirable and behavior which is against the law
 - harassing behavior among peers or by individuals without authority over the victim and harassment that represents an abuse of power by a superior, for example, faculty to student, supervisor to employee
 - a one-time lapse and a repeated pattern of harassment.
- University policy must be able to recognize these distinctions.
6. Resolved that any kind of harassment—sexual, racial, or other—and in any degree is inappropriate at the University of Pennsylvania.

7. Resolved that procedures, rules, and mechanisms be developed to deal adequately with problems of harassment at the University.
8. Resolved that the schools and the University develop and publicize a number of channels for easily and discreetly reporting cases of all kinds of harassment.
9. Resolved that the University not set up separate procedures for dealing with different types of harassment (e.g. racial, sexual, etc.).
10. Resolved that primary responsibility for dealing with harassment on the school level be the responsibility of the dean, and that the deans are responsible for the establishment of a system (not necessarily different from existing systems) to handle harassment in each school.
11. Resolved that the University provide a central investigative and judicial mechanism (not necessarily different from existing mechanisms) for dealing with harassment cases that are not or cannot be dealt with at the school level.
12. Resolved that it is the responsibility of the schools and of the University to ensure that there will be no retaliatory actions against individuals who have brought charges of harassment unless these charges are found to be clearly malicious.
13. Resolved that complaints of harassment in which the accuser is unwilling to make a formal complaint (giving his or her name and allowing the accused an opportunity to respond) will not be placed in the record.
14. Resolved that University panels of peer counselors be available to aid in the support and adjudication process for complainants.

A Tribute to Tom Ehrlich

Now that we find ourselves engaged in a search for a new provost, it is worth taking a moment to reflect on how fortunate we've been to have the leadership of Tom Ehrlich.

He arrived at Penn having already achieved distinction in law, government, and academia. As Dean of the Stanford Law School, as adviser to Presidents Ford and Carter, and as a guest scholar of the Brookings Institute, Tom Ehrlich demonstrated the same combination of practical intellect and humanistic vision that



have informed his accomplishments at the University.

And those accomplishments have been many. Soon after taking office as Provost and Professor of Law, he established a series of seminars for Penn undergraduates in ethics and the professions. His extensive work in strategic planning has led to changes in tuition financing and increases in graduate financial aid, innovative faculty support mechanisms, and improvements to research facilities. As we begin to implement plans for a major funding initiative to be launched shortly, we are again reminded of the positive and enduring influence he has had on virtually every aspect of life at Penn.

As grateful as we are for his work, more impressive have been the personal qualities that made it possible and which go with him to Indiana University. Perceptive, able to be decisive, and willing to take the inevitable heat and flak with grace and a sense of humor, he has been a consummate leader.

As we observed his talent for doing more in one day than most manage in three, many stood in awe. Tom Ehrlich conjured time out of thin air, returning calls to peers who were already at home, going to one more function,

and yet always taking the time to listen. Together with his bright, articulate, and engaging wife Ellen, herself an active professional woman, the Ehrlichs brought together and represented the University community with skill, warmth, and élan.

Throughout his distinguished service to the University, Tom managed, above all, to be even-handed. An able consensus-builder, he consistently achieved that most difficult of tasks—getting people to accept negative as well as positive results for the sake of an overall good. Always even-tempered, he was willing to make the tough calls in an environment that can never provide enough to meet the requests of all.

He has been a prime mover, concentrating his efforts on the most important goals of the University, adhering to a clear and present vision of what our University is and is becoming. As he assumes the presidency of the eight-campus Indiana University system, our thanks, admiration, and best wishes go with him—a leader, a colleague, and a friend.

Michael Aiken
Michael Austin
Joseph Bordogna
Lee Copeland
Claire Fagin
George Gerbner

Dell Hymes
Jan Lindhe
Robert Marshak
Robert Mundheim
Russell Palmer
Edward Stemmler

Following is a response to the President's call for comment on the proposed Harassment Policy.

On the Proposed Harassment Policy

Summary

The proposed statement on harassment (*Almanac Supplement*, April 14) is an important step in the increased sensitivity of the University administration to the human misery and illegal discrimination that harassment represents. *The primary strength of the statement is its requirement that deans appoint special advisors to serve as informal mediators and counselors.* This action will provide an important impetus for school administrators to take a more active and constructive role in the handling of harassment.

While an important step, *the report falls far short of the recommendations of the Council committee on harassment and the task force on racial harassment.* Among its weaknesses are:

- 1) the report fails to address the issue of retaliation either in section II (Purpose and Definitions) or section III (resources);
- 2) the report contains no mechanism to assure compliance with the special advisor requirement;
- 3) the academic freedom and responsibility committees are the wrong entity to adjudicate formal complaints against faculty members.

Retaliation

The findings of the harassment survey suggest that students, staff, and faculty who bring complaints against faculty members or administrators often find themselves subjected to retaliation, including unfair evaluations, whisper campaigns, and loss of academic opportunities. The policy on harassment should explicitly address this problem. Under definitions, acts of retaliation should themselves be considered

harassment. Under resources, some mechanism must be developed that protects complainants from retaliation during the process of complaint resolution.

Special Advisor

During the past year, I have served as the school ombudsman for the School of Social Work. This experience has convinced me that informal mechanisms are the crucial first step in empowering women to respond to the experience of harassment. The requirement of special advisors is the most important innovation in the current draft of the harassment statement.

Yet, for special advisors to be effective they need the knowledge and skills to handle the job, and there needs to be a compliance mechanism that will assure that they are doing their job. The experience with counselors and ombudsmen to date suggests that without these features, unsympathetic administrators and faculty members can render the special advisors ineffective.

Both of these needs could be handled successfully by the Penn Women's Center which is currently the only office on campus with an outstanding record in responding to harassment. The Center's director could be mandated in the statement to provide information to the advisors (as outlined in section III.E.1 of the draft). In addition, the Women's Center should be required to offer regular training sessions for the special advisors to help them develop expertise in responding to the needs of community members. The director should also be required to monitor the appointment and procedures of

the special advisors to assure that all Schools remain in compliance.

Formal Complaints

The most severe shortcoming of the draft is its reliance on the committees on academic freedom and responsibility as the main entity for handling formal complaints against faculty members. If this feature were retained in the final draft, it would compromise the historical role of these committees at the University and block an increase in the proportion of harassment incidents leading to formal complaints.

Through their history, the chief function of committees on academic freedom and responsibility has been to serve as protector of and advocate for the rights of faculty members to exercise maximum freedom of expression in the pursuit of their academic work. *Responding to harassment complaints, therefore, has little to do with academic freedom.* To force these committees to become judge in the case of sexual harassment will compromise their role as advocate. The result will be either committees with less power to address real threats to academic freedom or committees that are not credible protectors of the rights of those who have been harassed.

If the body that handles harassment complaints must be an all-faculty body, it should be one with a clear mandate to serve as advocate for students and staff members. In Social Work, for example, the Student Affairs committee would be the obvious choice, leaving the academic freedom and responsibility committee free to fulfill its role as protector of faculty rights.

—Mark J. Stern, associate professor
School of Social Work

May on Campus

May on Campus

On Council's April 29 agenda, the Special Committee to Review the University's Guidelines on Open Expression, chaired by Dr. Michael L. Wachter, will present the items below.

Summary and Recommendations on Open Expression

In October 1986, President Hackney and Provost Ehrlich appointed a Special Committee to Review the Guidelines on Open Expression (hereafter Special Committee). The Special Committee focused on four primary functions of the Committee on Open Expression under the present Guidelines: (1) clarifying the Guidelines by formal promulgation of interpretive rules or recommending to Council specific changes in the Guidelines (hereafter referred to as the legislative function); (2) advising University administrators, or others, on the meaning and application of the Guidelines and rules; (3) observing demonstrations and mediating among persons involved to avoid violations; and (4) evaluating and characterizing incidents as part of the adjudicatory process. We recommend that:

- (1) the legislative, advising, and mediating functions of the Committee on Open Expression be clarified and strengthened; and
- (2) the after-the-fact adjudicatory function (see (4) above) of the Committee be ended.

These changes are designed to:

- (1) strengthen the Committee's on-site mediating and advising roles to minimize potential violations of the Guidelines;
- (2) strengthen the Committee's role as the University-wide body responsible for educating the community about the Open Expression Guidelines;
- (3) eliminate the potential conflict of interest in the multiple roles of Committee members as observers and advisors on the one hand, and adjudicators on the other;
- (4) reduce duplication in judicial procedures which will (a) avoid conflicts in findings between the Committee and other judicial bodies, and (b) shorten the time required to resolve cases involving alleged violations of the Guidelines.

The reasoning behind the recommendations of the Special Committee is detailed in the body of this report. Our scrutiny of open expression issues and procedures leads us to believe that these problems will become exacerbated unless they are addressed by the University community.

Some Excerpts from the Report

As a result of our discussions, we identified three areas of particular concern to the University community at this time: (1) the bifurcation of adjudicatory responsibility between the Committee on Open Expression (hereafter the Committee) and the regular adjudicatory bodies such as the Student Judiciary and faculty Committees on Academic Freedom and Responsibility; (2) the length of time required for completion of the judicial process in Open Expression cases; and (3) ambiguities in certain Guideline standards.

The Special Committee has chosen initially to review the problems of bifurcated jurisdiction and delays in the resolution of Open Expression cases, problems (1) and (2), above. In this first report, we present our recommendations for addressing these issues. A later report will address the Principles, Standards and Enforcement sections of the Guidelines.

The adjudicatory function of the Committee is fraught with difficulties. Three significant issues have emerged. First, the Committee's advisory role to the Vice Provost and others at the scene of a demonstration conflicts with its subsequent adjudicatory role in determining, after the fact, whether the Guidelines had been violated by specific actions. Second, the rights of potential violators under the present Guidelines are uncertain and may be poorly protected in the Committee's hearing process. Third, the rights and interests of potential violators under the Guidelines may conflict with their rights and interests in subsequent disciplinary procedures (see Appendix V. of the forthcoming Report). In such cases, the duplication of hearings, combined with the inherent confusion between determinations of law and determinations of fact, introduces the possibility of conflicts in findings and protracts the resolution of disputes.

Adjudicatory processes that protect the rights of students, faculty and staff with respect to open expression or other issues are currently in place. Duplicate processes waste time and resources, create confusion and delay, and raise serious questions about the integrity of the system. The important role that the Guidelines and the Committee on Open Expression play in an academic community demands that matters before the Committee be resolved in a fair and timely manner. By taking the Committee out of the adjudicatory process and focusing its efforts on legislation, advice, and mediation, we believe the Committee can better serve the University community as the voice of authority on open expression issues.

At Council on April 29, the Committee on Facilities will present the following resolutions, prepared jointly by its Subcommittee on Parking and Transportation (Dr. Ed Morlok, chair) and its ad hoc Task Force on Transportation (Dr. Vukan Vuchic, chair). The resolutions were passed unanimously by the parent committee, chaired by Dr. Noam Lior, which notes its gratitude for data and information provided by Steven Murray, director of business services, and Robert Funniss, director of transportation and parking.

Recommendations on Transportation and Parking

Based on the background information in [a 20-page report furnished to Council members], the University Council Committee on Facilities recommends immediate action to resolve parking and transportation problems as follows:

1. Parking and Transportation revenues, including interest on accumulated funds, should be used only for financing parking and transportation.
2. Present average parking fee levels (permit and transient) are acceptable and should be raised approximately with the Consumer Price Index.
3. Reduce the waiting list for permit parking to a maximum of 300 to 500 requests, and increase the availability of transient parking by the following measures:
 - A. Provide additional spaces through construction of permanent remote lots, connected to campus by shuttle buses as appropriate.
 - B. Parking rates (permit and transient) should be differentiated by proximity to the campus center. At a minimum there should be three different fee levels:
 - a. premium rates for core area parking,
 - b. intermediate rates for parking around the core,
 - c. low rates for remote lots.

However, the overall average permit parking rate should follow guideline #2, as should the average transient rate.

C. Work with the City of Philadelphia to increase short-term usage of on-street parking through reduced duration and increased fees.

4. Encourage and facilitate the use of public transportation through increased information about services and promotion of the ComPass Plan, improvement of Penn Bus Service, and through cooperation with SEPTA on improving facilities and safety.

5. Improve pedestrian travel in and around campus through improved walkways, crossing protection, and enhanced security.

6. Facilitate bicycle usage and reduce conflicts with pedestrians through provisions of designated paths, increased regulation, and more secure storage.

7. The Transportation and Parking Office should develop within three months a short-term plan to implement the above programs, in cooperation with other offices as necessary, and also within a year, prepare a Plan consistent with the Five-Year Plans of University academic programs and resource centers, and with the University's Master Plan.

On Penn Children's Center

At a recent meeting of University Council, a number of interested persons spoke on behalf of the Penn Children's Center. While the Center, over the last year or so, has suffered from declining enrollments, I was reminded of the important service the Penn Children's Center has provided through the years to children of the University and neighboring communities and their parents. A service of quality child care ought to be preserved at Penn, if possible, and I am convinced that we ought to go to extraordinary lengths to do so.

Therefore, I am extending until September 15, 1987, from June 15, 1987, the time to enroll enough children who would equal 38 full-time equivalents. This extension will give parents and the Center's advocates an opportunity to carry forth the Center's program and enroll additional children. I am also persuaded that this service should no longer be the responsibility of the School of Social Work, that School's budget and its curriculum. Thus we will be exploring over the coming months alternative ways to operate a day care center, including the possibility of its becoming a not-for-profit entity, or a center operated on behalf of the University by an outside agency with a parent advisory board.

The question of whether the University should subsidize day care is much too complex to try to answer quickly. In the short term, there are a number of ways that the University can be helpful to the Center. To smooth the transition and demonstrate the University's commitment to the Center and its service, Penn will commit \$50,000 to the operation in fiscal year 1988. However, after that time, the Center should be self-sustaining. If by September 15, 1987, enrollments fall short of the established minimums, Penn will, as noted, subsidize the Center to up to \$50,000 to keep it in operation for the duration of fiscal year 1988. If new solutions for the operation of the Center do not prove feasible, Penn will work with parents to place their children by July 1, 1988, in other local day care centers. I am hopeful, however, that this effort will not be necessary and, to the contrary, the Penn Children's Center will have an opportunity to serve many more of the University's and its neighboring communities' children in the years ahead.

—Sheldon Hackney

Summer Day Care Program

Applications for the summer and fall day care programs for pre-school and kindergarten age children at the Penn Children's Center are currently being accepted.

The summer program, beginning June 1, offers options for three, four, or five day programs, from 7:30 a.m. to 5:45 p.m. Registration is also being accepted for the fall program, which begins September 8.

In addition to pre-school and kindergarten education, Penn Children's Center offers arts and crafts, music, activities involving senior citizens, field trips and parent education.

The Center is located on campus at the rear of 3905 Spruce Street. For further information, call Pam Johnson, Ext. 5268.

Speaking Out

Faculty Club Crisis

It is of the utmost urgency that all members of the Faculty Club attend the Annual Meeting on April 29 at 4 p.m. This will be unlike any prior annual meeting because we are looking to you for advice about whether or not the Faculty Club should continue to exist.

The Faculty Club came into being almost thirty years ago at a time when President Harnwell and his colleagues recognized that the Lenape Club (forerunner of the Club) could no longer accommodate the diverse segments of a rapidly expanding University community. Established as a private non-profit organization with a Board of Governors elected by its members, the Club enjoyed from the outset—and for many years thereafter—a collegial relationship with the University administration.

The Club was perceived as serving a vital function as the common meeting place for the University's many constituencies. For this reason, an operating deficit was underwritten by the University for many years. This situation changed when, in 1983, the University administration agreed to support the Club with a subvention that would decrease in increments of \$50,000 per year through fiscal year 1988, at which time the subvention would disappear entirely.

Owing to escalating fixed costs of running the Club and to efforts to enhance quality, the Board of Governors in 1981 entered into a management contract with Restaurant Associates. Under that management the quality of food and service improved, but an annual operating deficit remained.

At the end of the 1986 fiscal year, the Board of Governors terminated the Faculty Club's contract with Restaurant Associates, and agreed to have the University Dining Services manage the Club for a trial period of one year. The University administration in a letter of intent agreed to operate the Club's facilities in consultation with the Board of Governors whose legal responsibilities include setting policy and seeing to the overall management of the Club.

The University operator, however, has shown unwillingness throughout the year to consult with the Board and has proceeded without Board approval to institute policies which the Board has not approved.

The Board of Governors feels that this situation cannot be allowed to continue. However, the University administration has questioned the viability of the existence of the Club if the Board of Governors should decide to terminate the Club's arrangement with Dining Services.

We urge the membership, therefore, to attend the Annual Meeting on April 29 to discuss whether or not the Club should remain affiliated with the University Dining Services.

That decision must be made the next day.

—Faculty Club Board of Governors

Response on Faculty Club

On April 15, 1987, President Hackney met with members of the Faculty Club Board and the Faculty Senate, Thomas Ehrlich and myself. At that time, he reaffirmed his commitment to the importance of having a gathering place on campus where faculty, staff, alumni and friends could meet and break bread together in a spirit of fellowship. He also affirmed, however, his concern over the continuing deficits that the Faculty Club had incurred under its previous management. That deficit, in spite of agreements with the University, amounted, before subvention, to more than \$1.5 million.

Under new management and the auspices of Hospitality Services [umbrella under which Dining Services falls], a number of positive changes have occurred: local alumni are now joining the club; there is increasing utilization of the Club by faculty and staff members; and there is a tremendous improvement in service and menu variety. Further, deficits experienced by the Club are being reduced; and the Club, for the first time in a number of years, appears to be on the verge of breaking even, or operating with minimum subvention by the University.

At that meeting, all participants recognized that the Club was in a period of transition. New management brings new approaches, and change can often be painful to those who are accustomed to the old ways of doing things. Nonetheless, we all came away from that meeting believing that the Club was being operated by the University, through Hospitality Services, for the benefit of members of the University community; that we had reached agreement on the difference between consultation over changes and referendums on those changes; and that, in a spirit of mutual cooperation, both the Board of the Faculty Club and the University would continue to work together to insure that the Club at the University of Pennsylvania was among the best in the country, yet did not present an unconscionable drain on scarce University resources.

We in the administration hope that the Board of the Faculty Club will not vote itself out of existence at its upcoming meeting. However, if it does so, the University is committed to continue to operate a club for the University community that welcomes faculty, staff and alumni and their friends, at reasonable membership rates, in an ambiance that is pleasing, and with food quality that seeks to attain the high marks of quality and freshness. We look forward to the future and regret the continued misunderstandings that we have fought hard to resolve but that apparently continue to exist.

—Helen O'Bannon, Senior Vice President

SPEAKING OUT welcomes the contributions of readers. Almanac's normal Tuesday deadline for unsolicited material is extended to THURSDAY noon for short, timely letters on University issues. Advance notice of intent to submit is always appreciated.—Ed.

The third annual Festival will present ten different shows from Austria, Canada, England, Switzerland, Taiwan and the United States, with 68 performances on five different stages. Sponsored by the Annenberg Center, the Festival—part of *We the People 200*—will take place on campus May 20-24. Each ticket bought at \$5 (all ages) entitles the bearer to a ticket at \$2.50 for another show.

In addition to the indoor entertainment, there will be outdoor street performers from 11 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. on weekdays and from 11 a.m.-4:30 p.m. on the weekend. Supervised Playworks tables where children can create their own works of art will be open from 10 a.m.-2 p.m. on weekdays and 10 a.m.-4 p.m. on weekends (free for ticket holders). New this year are Playworkshops designed for 5th graders and up instructing children in mime, theatre, dance, tap, group folk dancing, juggling and improvisation (also free for ticket holders). Channel 3 (KYW-TV) will have a television camera at the Festival as part of their "For Kids' Sake" program. Children can read the news, sports or weather and appear on the TV monitor.

For a brochure of show times and ticket information call the Annenberg Center at Ext. 6791.



Department of Public Safety Crime Report

This report contains tallies of Part I crimes against persons, and summaries of Part I crimes in the five busiest sectors on campus where two or more incidents occurred between April 20 and April 26, 1987.

Total Crime: Crimes Against Persons—1, Burglaries—2, Thefts—17, Thefts of Auto—1

Area/Highest Frequency of Crime

Date	Time Reported	Location	Incident
Crimes Against Persons			
04-24-87	8:25 AM	3900 Blk Locust	Person assaulted and money taken from pockets.
Spruce St. to Walnut St., 33rd St. to 34th St.			
04-20-87	3:32 PM	Smith Hall	Cash taken from unattended purse.
04-23-87	3:57 AM	Towne Building	Secured Raleigh 10-speed taken from rack.
04-25-87	6:18 PM	Hayden Hall	Arrest/2 males apprehended for stealing wallet.
Baltimore Avenue to Walnut St., 40th St. to 42nd St.			
04-22-87	1:06 PM	Evans Bldg.	Unattended dental equipment taken from clinic.
04-22-87	11:20 AM	Divinity School	Vehicle bra taken from silver Nissan.
04-24-87	2:06 PM	Evans Bldg.	Dental tools taken from basement locker.
Spruce St. to Locust Walk, 34th St. to 36th St.			
04-24-87	10:17 AM	Houston Hall	Purse and contents taken from table.
04-24-87	7:02 PM	Houston Hall	Front door broken in/answering machine taken.
South St. to Walnut St., 32nd St. to 33rd St.			
04-21-87	9:04 PM	Hutchinson Gym	Lock broken from locker/wallet taken.
04-24-87	5:50 PM	Franklin Field	North Stands/wallet taken.
Hamilton Walk to Spruce St., 36th St. to 38th St.			
04-21-87	6:34 PM	Mask & Wig Dorm	Walkman/earphones & batteries taken from desk.
04-26-87	4:30 PM	Stouffer Training	Rear tire from Columbia 10-speed bike stolen.

Safety Tip: Be alert and think prevention; don't give someone who has the desire, the opportunity to make you a victim. Report all suspicious persons to Penn police immediately by dialing 511 or Ext. 7333.

Update

APRIL ON CAMPUS

EXHIBIT

28 Serigraphs and Monoprints: multi-media art of Harvey Weinreich; 9 a.m.-5 p.m., Print Hall, Morgan Building. Through May 18.

TALKS

29 In Vitro Transcription of the Mouse Metallothionein-I Gene: Some Aspects of Regulation; Maria Webb, Milton S. Hershey Medical Center, Pennsylvania State University; noon, Suite 100-101, Med Labs Building (Department of Pharmacology).

The Molecular Basis of Differential Gene Action; Donald Brown, director, Carnegie Institute; 4 p.m., Dunlop Auditorium, Medical Education Building (Department of Human Genetics).

30 Biochemical Topics of Receptor Biology; Jeffrey Besterman, University of North Carolina; noon, Hirst Auditorium, 1 Dulles Building (Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics).

Control of Muscle Differentiation by Growth Factors: Stimulation by IGF's and Inhibition by TGF-beta; James Florini, professor of biochemistry, department of biology, Syracuse University; 3:30-4:30 p.m., Auditorium, Wistar Institute (Center for the Study of Aging).

Molecular Components of Excitation—Contraction Coupling; Kevin Campbell, department of physiology, University of Iowa; 4 p.m., Physiology Library, 4th floor, Richards Building (Department of Physiology).

Deadlines

The deadline for the weekly calendar update entries is Tuesday, a week before the date of publication. The deadline for the Summer pullout is **Tuesday, May 12**. Send to *Almanac*, 3601 Locust Walk/6224 (second floor of the Christian Association).

Greener by the Yard

Greener by the Yard, the first in a series of gardening workshops sponsored by the West Philadelphia Partnership, will deal with the West Philadelphia front yard and the challenges it presents. The workshop will be held Saturday, May 2 at the Church of the Community of the Good Shepherd, 314-18 S. 46th Street, 2nd floor auditorium, 10 a.m.-1 p.m. The instructors, garden designer Patricia Schriber and landscape architects Gary Smith and Burt Tanoue, encourage participants to bring questions, ideas, designs and pictures to work out a garden scheme for their front yard. A \$3 donation is suggested. To register call 625-8280.

Almanac

3601 Locust Walk, Philadelphia, Pa. 19104-6224
(215) 898-5274 or 5275.

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

EDITOR Karen C. Gaines
ASSISTANT EDITOR Marguerite F. Miller
EDITORIAL ASSISTANT Mary Corbett
STUDENT ASSISTANTS Catherine E. Clark, Mary A. Downes, Amy E. Gardner, Michelle Y. Holloway, Michael S. Markowitz, Leonard S. Perlman, Daniel B. Siegel
ALMANAC ADVISORY BOARD Chair, Lucienne Frappier-Mazur; F. Gerard Adams, Dan Ben-Amos, Linda Brodkey, Jean Crockett, Michele Richman, Roger D. Soloway, Michael Zuckerman, for the Faculty Senate; William Epstein for the Administration; Carol Carr for the Librarians Assembly; John Hayden for the A-1 Assembly; Joseph Kane for the A-3 Assembly.