

Almanac

Tuesday, March 20, 1990

Published by the University of Pennsylvania

Volume 36, Number 27

INSIDE

- Senate: SEC Actions 3/7/90, p. 2
- Report on Review of Council, p. 2
- Open Expression: Proposed Revisions, p. 3
- Speaking Out: 5-Year Review; MDs; pp. 4-5
- Deaths: Dr. Scheie, Three Students, p. 6
- Council: Upcoming and Synopsis 2/14/90, p. 6
- UPS Grants; U-BRSG Guidelines, p. 7
- Update, pp. 7-8; CrimeStats p. 8
- Pullouts: Budgeting for FY 1991, pp. I-IV
- CRC's Penn Printout

Update: The Clemente Case

On March 9, Wharton sophomore Christopher Clemente was stabbed by two fellow inmates at Riker's Island Prison, N.Y., reportedly in a quarrel over a telephone. He was in Elmhurst Hospital with multiple stab wounds and a collapsed lung, when his March 15 bail hearing produced a reduction of bail from \$75,000 to \$25,000. At presstime, it was reported that Mr. Clemente would be moved this week to the infirmary at Riker's Island.

Students petitioning the University to post Mr. Clemente's bail after the court declined to accept his family's house are now beginning a bail fund drive.

Meanwhile, on March 7 the Vice Provost for University Life issued the following:

The Judicial Inquiry Officer and Christopher Clemente's lawyers have reached an agreement regarding a timetable for a further judicial process. Mr. Clemente has agreed that he will be on leave of absence until no earlier than fall 1990. He will only be permitted to enter the campus under appropriate supervision. The Judicial Inquiry Officer will decide in the summer of 1990 whether and under what circumstances she will proceed with a hearing. In accordance with this agreement I am lifting the "suspension" imposed on Mr. Clemente because I am satisfied that the safety interests of the University community have been met by the terms of this agreement. I want to thank Mr. Clemente's lawyers for their cooperation and I want to commend, in particular, the work of Ms. Constance Goodman for her skilled and dedicated efforts to reach an agreement which satisfies the needs of all parties.

—Kim M. Morrisson

President and Provost on Civilized Debate

The behavior of several members of the Penn community at the recent program on Pennsylvania's anti-abortion law reminds us that we have yet to realize fully our hope that controversial issues can be discussed on campus in a civilized manner.

We recognize that strong feelings often accompany debate on important and difficult policy issues, and we encourage the airing of such debates on our campus. At the same time, discussions and programs, as heated as they might be, should take place without the interruption of speakers and without the display of the sort of religious slur that was contained on at least one sign carried on the night of the recent program in Meyerson Hall. The heckling of speakers and the religious slur were in complete conflict with our vision of a community in which members respect diverse viewpoints.

We remind all of the members of our community how undignified and unbecoming such behavior is, and we hope that we can strive for a higher standard as we argue the important and emotionally charged issues of the day.

—Sheldon Hackney, President

—Michael Aiken, Provost

Open Enrollment: Starting April 2

For 1990, the annual Benefits Open Enrollment period is April 2 through April 12. Open Enrollment is the time for benefits-eligible faculty and staff to take a closer look at current benefits choices and, if desired, to make changes to them.

A feature of this year's Open Enrollment is the addition of a new health plan, Keystone. When your Open Enrollment materials arrive, please take time to review them carefully. Please mark your calendar for the annual Benefits Fair to be held at the Faculty Club's Alumni Hall on April 3 from noon to 2 p.m.

—Office of Human Resources/Benefits

The Provost to BSL on the Clemente Case

As the community is probably aware, the attorneys for Christopher Clemente requested that the University post bail for him. Concerned for Chris, members of the administration reviewed the request with care and met twice last week to discuss it with interested students. The following letter, addressed to Black Student League President, Reuben Brown, explains the University's decision. [A shorter formal response has also been sent to Chris' attorneys.]—M.A.

Text of Letter to Reuben Brown

President Hackney and I share the deep concern that you and others in the community have expressed about the legal difficulties confronting Christopher Clemente in view of the current felony charges he faces in New York and what we learned yesterday about his two past arrests. That concern was naturally compounded when we learned of the stabbing that occurred last Friday.

As a parent, I can fully understand the anguish felt by Chris' mother and my heart goes out to her. I sympathize also with his friends and fellow students who are worried about his health and safety, as well as about his legal problems.

We have been active in seeking information about Chris' medical treatment and safety. Because of our concern, a physician from the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania has been in direct contact with the head of the trauma unit at Elmhurst Hospital who is the surgeon responsible for Chris' treatment. We were advised that his medical care is being managed effectively, and we are reassured to

learn that he is making progress.

We have also been in touch with representatives of the New York State Department of Corrections to express our strong interest in Chris' safety. We have learned that Chris or his attorneys can request protective custody, or the Department itself can initiate this reassignment. One of his attorneys confirmed that this reassignment is likely. We shall follow up to learn what is done.

President Hackney has spoken with Chris' mother to convey directly our interest in his welfare. In addition, I have asked a University Life staff member to remain in touch with her, assuring her of our interest and seeing if we can be of assistance to her.

We have given careful thought to your recommendation that the University provide bail for Chris and have decided that such an action would not be appropriate. Although the University seeks to be a supportive community, such support must always be even-handed and consistent with its educational mission. We are not aware of any instance in which this University has provided bail for a student. Providing bail in this case would set a precedent with such far-reaching consequences for the University that we simply cannot take the step you recommend, even though in response to Chris' lawyers, the judge has permitted a new bail option.

I am very sorry whenever any member of the Penn community faces serious problems. We shall actively continue to follow the steps being taken to protect Chris' health and safety.

—Michael Aiken, Provost

OF RECORD

Change in Transferability of Annuity Fund Balances

Please note the following change to the *transferability provision* for the Tax Deferred Annuity Plan which was announced in *Almanac* on February 20, 1990. The inset paragraph which follows supersedes the paragraph on transferability on page 3 in *Almanac* of that date. (Previously only transfers of 100% of balances were authorized. Now transfers may be any amount of the balance, up to 100% of the balance. This change is made possible under the recently issued revenue ruling 90-24.)

Transferability

Participants may transfer up to 100% of balances from a fund in one University approved carrier directly to an approved fund offered by one of the other two approved carriers.

Questions about transferability should be directed to the Benefits Office, Ext. 8-7281.

—Adrienne S. Riley, Director, Human Resources
—Dennis Mahoney, Manager, Benefits

From the Senate Office

The following statement is published in accordance with the Senate Rules. Among other purposes, the publication of SEC actions is intended to stimulate discussion between the constituencies and their representatives. We would be pleased to hear suggestions from members of the Faculty Senate. Please communicate your comments to Senate Chair Robert E. Davies or Senate Staff Assistant Carolyn Burdon, 15 College Hall/6303, Ext. 8-6943.

Actions Taken by the Senate Executive Committee Wednesday, March 7, 1990

- 1. Committee Vacancies.** SEC made nominations to committees for 1990-91. A ballot will be circulated to all SEC members; approval voting will be used.
- 2. Free speech and the harassment policy.** The sense of SEC members was that this is a serious matter, and that information was needed on cases. SEC concluded with the understanding that a full discussion will occur at the March 21 University Council meeting.

3. Report of the Senate ad hoc Committee to Review University Council. SEC had discussed the report over two previous meetings, and after a brief discussion adopted the report (which appears below) by an overwhelming majority.

4. Formal vote on SEC's continued participation in University Council. It was pointed out that the question adopted in the May 9, 1989 ballot sent to all members of the standing faculty requires that SEC vote on the motion "that continued participation in the University Council serves the interests of the faculty." SEC adopted a motion, without objection, to "wait until the April SEC meeting to vote."

5. Code of Academic Integrity Review. Review committee chair, Professor David Pope and member graduate student Teresa Goddu described preliminary plans to involve students in the operating of the honor court in an effort to improve the present code of academic integrity. Most SEC members favored involvement of an equal number of faculty and students.

Report of the Senate Ad Hoc Committee to Review University Council

January 30, 1990

In a May 1989 mail ballot concerning the Faculty Senate's role in the University Council, Faculty Senate members agreed that a faculty committee should be appointed by the Senate Executive Committee and charged with drafting proposals by February 1, 1990 designed to improve the University Council. The Senate Executive Committee accordingly appointed the Senate ad hoc Committee to Review University Council.

The committee held eight meetings, including two public hearings announced by letter to each Council member, and in *Almanac*. The announcement was also sent to *The Daily Pennsylvanian*.

The committee considered the 1979 report of the Council Review Committee (the Conn committee), as well as letters and oral presentations by members of the University community. The committee presents this report, including both suggested changes in the Council bylaws and recommendations for more effective implementation of existing bylaws.

The committee's suggestions are primarily procedural. They call for changing the bylaws regarding the presiding officer, the handling of matters not on the agenda for action, attendance at meetings, the agenda-making process, time limits on debate and Steering's handling of committee reports.

The committee has deliberately chosen not to deal with "no-shows" and the disparity between the number of SEC members and the number who may vote in Council; both of these problems, we believe, are for SEC, rather than the committee, to resolve.

And finally, the committee wishes to emphasize that this is a unanimous report.

Suggested deletions from bylaws are in square brackets, and suggested additions are *italicized*.

III. Positions, 1. Presiding Officer: The President of the University, with the advice of the Steering Committee and the consent of the Council, shall [may] each year appoint a Moderator of the Council, who shall thereby become a non-voting member of the Council. [If a Moderator is appointed] The Moderator shall act as presiding officer at meetings of the Council. [In lieu of appointing a Moderator, the President may act as presiding officer of the Council.]

[If the President has appointed a Moderator,] The Chair of the Steering Committee shall serve as presiding officer in the absence of the Moderator. [If the President has not appointed a Moderator, the Provost shall act as presiding officer in the absence of the President, or when the President, on specific occasions, wishes not to serve as presiding officer; the Chair of the Steering Committee shall preside if both the President and Provost are absent or wish not to preside.]

Rationale: The committee has concluded that the dual role of the President as presiding officer and recipient of Council's advice creates unnecessary pressures and embarrassments, which could be avoided by having a neutral moderator.

IV. Meetings, 3. Notice of meetings, agenda, and committee reports: Addendum to last sentence in second paragraph:

"...The Council, by affirmative vote of a majority of the full membership, may decide to act on a matter not on the agenda for action; otherwise

no action, including a straw vote, may be taken."

IV. Meetings, 5. Persons entitled to attend: (last sentence)

"...[Any guest] *Anyone* who, in the opinion of the presiding officer, does not preserve the decorum of the meeting will be asked to leave."

The committee concluded that the present rule permitting guests to attend if they have signed a list in the Secretary's Office is adequate, but should be enforced routinely. The distinction between members and guests should be clearly maintained in the conduct of the meeting.

V. Steering Committee, 3. Duties:

"(a) The Steering Committee shall prepare the agenda for meetings of the Council. *Announcement of forthcoming Steering Committee meetings shall be published in Almanac and in The Daily Pennsylvanian reminding the University Community of the appropriate means to request that items be placed on the agenda of the Council.* [It will meet after the last Council meeting of each academic year to formulate the basic, long-range agenda for Council for the coming year.]

(b) *Incoming and outgoing Steering Committee members will meet after the last Council meeting of each academic year and a portion of that meeting will be devoted to discussion of the basic Council agenda for the coming year."*

Old sections (b) through (g) are to be relettered as (c) through (h).

Suggested change in section (f) (formerly section (c)), second paragraph:

"The Steering Committee is empowered to formulate Rules of the Day, such as the designation of specific time limitations on the debate of specific issues. *The committee may, at its discretion, invite representatives for each side of a controversial issue to speak for specified periods of time, before general debate is begun.* Changes in these rules shall require a majority vote of those present."

VI. Committees, 1. Standing Committees, at end of last paragraph:

"...*The Steering Committee shall include, as appropriate, a synopsis of committee activities in the report to council.*"

This committee recommends that members who intend, in the question period, to ask a question which may require an extended answer including factual information, be encouraged to present the question in writing to the Steering committee. If time limits on speeches have been set, they should be enforced.

The committee thinks that at this time the problems of the University Council are not related to its size, and therefore proposes no change in the composition of Council.

Senate ad hoc Committee to Review University Council

Jacob M. Abel (Mechanical Engineering)

June Axinn (Social Work)

Meridith Bogert (Restorative Dentistry)

Michael Cohen (Physics)

Helen C. Davies (Microbiology/Medicine)

Marten S. Estey (Management), Chair

Victoria E. Kirkham (Romance Languages)

To the University Community:

The Committee to Review the Guidelines on Open Expression has been meeting since last fall and has discussed many concerns about the Guidelines suggested by Committee members and brought to its attention by the Provost and other members of the University. The Committee determined that the Guidelines were not in need of a major overhaul, but that relatively minor amendments and additions would serve to correct the problems which we detected.

The following changes represent our current proposals for improving the Guidelines. We invite members of the University to review our proposals and to communicate their views to us by attending the Open Forum scheduled for Thursday, March 22, from 4:30 to 6 p.m., in Room 108 of the Annenberg School, or by writing to me (Annenberg 317/6220).

Larry Gross, Chair

Guidelines on Open Expression: Proposed Revisions *March 12, 1990*

I. Principles

Add:

D. In case of conflict between the principles of the Guidelines on Open Expression and other University policies, the principles of the Guidelines shall take precedence.

II. Definitions

No changes proposed.

III. Standards

Replace introductory paragraph of Section B as follows:

B. Each member of the University community is expected to know and follow the Guidelines on Open Expression. A person whose conduct violates the following Standards may be held accountable for that conduct, whether or not the Vice Provost or delegate has given an instruction regarding the conduct in question. Any member of the University community who is in doubt as to the propriety of planned conduct may obtain an advisory opinion from the Committee on Open Expression in advance of the event.

Replace Section B.3. as follows:

B.3. a. Individuals or groups violate these guidelines if they continue to engage in conduct after the Vice Provost for University Life or delegate has declared that the conduct is in violation of the Guidelines and has instructed the participants to modify or terminate their behavior. Prompt compliance with the instructions shall be a mitigating factor in any disciplinary proceedings based upon the immediate conduct to which the instructions refer, unless the violators are found to have caused or intended to cause injury to person or property or to have demonstrated willfully in an impermissible location.

b. If the individuals or groups refuse to comply with the Vice Provost's or delegate's order, they may challenge the appropriateness of the order to the judicial system. If the judiciary finds that the conduct was protected by the Guidelines, all charges shall be dismissed.

c. Individuals or groups complying with the Vice Provost's or delegate's order may request that the Committee on Open Expression determine if the Guidelines were properly interpreted and applied to their conduct.

IV. Committee on Open Expression

Add sentence at end of present Section B.3. as follows:

The Committee must respond to such requests as soon as feasible but in any event not later than within one month of their receipt by the Chair of the Committee.

V. Responsibilities for Enforcement

Replace introductory paragraph of Section C as follows:

C. The Vice Provost or delegate is responsible for enforcing Section III.B. and may instruct anyone whose behavior is violating or threatens to violate these Guidelines to modify or terminate such behavior. The instruction shall include notice that failure or refusal to comply is a further violation according to Section III. B. of these Guidelines.* However, an instruction or warning by the Vice Provost

or delegate is not a prerequisite for a finding that a violation has occurred.

Amend Section IV.C.1. as follows:

1. When the Vice Provost or delegate declares that an individual or group has violated the Guidelines, he or she may request to examine their University identification.

a. Failure to comply with this request is in violation of the Guidelines.

b. If an individual declared to have committed a violation refuses the request of the Vice Provost or delegate to show University identification, the Vice Provost or delegate may direct a University employee, other than a member of the University of Pennsylvania Police Department, to photograph or videotape the individual. The Vice Provost or delegate must warn the individual that this will occur unless identification is presented. Photographs and videotapes obtained without such warning may not be used as evidence in disciplinary proceedings. The Vice Provost must obtain and hold such photographs and videotapes, share them with others only for purposes related to the Guidelines, and assure their destruction after the purpose for which they have been taken has been accomplished.

Replace Section V.D. as follows;

present Section V.D. becomes Section V.E.:

D. 1. Cases involving undergraduate students are referred to the Judicial Inquiry Officer who investigates the event and decides what disciplinary proceedings, if any, to pursue.

2. Cases involving graduate or professional students are referred to the Judicial Inquiry Officer or to the established disciplinary body of the school in which the student is enrolled.

3. Cases involving faculty are referred to the appropriate dean or to the Provost.

4. Cases involving University staff or administrators are referred to that individual's supervisor or any other person above that individual in the chain of command.

5. Cases involving trustees and associate trustees of the University and members of Boards of Overseers or other bodies advisory to the University are referred to the Executive Committee of the Trustees.

Committee to Review the Guidelines on Open Expression

Faculty:

Larry Gross, Annenberg, Chair
Adelaide Delluva, Animal Biology
Ira Harkavy, Vice Dean/Adj. Prof., SAS
Sorab Rabii, Electrical Engineering
Curtis Reitz, Law

Leonard Rico, Management

Undergraduate Students:

Andrew S. Cohen, W'91

Brett Parker, Col'90

Graduate Students:

Susan Garfinkel, American Civilization

Ivy Barsky, History of Art

Staff:

Bob Schoenberg, Student Life

* Committee member Curtis Reitz recommends that the following be added here: *The Vice Provost or delegate shall further give notice that continuation of such behavior is not a violation of Section III.B.3. if the instruction is not a correct interpretation of the Guidelines.*

Speaking Out

Man and Beast

A report in *Almanac* January 16, decries a vicious and illegal disruption of the research work of Dr. Adrian Morrison in the Department of Animal Biology. Similar deplorable events in other medical areas bring growing concern about the "City of Brotherly Love," the very name of which tends to enshrine also parental, sisterly, and even calf or puppy love. What becomes of the city's long cherished respect for its great educational and humanitarian institutions and their principles and standards?

In the interval between my arrival at the School of Veterinary Medicine, in 1948, and my departure as Emeritus Professor of Physiology in 1968, there was much to learn about animals, including *Homo sapiens*, and about what I have come to call the *metabiology* of a university and of a city called Philadelphia.

My instruction began a few days after I arrived there. Dean Kelsner was interviewing applicants for a job to care for hospitalized animals. One applicant was the minister of a small congregation who was seeking extra income. After the interviews, the dean came to my office to consider the prospects. He said he had asked the reverend if he liked horses, and with a pause for reflection the reply was, "Yes sir—in proportion, in proportion."

His meaning was clear. The reverend's insight could have become more indigenous for Philadelphia, especially along the Animal Liberation Front, where ostensible intentions or motivations are admirable but methods, including malicious impugning and mindless destruction, are despicable.

—F. Harold McCutcheon,
Emeritus Professor
of Physiology in Animal Biology/Vet

Against Five-Year Review

I read with dismay the exchange of letters concerning status reports on fifth-year Ph.D. candidates initiated by the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies. All the practical questions raised about this move appear legitimate. However, it seems to me that the exchange ignores the more important question of what any Dean's office has to do with the academic evaluation of any student, least of all, a Ph.D. candidate. It seems to me that this kind of proposal can only arise from a view of the Ph.D. process as some form of supertechnology amenable to bureaucratic and mechanical regulation.

It has always been my understanding that the supervisor-candidate relation is at the very core of Ph.D. education. This is a unique, more or less personal and highly sensitive relation which places a distinctive stamp on Ph.D. training and sets it apart from other degree programs. On the characteristics and traditions of this relationship rests the production of much of

our national leadership, and the excellence of the faculty of our universities. In so far as this or any other university has an excellent Ph.D. program, it is because it guides the Ph.D. candidate to logical and creative thinking, originality in research planning and experimental design and creativity in the analysis of results and the generalization of discovery. If this is still the function of the Ph.D. supervisor, then he or she is the only person who can report meaningfully on the progress of a candidate and the only way it can be done without disturbing the relationship is informally. Regardless of the year, if the supervisor is satisfied with the candidate's progress that should be sufficient. To my knowledge, administrative intervention in this purely academic process is highly unusual. The research supervisor is charged with responsibility for maintaining the standards of excellence of this university; failures in this regard are a responsibility of units of the faculty beginning with the supervisor's immediate colleagues. By the very nature of this responsibility, I can see no way by which administration can keep score on this process without adversely affecting the supervisor-candidate relationship. Accumulated experience has already shown that even a thesis committee can only intercede with utmost care, even where there are palpable grounds, without infringing academic freedom and traditional prerogatives. How then can the relatively distant administration enter this terrain without converting the unique scholarly relation into a mechanical proposition subject to equally mechanical rules? Which slow-bloomer-later-to-be-genius or which esoteric thinker-later-to-be-discoverer will run afoul of these bureaucratic barriers and be lost?

For God's sake! There is already enough unavoidable fiat at any university as things stand. Let the supervisors monitor their students quietly, consulting colleagues as necessary so as to preserve the unique scholarly characteristics of the relation and its full measure of academic freedom.

—Robert J. Rutman, Emeritus Professor,
Biochemistry in Animal Biology/Vet

Response to Dr. Rutman

As Chair of the SAS Committee on Graduate Studies, I would like to respond to Dr. Robert J. Rutman's thoughtful letter on the recent decision to implement an annual reporting procedure for dissertating students beyond their fifth year. Dr. Rutman's letter is the most recent in a series of comments on the move to improve faculty monitoring of a student's progress toward the doctorate. It is perfectly understandable that one not privy to each step of the decision making process might not readily understand how

that decision was reached—or who reached it.

Let me begin by assuring Dr. Rutman that the graduate faculty is still very much in charge of the academic evaluation of graduate students; we continue to supervise students without administrative intervention in our responsibility to maintain research standards or in our efforts to cultivate a sensitive, responsive relationship with the candidate. If the supervisor proves negligent in advancing the candidate toward her or his goal, the supervisor's immediate colleagues are still called upon to rectify the situation. The all-important relationship between supervisor and student and between student and graduate group has not been superseded by some Orwellian "supertechnology amenable to bureaucratic and mechanical regulation." In fact, there is very little, if anything, mechanical about the process.

What the faculty has done is to take steps to tighten and clarify procedures for the benefit of all parties. After having consulted with all the graduate chairs in SAS on the issue, the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies, Donald D. Fitts, presented the proposal for a more responsible reporting system to the SAS Committee on Graduate Education on November 20, 1989. It was suggested that an annual progress report be compiled by the student, the supervisor and the graduate chair regarding the question of appropriate progress on the dissertation. The supervisor's judgment would obviously be decisive. Because the time limit for the completion of degree work has traditionally been unspecified, it was not uncommon for students to take ten or more years to finish the dissertation. In fact, 28% of SAS doctoral candidates required more than ten years; the median time to the doctorate is currently eight years. While it is true, as Dr. Rutman points out, that there are, indeed, late bloomers, it would seem that Penn has been particularly blessed with them. Then again, it might be the result of not having enforced a reasonable time limit.

After careful consideration of the various aspects of taking such action, the Committee on Graduate Education agreed that we needed to impose a structure somewhat analogous to the practice of our peer institutions. We also agreed that there are always exceptions to the rule and that we should be cognizant of extenuating circumstances. In order not to treat students who had entered programs under the former expectations, we decided to "grandfather" them. Finally, we felt it best initially to send report forms only to those students in their sixth year of studies or beyond; thereafter reporting

would be required beginning in a candidate's fifth year (i.e., well beyond the required course segment of his/her training). Each of these individual decisions was reached by the faculty members who constitute the SAS Committee on Graduate Education. Moreover, each decision reflects the spirit of the final report submitted by the working group on Ph.D. Education in December of 1989 (see *Almanac Supplement* 12/5/89). That report cited a pressing need to improve the working relationship between supervisor and candidate, to encourage the graduate groups to exercise their responsibility to review a candidate's progress, and to urge students to complete their

degrees within a "reasonable" amount of time. "Reasonable" was defined as from 4-8 years (*Almanac* 12/5/89, p. 22).

Consequently, members of the various graduate groups had direct input into the decision making process. Dean Fitts acted as a facilitator, not as a policy maker. The faculty has not abdicated its rights. The special relationship among student, supervisor, and graduate group remains intact, and candidates stand to benefit particularly from an expeditious advancement of their careers which, in turn, will more fully satisfy Penn's graduate mission.

—John A. McCarthy, Professor of German and Chair of the SAS Committee on Graduate Education

The letter below responds to issues raised in The New York Times and was published there on the editorial page Sunday, March 11. At the recommendation of the Medical Faculty Senate Steering Committee it is published here with the authors' permission.—Ed.

The Next Generation of Doctors Is Hopeful

The doctors you describe in "Doctors in Distress" (series, Feb. 18-20) are not deciding to go into medicine today. We are. Our view of the profession differs from theirs. Indeed, some of the changes they decry, we applaud. As medical students, we are aware of the changes that have altered traditional medical practice; the less lofty image of the physician; the new patient-doctor relationship; the effects of malpractice and the increased regulation by third-party payers. You would have to be an ostrich to miss these changes.

Change in any profession brings insecurity. Almost everyone in our class was warned by members of previous medical classes to think about other careers. Nevertheless, we decided to become doctors. Why?

This is an exciting time to enter medicine. Technology has expanded the physician's arsenal. Genetic engineering, magnetic resonance imaging, laser surgery and the discovery of the gene for cystic fibrosis mark only a few of the recent advances. There is a greater recognition of the collaborative role of all members of health care teams, including nurses, physical therapists, dietitians and social workers, as well as doctors. And we reflect that shift. We come from a variety of backgrounds. More of us are women and members of minority groups. More of us worked in medical and other fields before entering medical school. Some of us are raising families. Such diversity, we hope, will help us better understand and care for patients.

Our training is also changing. In addition to the traditional basic sciences, our curriculum incorporates earlier clinical exposure and symposiums on communication, chronic illness, acquired immune deficiency syndrome and inequities in the distribution of medical resources.

Our future capabilities, demographic composition and training differentiate us from the physicians you interviewed. Similarly, our expectations may differ from previous generations of physicians. We believe that better informed and more

discriminating patients may lead to better health care.

As we prepare for careers in all aspects of medicine—research, administration, public policy and clinical practice—we do not want to be passively affected by health care legislation. Any changes must be tempered with firsthand understanding of medicine's capabilities, constraints and developments.

The poet Rainer Maria Rilke said "the future enters into us in order to transform itself in us, long before it happens." The evolution of medicine has compelled us to be more introspective about our profession, our community and our goals. We have entered into the medical profession conscious of such changes, and it has entered into us. That we are medical students testifies that pessimistic oracles have not discouraged us "long before it happens."

—John Alexander, Michael Cabana, Steve Chapman, Linda DiMeglio, and William Greer
Philadelphia, Feb. 28, 1990

This letter was signed also by [the following] forty members of the first-year class at the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine.

Isha Agarwal	Jonathan Maltzman
Anthony Paul Andrews	Jason Mills
Marc Arginteanu	Kate Nathanson
Karen Bell	Quan Nguyen
Catherine Belford Budd	Robert Noone
Hetty Cunningham	Ilene Rosen
Duyen Dang	Jonathan Roth
Diane Fine	Nicky Shah
David Gaieski	Nisha Solanki
Amelia Gallitano	Janio Szklaruk
Peter Hellberg	Dana Unger
Jillian Imagine	Cindy Van Arsdale
David Inslicht	Anne Vanden Belt
Cynthia Jacobstein	Lacey Washington
Doug Kroll	Cindy Weinbaum
Robert Larson	Jeffrey Weinberg
Susan Lerner	Steve West
Eric Levey	James Whitman
Dan Levy	Albert Yan
Anne Maitland	Steven Zgleszewski

Thesis Awards in Science

The deadline for nominations for Sigma Xi Ph.D. Thesis Awards is April 5, 1990.

Two awards of \$500 each may be made to Ph.D. candidates for theses of outstanding quality and contribution to science at the Thesis Award Dinner on April 19. The winners receive certificates as well. Nominations are made by the thesis adviser on the thesis adviser's initiative for theses completed during the academic year.

Nominations should include a thesis abstract, a copy of the thesis, a vita for the candidate, a letter of recommendation from the thesis adviser and from either the graduate group chair or the sponsoring department chair. Please send these items to Dr. Richard V. Kadison, Department of Mathematics, DRL/6395.

Call for Residential Ass't Deans

The Department of Residential Living is currently searching for Assistant Deans for Residence to support two programs—the First-Year Residential Program, and W.E.B. DuBois College House. We welcome the help of faculty, staff and students in identifying qualified candidates within the Penn community.

First-Year Houses are located in the Quad and (the program? each house?) accommodate 300-400 undergraduates. The DuBois College House Program involves 100 students and occupies half of a low-rise building in Superblock, where an additional 100 students live on non-Program floors.

Each Assistant Dean works closely with faculty, students, and staff to develop programs, coordinate activities and governance, and administer the House budget. S/he supervises Resident Advisor or Graduate Fellow staff, counsels students, deals with disciplinary problems, and serves as a liaison between the House and various University departments.

In First-Year Houses the focus is on the transition of new students into the University environment, while the DuBois College House Program centers on African-American history and culture. Each Assistant Dean for Residence also holds an appointment as academic advisor in the College of Arts and Sciences.

The ideal Assistant Dean has enthusiasm for working with college students, experience operating within a university environment, and excellent organizational, interpersonal, and administrative abilities. A Master's degree, plus several years of related work experience, is required. We actively seek a diverse pool of candidates.

Please ask potential candidates to send their resumes by April 6 to:

Chair, Assistant Dean Search Committee,
Department of Residential Living,
3901 Locust Walk,
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6180.

The Search Committee will begin its work shortly. If you would like to speak with me about a candidate, please call me at 898-3547.

—Gigi Simeone, Director,
Residential Living

Death of Dr. Scheie

Dr. Harold G. Scheie, the internationally known ophthalmologist who founded the Scheie Eye Institute, died March 5 at the age of 80.

Dr. Scheie was widely known for developing surgical techniques to treat cataracts and glaucoma. He came to Philadelphia in 1935 as a resident at the University hospital and in 1943 was called to active duty in the U.S. Army, where he headed the ophthalmology unit in the China-Burma-India war zone. In 1972 he founded the Scheie Eye Institute, which houses the University's department of ophthalmology and is based at the Presbyterian-University of Pennsylvania Medical Center.

Dr. Scheie worked tirelessly often giving free eye care to the poor, colleagues recall. His patients also included such well-known figures as Eugene Ormandy, conductor of the Philadelphia Orchestra, sculptor Joe Brown, and Lord Louis Mountbatten. He retired from medical practice in 1983. Dr. Thomas Langfitt, president of Pew Charitable Trusts, said of Dr. Scheie, "His innovative contributions to ophthalmic surgery, in particular, and his skills as a surgeon were legendary."

He is survived by his wife Mary Ann Tallman Scheie, sons, Eric and Harold G. Jr. and a daughter, Nancy. Contributions in his memory can be made to the Harold G. Scheie Teaching and Research Memorial Fund at the Scheie Eye Institute.

Jordan Greenwald, a graduate student in Linguistics died March 9 at the age of 32. He took his B.A. from SUNY, Binghamton and did graduate work at Cornell before coming to Penn. He is survived by his mother Roslyn Miller and stepfather R. G. Miller.

On March 9, 22-year-old **Sandy Lai Moy**, a senior in the School of Nursing, and 21-year-old **Kenneth Garlikov**, Wharton senior, died in an automobile accident in Prince George County, Va. According to accounts by Virginia State Police and the local newspapers, the driver, Lily Ho, a freshman Engineering student, lost control of her rented 1989 Chevy Geo and drove into a north-bound lane. The car was struck by a 1990 Toyota pickup truck driven by a 15-year-old with a learner's permit. Other passengers in the truck included his father, George Pride of Stony Creek, and a 10-year-old. The driver was uninjured, the father received minor cuts, and the 10-year-old received a severe head cut. Ms. Ho had a concussion and was held for three days for observations. No alcohol or excessive speeding was involved.

Kenneth Garlikov is survived by his parents Donald C. and Edie Garlikov of Columbus, Ohio. Sandy Lai Moy is survived by her parents, Don Cheung and Wai Moy, of Brooklyn, New York, and a sister Shuet, a junior in the School of Arts and Sciences.

To Report a Death: The Office of the Chaplin, Ext. 8-8456, on being informed of a death in the University family, assists in numerous ways including notification to the appropriate University offices and publications.

Council: Debating Harassment Policy and First Amendment

A full hour of the University Council's March 21 meeting is set aside for the question, "In the light of the Michigan decision should the University of Pennsylvania revise its harassment policy?" Professor C. Edwin Baker of the Law School has been asked to give a five-minute "content neutral presentation of general background" on the issue which arose when the Judge Avern Cohn U.S. District Court Eastern District found the University of Michigan's similarly-worded harassment policy unconstitutional. Copies of Judge Cohn's opinion and Michigan's policy have been distributed to all Council members.

Two action items are on the agenda.

One marks the release of Nelson Mandela in South Africa, crediting the release to pressures including divestiture, and urging that "the policy of divestiture be continued until the legal structure of apartheid has been dismantled."

The other calls for parity for graduate students (with undergraduates) in the percentage of the General Fee received back as student activities funding. Using 1990 figures, GAPSA indicates that undergraduates receive back for activities 5.15% of their \$1147 general fee, and graduate students 3.21% of their \$848 fee. The recommendation is for equal percentages, with a plan by April 1 to be implemented next year. GAPSA also recommends delineating the student activities fee as separate from student services.

COUNCIL

Summary of Meeting February 14

President's Report: President Hackney reported on the inaugural events for the 250th Anniversary Celebration.

The President announced the appointment of Cheryl L. Hopkins as Director of Community Relations.

President Hackney expressed pleasure that the Campaign for Penn had raised \$420,000,000.

The President discussed the Dr. Rosalie Tung case decision by the U.S. Supreme Court. The President is concerned the decision may make it more difficult to obtain candid forthright evaluations.

Dr. Kim Morrisson explained the reasons for the decision to temporarily suspend Christopher Clemente for the "order, health, and safety of the University community." Mr. Clemente's status will be determined by a hearing board panel.

The President announced that Mrs. Adele K. Schaeffer, CW'55 and Mr. Julius L. Chambers have been elected trustees.

President Hackney announced that a committee consisting of the Provost, the Senior Vice President, the Director of Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics had been asked to develop a multi-year plan for upgrading recreation facilities with suggested mechanisms for funding.

Provost's Report: The Provost emphasized that the University will protect research and discussed the burglary of Professor Adrian Morrisson's laboratory.

The Provost reported that the ICA building on 36th and Sansom Street is scheduled for fall completion.

The Provost announced that Professor Robert Dyson has been appointed chair of the search committee for the vice provost for graduate education.

Report of the Chair of Steering: The chair expressed support for the following resolution about South Africa.

On the auspicious occasion of the release of Nelson Mandela by the South African government, we commend the

actions of the University of Pennsylvania in January and June 1986, which condemned apartheid and committed the University to a policy of divesting of the stocks and bonds of companies that did not withdraw from South Africa by June 1988.

Actions such as these, and the sanctions imposed by the U.S. government, generated much of the pressure that led, ultimately, to Mandela's release.

Consistent with the conditions set forth in the "Report of the Committee on University Responsibility to the Trustees, with Recommendation" dated January 16, 1986, we urge that the policy of divestiture be continued until the legal structure of apartheid has been dismantled.

GAPSA: Chair Mohamed Saadi-Elmandjra expressed the concern of the graduate students about the new policy requiring 5 year reports and the concern about The Franklin Fund. He asked for a report about the action on the request for a more satisfactory counseling network for graduate students. Mr. Saadi-Elmandjra also expressed sympathy to Susan Garfinkel whose father Professor David Garfinkel of SEAS died recently.

UA: Chair Benjamin Karsch reported on progress of the UA Constitution, PennWatch, the Residential Living Committee, the Financial Aid Letter Drive and the 1995 Paper a five-year plan concerning safety, dining, social life, residential life and facilities.

Discussion: Questions and comments on the reports mostly concerned the situation with Christopher Clemente, and the harassment policies and free speech.

Professor Peter Freyd discussed the process for selecting honorary degree recipients and answered questions.

Dr. Kim Morrisson and Professor Stephen Gale led a discussion for the Campus Center proposal. After discussion the proposal was accepted by Council with various degrees of ecstasy.

—Duncan Van Dusen, Secretary

Eight UPS Public Policy Grants for 1990-91

The President and Provost have announced the award of 8 grants to 14 faculty members from the Public Policy Initiatives Fund provided by the UPS Foundation.

With this round, the Fund has awarded 73 grants since its inception in 1984, mostly in the \$3000 to \$7000 range and for a variety of public policy-related projects as spelled out in the guidelines published in *Almanac* November 21, 1989.

Proposals are reviewed by a seven-member faculty committee, chaired by President Emeritus Martin Meyerson.

"The committee was very pleased with the quality of the proposals," Mr. Meyerson said in forwarding the selection of:

— Harold J. Bershad, associate professor of sociology and Jane Balin, graduate student, SAS—*Community's Reception to an AIDS Nursing Home*.

— Patricia Danzon, professor of health care systems and Kimberly Rask, doctoral candidate, Wharton—*Analysis of Programs Designed to Improve Access to Care for the Indigent*.

— Martha M. Dore, assistant professor of social work, School of Social Work—*Federal Policy Development Regarding Adolescent Pregnancy and Parenting: 1970-1990*.

— Peter D. Linneman, professor of finance, Wharton—*Central City Employment: A Study of the Impact of the Continuing Erosion of the Central City Employment Base*.

— Howard Pack, professor of city & regional planning; economics, public policy & management, SAS—*Analysis of Industrial Policy, the Growth of Industrial Competence in the U.S. and the Impact of the Competitive Pressures from Japan and Europe*.

— William Pierskalla, professor and chairman of health care systems, Naoki Ikegami, professor of medical science of Keio University and visiting professor of medicine, William Kissick, professor of research medicine, Mark Pauly, professor of economics and health care systems, Arnold Rosoff, associate professor of legal studies, Wharton—*Development of an Undergraduate Course in Comparative Health Care Systems and Policies*.

— Edward B. Rock, assistant professor of law, —*Development of a Policy Course on the Law and Economics of Corporate Law and Antitrust*.

— Anita A. Summers, professor of public policy & management, Wharton—*Editorial Preparation of Volume Derived from Conference on "Comparative Urban Development"*.

Update

MARCH AT PENN

CONFERENCES

24 Occidentalism: Middle Eastern Muslim Representations of the West; eight speakers will focus on the evolving Middle Eastern Muslim awareness of Europe and America; 9 a.m.-5:30 p.m., University Museum. Registration: \$10, students \$5; lunch \$10. Information: Ext. 8-6335 (Middle East Center, Muslim Student Association, Temple University Department of Religion).

FITNESS AND LEARNING

21 Single Parenting: Insights and Coping; Michael Snyder, private practitioner; noon-1 p.m., Bishop White Room, Houston Hall. Registration: Ext. 8-0313 (Faculty/Staff Assistance Program).

Sobriety I: Less Than 18 Months in Recovery; Carol Bennett-Speight, Nancy Madonna, F/SAP Counselors; noon-1 p.m., Room 301, Houston Hall. Registration: Ext. 8-7910 (F/SAP). Weekly.

22 Sister Sister; African-American support group; 6:30-7:30 p.m., W.E.B. DuBois Hall, Seminar Room (Penn Women's Center).

24 College of William and Mary Concert Band; joined by the Penn Wind Ensemble; 8 p.m., Church of the Saviour. Information: Ext. 8-6244.

(Continued on page 8.)

University Biomedical Research Support Grant (BRSG): April 2 Deadline

The Biomedical Research Support Grant is intended to strengthen, balance and stabilize existing Public Health Service-supported biomedical and behavioral research mechanisms. The funds are awarded to the University to complement and enhance the efficiency of biomedical and behavioral research, and to permit on-site judgment regarding emphasis, specific direction and content of activities supported. It will allow the institution to respond quickly and effectively to emerging opportunities and unexpected requirements that develop frequently in the course of research.

Grants from the program are intended to support primarily those biomedical and behavioral research activities not readily or normally supported by PHS categorical research grant programs.

Examples of the usage of BRSG funds include:

- Pilot research
- Support of new investigators
- Unexpected research requirements and emergencies
- Continuation of research during temporary interruption of grant support
- Emerging research opportunities
- Setting up new laboratories
- Improvement of investigators' research skills
- Investigations in new fields and in fields new to the investigator
- Central shared research resources
- Compliance with animal welfare requirements

— Research opportunities for minorities and women

Certain expenditures are prohibited in this grant, including the following:

- Indirect costs
- Previously incurred cost overruns
- Training stipends
- Construction
- Support for grant projects disapproved by advisory councils
- Library support, aside from specialized publications
- Travel, unless directly related to research activities

Research salary support for tenured faculty is permitted only on a short-term basis and with justification. Ongoing PHS grants can be supplemented only for emergency needs.

Submitted with an original and seven copies, proposals should take the form of mini-grant applications, three to five pages long, and should be transmitted via the departmental chairperson.

The cover page of the proposal should contain the following information:

1. Name, Rank, Department, School
2. Title of proposal
3. Amount requested
4. Does the project involve the use of human subjects or animals?
5. 100 word abstract of need
6. 100 word abstract of significance of research
7. Amount of all current research support

8. Do you have an application pending that includes support of the same request made here?

9. List BRSG support for past three years (years, amount and which BRSG)

10. Have you made requests from other BRSG committees this year? If so, was it from the Dental, Medical, or Veterinary BRSG and was it for the same or a different proposal?

The second page should include the budget, listing and justifying the specific items requested, and if possible assigning a priority to each.

Please also include a one-page NIH biographical sketch, giving your education, professional appointments, honors, and five most recent publications. If you had a BRSG award, please include a one-page summary of results.

The proposal itself should give a brief description of the research and a statement of the specific needs to be covered by the proposed grant.

As the funds available are limited, investigators with appropriate needs are encouraged to apply before April 2, 1990 in order to ensure proposal consideration. While there is no fixed size of the awards to be made, we expect that they will be in the \$3,000 to \$10,000 range.

Please contact Dr. Eliot Stellar (Ext. 8-5778) for substantive or procedural questions.

Proposals should be submitted to the Office of the Vice Provost for Research, 106 College Hall/6381.

—Office of the Vice Provost for Research

Note: For a list of the most recent winners of University BRSG awards, and the titles of proposals funded, please see *Almanac* July 18, 1989.

University of Pennsylvania Police Department

This report contains tallies of part 1 crimes, a listing of part 1 crimes against persons, and summaries of part 1 crime in the five busiest sectors on campus where two or more incidents were reported between March 5, 1990 and March 18, 1990.

Totals: Crimes Against Persons-2, Thefts-31, Burglaries-5, Attempted Thefts of Auto-6, Thefts of Auto-3

Date	Time	Location	Incident
Crimes Against Persons:			
03/11/90	6:54 PM	3600 Blk Locust	Strong-arm robbery/males/took under \$10
03/17/90	12:15 AM	4000 Blk Locust	Male shot in robbery attempt
Expressway to 32nd; Univ to Walnut			
03/07/90	9:45 PM	Ice Rink	Auto taken from lot
03/07/90	10:45 PM	Ice Rink	Jeep taken from lot
03/12/90	1:49 PM	Lot #33	Ignition pried/nothing taken
03/12/90	2:01 PM	Lot #33	Ignition pried/window broken
03/12/90	3:30 PM	Lot #33	Steering column damaged
03/12/90	7:58 PM	Ice Rink	Window broken on auto
03/15/90	11:05 AM	Hollenback Cntr	Knapsack & contents taken
03/16/90	10:12 AM	Hollenback Cntr	Window broken/vacuum taken from auto
03/16/90	6:44 PM	Lot #33	Steering column damaged
03/16/90	6:57 PM	Lot #33	4 juveniles arrested breaking into vehicle
03/17/90	8:39 PM	Ice Rink	Unattended purse taken from stands
34th to 38th; Civic Center to Hamilton			
03/05/90	5:51 AM	Medical School	Room forced open/nothing taken
03/05/90	6:59 AM	Anat-Chem Wing	Machine broken into/change taken
03/05/90	7:55 AM	Richards Bldg	Machine broken into/change taken
03/05/90	9:20 AM	Medical School	Answering machine taken/forced entry
03/05/90	11:28 AM	Johnson Pavln	Unattended purse taken
03/05/90	12:48 PM	Richards Bldg	Answering machine taken
03/06/90	9:10 AM	Richards Bldg	Secured Fax machine taken
03/07/90	1:03 PM	Medical School	Liquor and keys taken
03/10/90	11:40 AM	Greenhouses	Phone machine & microwave taken
03/13/90	1:31 PM	Johnson Pavl	Wallet taken/recovered in men's room
03/16/90	9:55 PM	Nursing Ed Bldg	Food taken from vending machine
34th to 37th; Spruce to Locust			
03/11/90	9:54 PM	Houston Hall	Secured bike taken from rack
03/14/90	5:01 PM	Duhring Wing	Secured bike taken from railing
03/15/90	1:34 PM	Houston Hall	Items taken from area by employee
03/15/90	3:54 PM	Houston Hall	Unattended wallet & contents taken
03/16/90	9:34 AM	Williams Hall	Secured bike taken
36th to 37th; Locust to Walnut			
03/05/90	9:12 AM	Annenberg Cntr	Typewriter/fax machine taken
03/06/90	9:24 PM	Hillel Foundtn	Unattended jacket taken
03/12/90	3:34 PM	Annenberg School	Library & credit card taken from jacket
03/15/90	5:49 PM	Annenberg Cntr	Unattended jacket/wallet taken
38th to 42nd; Walnut to Market			
03/07/90	2:37 PM	Lot # 40	Clothing & video taken
03/09/90	1:03 PM	Sigma Alpha Mu	3 jackets taken
03/18/90	10:43 PM	3800 Blk Chestnut	Wallet taken

Safety Tip: If someone comes to your door and wants to use your phone, no matter what emergency is claimed, offer to make the call; but do not open the door.

18th District Philadelphia Police

Schuylkill River to 49th Street Market Street to Woodland Avenue
Reported crimes against persons from 12:01 AM February 26, 1990 to 11:59 PM March 4, 1990.

Total: 21 Incidents, 2 arrests

Date	Time Reported	Location	Offense/ Weapon	Arrest
2/26/90	7:50 PM	4100 Sansom	Robbery/knife	No
2/26/90	11:59 PM	4400 Market	Robbery/strong-arm	No
2/27/90	7:50 PM	4845 Pine	Agg Assault/fists	Yes
2/27/90	8:10 PM	3600 Spruce	Agg Assault/fists	No
2/27/90	9:35 PM	4800 Springfield	Robbery/gun	No
2/28/90	11:05 PM	4600 Market	Agg Assault/gun	No
3/02/90	12:40 AM	4600 Springfield	Robbery/gun	No
3/02/90	7:06 PM	4058 Chestnut	Robbery/strong-arm	No
3/02/90	10:15 PM	4447 Chestnut	Robbery/gun	No
3/02/90	10:35 PM	4500 Larchwood	Robbery/knife	No
3/02/90	10:35 PM	4400 Pine	Robbery/knife	No
3/02/90	11:15 PM	4039 Chestnut	Robbery/strong-arm	No
3/02/90	12:00 AM	4512 Chester	Robbery/gun	No
3/02/90	5:12 PM	4100 Chester	Robbery/gun	Yes
3/02/90	6:41 PM	4800 Springfield	Robbery/gun	No
3/02/90	7:51 PM	4800 Locust	Robbery/gun	No
3/02/90	9:20 PM	4200 Baltimore	Robbery/knife	No
3/02/90	9:36 PM	1017 Farragut	Robbery/gun	No
3/02/90	11:10 PM	4400 Chestnut	Purse Snatch/strong-arm	No
3/03/90	9:25 AM	101 S. 40th	Robbery/knife	No
3/03/90	6:35 PM	4006 Spruce	Robbery/strong-arm	No

26 Take Back the Night; Safety and Security March; 7 p.m., College Green (Women's Alliance, STAAR).

MUSIC

24 College of William and Mary Concert Band; joined by the Penn Wind Ensemble; 8 p.m., Church of the Saviour. Information: Ext. 8-6244.

TALKS

21 PEN at Penn Lecture Series; Susan Sontag, author, film maker and social critic; 3:30 p.m., Room 17, Logan Hall (PEN Center of New York, College of Arts and Sciences).

Children's Television in the 1990s; Geraldine Laybourne, president of Nickelodeon and Nick At Nite; 4:30 p.m., Room B-6, Stiteler Hall (GSE).

The Arab Poet-Critic: Discussion and Poetry Reading; Henri Zgaib, poet and critic; 5:30 p.m., Cherpach Lounge, Williams Hall (Oriental Studies, Comparative Literature, Middle East Center).

22 Charge Movement in Frog Cut Muscle Fibers; Knox Chandler; 4 p.m., Library, 4th floor, Richards Building (Department of Physiology).

Islamic Traditions of Social Reform in South Africa; David Robinson, Michigan State University; 4 p.m., West Lounge, 4th floor, Williams Hall (PATHS/Middle East Center).

Literature and the Second World War: Dutch Resistance Fighters and Flemish Collaborators; Georges Wildemeersch, University of Antwerp; Peter Brueghel, visiting professor; 8:15 p.m., Max Kade German Center (Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures).

23 The Physiology of Exercise in Cold Water and in Hyperbaric Environments; Thomas J. Doubt, Naval Medical Research Institute; 12:15 p.m., Room 1, John Morgan Building (Institute for Environmental Medicine).

Wall Street and International Relations; Shahin Mossavar-Rahmani, vice president, United American Securities; 3 p.m., I.R. Seminar Room, Logan Hall (International Relations).

26 Visual Discrimination Learning in Binocularly Deprived Cats; Boguslaq Zernicki, Nencki Institute of Experimental Biology; 4 p.m., Library, John Morgan Building (Mahoney Institute).

27 The Problem of Quality in Popular Culture: Adorno vs. Fiske; Simon Frith, Strathclyde University; 4:30-6 p.m., Room 111, ASC (Annenberg School for Communication).

The Bibliomania: English Book Collecting in the Early Nineteenth Century; Anthony R. A. Hobson, former director of Sotheby; 5:30 p.m., Lessing J. Rosenwald Gallery, Van Pelt Library (Van Pelt Library). Also March 28 & 29.

28 Regulation of Protein Synthesis in the Mamalian Cells; Albert Wahba, University of Mississippi Medical Center; noon-1 p.m., Room 427, Levy Building (Department of Biochemistry).

Almanac

3601 Locust Walk Philadelphia, PA 19104-6224
(215) 898-5274 or 5275 FAX 898-9137
E-Mail ALMANAC@A1.QUAKER

EDITOR
ASSOCIATE EDITOR
EDITORIAL ASSISTANT
STUDENT ASSISTANTS

Karen C. Gaines
Marguerite F. Miller
Margaret Ann Morris
Ashley M. Dupuy, Jung Y.
Sarah Kim, David K. Kim,
Phuong Nguyen, William
Shraga, Lynn L. Westwater

ALMANAC ADVISORY BOARD: For the Faculty Senate, June Axinn, R.E. Davies, Charles D. Graham (Chair), Almarin Phillips, Lorraine Tulman and Vukan R. Vuchic; for the Administration, William Epstein; for Staff Assemblies, Deverie Pierce (A1), Irma Feldman (Librarians), Joseph Kane (A3).