

# Almanac

Tuesday, April 9, 1991

Published by the University of Pennsylvania

Volume 37, Number 28

## INSIDE

- SEC Actions of 4/3/91, p. 2
- Committee on Economic Status Report, p. 2
- Committee on Administration Reports, p. 3
- (Role of Faculty in Governance; Statement on Confidentiality)
- SCUE Report on Good Teaching, pp. 4-5
- Speaking Out: Defense Research, p. 5
- PennNet & CRC Charges for 1991-92, pp. 6-7
- CrimeStats, Update, p. 8



Dean-Designate Conway

## Dean of Fine Arts: Patricia Conway

Patricia Conway, president of the interior design firm of Kohn Pedersen Fox Conway Associates Inc. and a founding partner of its companion Kohn Pedersen Fox, Architects, has been chosen for the deanship of the Graduate School of Fine Arts. After Trustee confirmation April 26, she will take office July 1 as the first woman dean in the school's hundred-year history.

Ms. Conway was a Lenley Scholar at NYU, where she took her B.A. in 1959 and M.A. in 1964 in English literature; a Mellon Fellow at Columbia, where she took her master's in urban planning in 1972; and a Loeb Fellow at Harvard in 1986-87. Winner of numerous national awards including *Interiors* magazine's 1987 Designer of the Year, Ms. Conway is the author of *Ornamentalism: The New Decorativeness in Architecture and Design*, nominated for the American Book Award in 1983, and of the 1990 *Art for Everyday: the New Craft Movement*. She is known especially as a strategic planner with "a talent for dealing with almost impossibly complex problems," according to President Hackney. Search Committee Chair Anne Whiston Spirn lauded her ability to encompass the breadth of GFSA's many collaborating disciplines.



For VP/Finance: Mr. Rael

## VP/Finance: Selimo Rael

Berkeley's associate vice chancellor of financial and business services, Selimo C. Rael, will take office as vice president of finance here August 1 after Trustee confirmation. In the post vacant since Dr. Marna Whittington became senior vice president in 1988, he will be chief financial officer with responsibility for the offices of Comptroller, Treasurer, Risk Management and others.

Mr. Rael is a 1969 graduate of New Mexico Highlands University who took his MBA from the University of New Mexico in 1977. His entire career has been spent in the California system and its national research laboratories, beginning at Los Alamos in 1970, with oversight of Livermore and Lawrence added later. Since 1982 he has been in central financial posts at Berkeley, which has an annual operating budget of some \$760 million. Dr. Whittington called him "an energetic, proactive, forward-thinking manager with a keen understanding of the challenges facing a major research institution."

## Penn's Way Vote:

### For Combined Campaign

President Sheldon Hackney released Monday the results of his referendum on workplace charitable campaigns held last month. He then announced (full text below) the decision to conduct a combined or partnership campaign in which "all qualifying federations will participate on an equal footing under the 'Penn's Way' banner."

Of the 9000 ballots sent out, 3405 were returned.

An overwhelming majority answered "yes" to the first of the ballot's two questions (Should the University of Pennsylvania conduct a charitable campaign in the workplace?):

Yes	2528
No	877

The vote was closer on the remaining question as to which of two alternatives the voter preferred—a United Way Campaign with Donor Option in which all employee contributions are solicited and distributed through the United Way of Southeastern Pennsylvania, or a Combined (or Partnership) Campaign in which employee contributions are solicited and distributed through any approved federation or umbrella organization. The response:

United Way	1,133
Combined Campaign	1,929
No choice expressed	343

Penn will be the first private employer in Philadelphia conducting a combined campaign, which has been the workplace campaign form for city employees and the public schools in the recent past. Expected soon are guidelines on eligibility of federations.

## In Memory of Lauren

One of the children who died in last week's tragedy in Lower Merion was a member of the Penn family. Lauren Freundlich, one of the two 6-year-old elementary school pupils killed on their playground after the collision of aircraft overhead, was the daughter of Dr. Bruce Freundlich, assistant professor of rheumatology, and his wife, Andrea. Colleagues in the rheumatology section of the Department of Medicine have established in Lauren's memory a scholarship fund for underprivileged students to attend the University. Contributions may be made to the Lauren Freundlich Undergraduate Scholarship Fund at the University of Pennsylvania c/o the University of Pennsylvania Trustees, and sent to the Office of the Treasurer, 3401 Walnut Street 19104-6205.

## To All Faculty and Staff: Text of the President's Decision on Penn's Way

With the conclusion of the referendum on Penn's charitable workplace campaign, I am now in a position to make several final decisions regarding the future of Penn's workplace charitable campaign. Taking into account the opinions expressed on 3400 referendum ballots and the informative campus debate which preceded the vote, as well as my own thoughts on the matter, I am confident that a full combined or partnership campaign is the best way to inspire the greatest University support for the tremendous needs in our city and region. The University of Pennsylvania's 1991-92 workplace charitable campaign will therefore be a combined campaign in which all qualifying federations will participate on an equal footing under the "Penn's Way" banner.

Implementing this new kind of campaign will require some major changes, as well as considerable effort on the part of Penn Staff members, University volunteers, and the federations who will be participating in it. Vice President for Human Resources Barbara Butterfield's departure also necessitates a new campaign leader. I have asked Dr. Raymond Fonseca, Dean of the School of Dental Medicine, to serve as the 1991-92 Penn's Way Campaign Chair. Dean Fonseca has accepted, as has the University's Commissioner of Public Safety, John Kuprevich, who will join the campaign operations committee as chair-elect.

I would like to reiterate my thanks to all those who helped make the campaign recently concluded our most successful support of community needs ever. And I want to extend my gratitude to all the University's citizens who participated in the referendum. We must now work together to realize a campaign capable of surpassing even last year's remarkable success. Our grateful recognition encompasses those at Penn and outside who informed the debate preceding the referendum.

The learning process needs to continue. Informed and involved donors often supplement their gift of funds with donations of time and commitment. As the distance continues to widen between those requiring assistance and public resources for these purposes, private funds grow more critical to the well-being of many area residents. With your active participation, Penn's Way can continue to be an important component in addressing some of their needs even as it enriches all of us.

— Sheldon Hackney, President

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 Almarin Phillips or Faculty Senate Staff Assistant Carolyn Burdon, 15 College Hall/6303, Ext. 8-6943.

### Actions Taken by the Senate Executive Committee Wednesday, April 3, 1991

**1. Committee on Administration Reports.** Committee Chair, Professor Solomon Pollack presented reports of the committee.

**a. Size of the Administration.** Following an hour-long discussion it was moved and overwhelmingly adopted, with one abstention, that: "The Senate Executive Committee strongly endorses the Report of the Faculty Senate Committee on Administration on the Size of the Administration, its intent and the direction of its findings; SEC is dismayed with the relative shrinkage of support for the academic component of the University; the members of SEC intend to publicize widely their perceptions of these findings to their constituencies; SEC requests from the administration a detailed explanation of the relative growth of the administration." (See *Almanac* March 19, 1991.)

**b. Faculty Role in Governance.** It was adopted that: "The Senate Executive Committee endorses the statement of principle and the observation of the Report on the Faculty Role in Governance of the Faculty Senate Committee on Administration, and SEC agrees to consider in the future the committee's proposal in that report." (See opposite.)

**c. Confidentiality.** SEC unanimously adopted the Statement on Confidentiality presented by the Senate Committee on Administration. (See opposite.)

**2. 1994 Commencement Change.** SEC reviewed a proposal to reschedule the date of Baccalaureate and Commencement in 1994 re-

quested by the Philadelphia Convention and Visitors Bureau in light of two major conventions set for that week. (The VPUL's recommended dates are: Baccalaureate May 18, 1994, and Commencement May 19, 1994.) The following motion was unanimously adopted: "The Senate Executive Committee sees no alternative preferable to the recommendation of the Vice Provost for University Life concerning the change in dates for the baccalaureate service and commencement in 1994. SEC is not pleased that this problem has arisen. Students, their families and the faculty will be inconvenienced by the change, particularly since two weekdays are now involved. That SEC has not voiced stronger objections is premised on: (a) an understanding that the only changes being made in the 1993-94 calendar are the dates for Baccalaureate and Commencement; and (b) an expectation that University officials will confer with officials of the Philadelphia Convention and Visitors Bureau to assure that there will not be a recurrence."

**Note:** Actions of the March 7 meeting (*Almanac* March 19, 1991), item 4, should have read that "SEC unanimously adopted a motion to continue its participation in University Council for the 1991-92 academic year, and that SEC shall monitor the implementation of the 1990 revisions to the Council Bylaws and vote no earlier than March 1992 and no later than the end of the academic year 1991-92 whether to continue its participation in University Council." This motion parallels a similar action taken on April 4, 1990.

## Report of the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty

April 5, 1991

The Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty decided to initiate studies relating to long-term policies affecting faculty compensation. The combined effects of financial stress at the University and probable higher rate of inflation raise concerns about a potential decline in the real incomes of faculty members similar to those that occurred in the last half of the 1970's and through 1981.

In past years, the administration has not made available to the committee all of the information the committee requested. The situation improved somewhat this year. Two new data sets were available for uses consonant with the committee's purposes. First, Professor Paul Taubman, a member of the committee, was appointed as liaison with a group appointed by the Provost to study faculty salaries. (The members of the Provost's group are Professors Janice Madden, Michael Wachter, and Robert Zemsky.) This group performed analyses of salary differences based on gender, using 1990 University-wide (except Medical School) base salary data. The Senate Committee was kept informed of these analyses and has suggested additional studies.

Second, the committee was presented detailed data on base salaries and salary increases by school and by rank. These data have not been used in any formal analyses, but have been used by the Provost to look into selected instances in which salary increases appear to be too low. The committee has not been involved in any such individual cases of possible salary inequities.

Three generalizations can be made about base salaries: (1) for the University as a whole, no statistically significant differences appear between salaries of male and female faculty members; (2) there is a positive relationship between salary and the attribute of having come to Penn as a full professor; (3) and as expected, there is a strong positive relationship between salary level and years at the University.

The study indicates the possibility of some instances of discrimination based on gender. The Provost is investigating these cases. There are so few members of racial minorities on the faculty that probabilistic statistical studies could not be undertaken with respect to these groups.

Other issues on the committee agenda have included: minimum salaries for ranks in addition to assistant professors; minimum percentage salary increases; teaching and University service in the determina-

tion of faculty compensation; the *de facto* development of a two-tier salary system, dividing the faculty into those who have been here at the University for a long time and those newly recruited.

The committee also raised with the Provost the question of colleagues who received zero or near-zero salary increases last year. The number of cases was small and, according to the Provost, his investigations indicate that all such actions were justified.

The committee has concluded that problems relating to fringe benefits are being dealt with carefully by the Personnel Benefits Committee. Relations with that committee have been excellent this year. (The Chair of the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty serves as liaison to the Personnel Benefits Committee.) The main problem is rapid escalation in medical costs. The committee concurred in a recommendation to increase to \$200 from \$100 the deductible for Blue Cross. This action will reduce the rate of increase in the rates and temporarily take some pressure off the 30% limit of salaries to the benefits pool. It also means, of course, that individuals are responsible for more of their medical expenses.

A major problem for the next few years will be cuts in funds to the University from the State budget. We are aware of the Report of the Senate Committee on Administration (*Almanac* March 19, 1991) and agree that decisions made during the past decade may well endanger the academic health of the University. Some educational programs—even schools—may be threatened. In this context, a continuation of the expansion in administrative costs will surely trivialize the faculty and change the nature of the University as an academic and educational institution.

*Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty*

Roger D. Abrahams (folklore & folklife)

Leonard J. Bello (microbiology/veterinary)

Madeleine Joulle (chemistry)

Jeremy J. Siegel (finance)

Paul Taubman (economics)

Henry Teune (political science), Chair

ex officio: Robert E. Davies (animal biology/veterinary)

Almarin Phillips (public policy & management)

Louise P. Shoemaker (social work)



## Agenda for the Annual Meeting of the Faculty Senate Wednesday, April 17, 1991 . . . 3:00 to 5:30 p.m. . . . 200 College Hall

1. Approval of the minutes of the April 18, 1990, plenary meeting
2. Report of the Chair
3. Report of the President
4. Report of the Provost
5. Report of the Committee on Administration on the Size of the Administration
6. Report of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty
7. Discussion of issues relating to academic freedom and responsibility
8. Discussion of definition of harassment
9. Adjournment by 5:30 p.m.

**Note:** Members of the Faculty Senate are encouraged to come to the meeting prepared with questions for the President, the Provost, or Chairs of committees of the Faculty Senate.

## Committee on Administration: The Faculty Role in Governance February 14, 1991

### Statement of Principle

The University is a community of scholars. The faculty, the senior scholars within that community, must have the capability to monitor and participate in planning, decision-making, and governance at all levels within that community. Only through the constant involvement of the faculty can the best interests of that scholarly community be protected and preserved through time.

### Committee Observations

The committee takes as given the following statements:

1. The University is a large, complex organization in which decisions are made at many levels (from relatively insignificant daily decisions to apparently benign decisions with far-reaching repercussions) by many individuals, formal bodies, and informal alliances.
2. The survey of faculty opinion (*Almanac* April 18, 1989) shows that an overwhelming majority of the standing faculty feel strongly that they wish to become more involved in the University governance and decision-making process.
3. A distinction must be made between those faculty members who are paid even partially as administrators (i.e., from A1 budgets) and other full-time standing faculty. The perspectives of the former may differ substantially from those of the latter.

### Proposal

Therefore, we propose the following:

1. That one full professor of the standing faculty be elected to each of the principal planning and decision-making committees, including but not necessarily limited to the Capital Council, Council of Deans, President's Advisory Group, Provost's Committee on Undergraduate Admissions, Provost's Staff Conference, Senior Planning Group, Senior Vice President's planning groups, Board of Trustees, University Relations, Vice Provost for University Life, to represent the perspectives of the standing faculty, subject to the following understanding:
  - a. the individuals will be elected for a term of three years from a slate of not less than three nominees, all of whom are committed to attending all of the scheduled meetings, if elected;
  - b. that each individual so elected shall treat with the utmost respect the confidentiality of the committees;
  - c. that each individual so elected shall make an annual report to the faculty, which, in the most general, qualitative terms (so as not to breach confidentiality) suggests to the faculty whether or not the best

interests of the scholarly community are being upheld through the decision-making processes.

2. That a series of seminars and informal meetings be scheduled between senior administrators and interested members of the faculty on topics of relevance to the present and future well-being of the University as a community of scholars. Such seminars and gatherings should be viewed as a way both to inform faculty of plans and decisions and to provide constructive fora from which faculty opinions can be elicited.

### 1990-91 Senate Committee on Administration

Jean Alter (*Romance languages*)  
James J. Leyden (*dermatology*)  
Elliot Mossman (*Slavic languages*)  
Solomon R. Pollack (*bioengineering*), chair  
Elsa Ramsden (*physical therapy*)  
James Ross (*philosophy*)  
ex officio: Almarin Phillips (*public policy & management*)  
Louise P. Shoemaker (*social work*)

### \* Dissenting View by Almarin Phillips

I agree with the aim but not the recommendation of the committee in this matter. I think it will not serve the faculty well to have one full professor elected to each of the principal planning and decision-making committees of the University.

My disagreement is based primarily on two considerations. These are:

1. While it is imperative that the faculty have the ability to determine the educational policies of the University and to monitor all aspects of University activities, it is my view that the faculty ought not as a general matter be involved in the administrative functions of the University. The faculty must be alert to having available to it accurate and timely information so that it may properly monitor and effectively determine educational policies, but it need not become involved in actual administrative and decision-making tasks to accomplish these purposes.
2. In my experience, service by the faculty on administrative and decision-making committees often results in cooptation of the faculty member by the committee. Then, rather than the faculty's participation acting to protect or preserve the interests of the faculty as the committee's recommendations would have it, that participation ends up all too often as an implicit endorsement by the faculty of what the administration is doing.

For these reasons, I dissent.

## Committee on Administration Statement on Confidentiality February 14, 1991

At the request of the Senate Executive Committee, we formulate some principles of openness/confidentiality for the campus in general and administration/faculty in particular.

1. Open access to information is the operative value to be followed in setting policies regarding the release of information. Holding information confidential is a stance that needs specific justification.
2. Restrictions on the release of information may be justified on the basis of concern for the welfare and privacy of individuals. This may apply, for example, to individual medical, financial, and academic records. Even in these cases, however, the rule of confidentiality may be overridden by a justifiable need to know.
3. All information that is directly relevant to the effective discharge of the functions of Senate committees, or faculty committees in the schools, is presumptively theirs by right, and cannot be withheld by an administrator. Only upon specific justification and subject to a grievance being filed by the relevant committee or faculty may

information be withheld.

4. Disputes as to the degree of detail and specificity of information to be made available to faculty committees should be resolved by the Chair, Chair-elect, Past Chair of the Faculty Senate in consultation with the President and the Provost. Where agreement is not reached, the matter should be referred to the Senate Executive Committee for a vote or referendum of the standing faculty.

### 1990-91 Senate Committee on Administration

Jean Alter (*Romance languages*)  
James J. Leyden (*dermatology*)  
Elliot Mossman (*Slavic languages*)  
Solomon R. Pollack (*bioengineering*), chair  
Elsa Ramsden (*physical therapy*)  
James Ross (*philosophy*)  
ex officio: Almarin Phillips (*public policy & management*)  
Louise P. Shoemaker (*social work*)

# The 1991 White Paper on Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching

## *The Student Committee on Undergraduate Education*

The Student Committee on Undergraduate Education believes the issue of teaching to be of the utmost importance in the academic life of the undergraduate. Also, there exists a growing realization that the quality of teaching is directly correlated with an institution's prestige and level of alumni support. We propose, despite these times of budgetary concerns, that teaching be given a high priority. With these issues in mind we propose the following recommendations:

### **Teaching Evaluation**

In order to even begin addressing how to increase the quality of teaching one must first decide how good teaching is to be judged. SCUE believes that any evaluation process must foremost be fair and accurate. If these conditions do not exist, the information gathered will not be respected. We also feel that a balance should be maintained between the University level and the department level of organization. Therefore, we suggest the evaluation process be standardized across all schools while maintaining enough flexibility for individual needs.

### **Office of Teaching Evaluation**

This would be best served by the creation of an Office of Teaching Evaluation which would be the chief distribution, collection, and compilation point for the teaching evaluation forms. This office will also assist the departments in adapting the forms to their specific needs through an advising process. It will serve as a central source for information on teaching evaluations for all members of the University community.

### **Evaluation Requirements**

Three audiences require the information from this evaluation process. First, the departments need information for the tenure/promotion process. Secondly, professors need it to improve their teaching quality. Finally, the students require the data for course and professor selection.

### **Evaluation Overhaul**

Considering these ideals and requirements, we recommend an overhaul of the entire evaluation process. Any one method of evaluation will provide only one viewpoint, so an integrated system of review must be implemented. This should include both students and alumni. SCUE calls for the student evaluation forms to be fundamentally redesigned. This reorganization should include questions on the environment of academic integrity and English fluency of the professor. Also attention should be made to the ordering and phrasing of the questions. In summary, we propose that a Provostial committee composed of faculty, students and administrators be formed to fundamentally redesign a single University-wide form.

### **Distributed Twice a Year**

These forms should be distributed in the classes once at the middle of the term to provide quick feedback to the instructor. Then at the end of the term the forms should be given again to be used for a comprehensive course review. This combination of reviews will better serve the faculty in examining their own performance.

### **Student Interviews**

The students should be given the option to volunteer for an interview. This option can be given through a place on the redesigned evaluation form. From this group a randomly chosen set of students would meet with a faculty member within the department and discuss issues concerning the class. A report would be drafted with the students' comments and a rebuttal, if requested, from the class professor. This process would be administered by the undergraduate chair of the department. Copies of the report would be sent to the department chair and the undergraduate dean of the school.

### **Alumni Evaluations**

Alumni information is also important, for the alumni viewpoint is one of hindsight and experience in their field. SCUE therefore suggests that selected alumni should receive evaluations concerning their undergraduate education. Some alumni should also be selected each year to be interviewed by a central University office (e.g. the Alumni Interview Center). The interviews and reviews should be sent to the affiliated school/department. Besides helping to evaluate each departments' programs, the entire University would directly benefit through increased

alumni involvement and possibly enhanced development efforts.

### **New English Fluency Law**

The new Pennsylvania law calls for all teaching staff members who have contact with undergraduates to be fluent in the English language. Its definition of fluency extends beyond simple manipulation of English words and sentences into the importance to convey information and connect thoughts. SCUE calls for questions pertaining to this definition of fluency be placed on all student evaluation forms. Also, we ask that an undergraduate be placed on the committee formed to enforce this law.

### **The Physical Environment of Teaching**

In order to create an environment in which good teaching can occur, the classroom setting must be in good physical condition, adequately lit, and have proper seating. SCUE applauds the Provost for his effort in creating a University committee to examine Penn's classroom space. We hope that the University will continue with this effort and finance improvements to the selected buildings.

Furthermore, we encourage the University to expand the access to technology presently used in the classroom. Computer-aided instruction and other audio-visual innovations should be considered when planning classrooms.

### **Training**

While a professor or teaching assistant may be very knowledgeable about her field, she may not know how to teach effectively. To combat this problem, SCUE reiterates the call for the University to found a long-proposed teaching center which will provide support for faculty members and teaching assistants. This center would provide videotaping equipment for self-evaluations, run a series of programs on how to improve one's teaching and provide general training. Though if this center was not to be opened, at the minimum, SCUE calls for mandatory training for all teaching assistants with optional training for faculty members. There exist now several pockets of highly effective teaching assistant training programs (such as the Language Departments) that are doing a very commendable job. Therefore, training can be an important way to increase the quality of teaching at Penn.

### **The Rewards of Teaching Excellence**

Of course, the greatest reward for being an excellent teacher is the satisfaction of helping another individual learn and develop intellectually. Indeed, we expect that every member of the faculty would be motivated by this goal. To this end, it would follow that the University would reward those faculty members who are excellent teachers by granting them tenure.

In addition to these emotional and structural rewards, the University should create another more public group of rewards for excellent teaching. These rewards would highlight high-quality teachers and hold them up as role models for their peers.

One more public reward for teaching would be the establishment of several endowed chairs for Undergraduate Teaching Excellence. These chairs should be given to faculty members in basic academic areas (humanities, sciences, etc.). The establishment of these chairs would demonstrate the significance of teaching at the University. It would also serve as a perpetual reward for excellent teaching as the chairs are filled by the next generation of teacher-scholars.

In addition, to further expand the list of those highlighted as excellent teachers and to also get departments more involved in rewarding teaching excellence, each department at the University should select an outstanding teacher from among its faculty. The names of those selected should be published by the University and should receive an award from the University. The reward should be determined departmentally for the winner.

### **Other Issues:**

**Rotation of Lecturers.** The problems of large lecture classes are well-known. They lack the student-faculty interaction which smaller classes can afford. Attempts have been made to correct this lack of interaction through the use of teaching assistants in recitation sections. However, this is not an adequate replacement for the intellectual stimulation provided by a faculty member. In addition, there is a serious lack of communication between the professor and the teaching assistants in most areas.

*(continued next page)*



Our solution to this problem requires the rotation of professors through one recitation section per week. This would have a number of very positive effects and will not become a significant drain on resources.

We believe this would strongly increase the level of student-faculty interaction, the quality of the teaching assistant instruction, the collegiate feelings at Penn and the TA-Faculty communication. All of which provide a more cohesive intellectual experience for students and faculty.

**Team-Taught Classes.** Furthermore, SCUE believes the University should further promote the concept of team-teaching among its faculty members. Two or more professors would not only teach in the class together but would also combine their efforts into a coherent and interconnecting experience. We feel that the dynamic interchange between at least two professors and a small group of students provides an unique

opportunity for learning. This team-teaching concept draws upon Penn's wide-ranging intellectual strengths which will foster interdisciplinary classes.

### Conclusion

While the University has discussed the importance of teaching in the past, SCUE believes that it is time for the University to make fundamental steps to increase the status of teaching at Penn. We further believe that our recommendations constitute an important step in this direction. SCUE looks forward to addressing these concerns with the administration, faculty and the newly revitalized Lindback Society.

—David Haynes, Chair, SCUE Teaching Committee  
—David Kaufman, Chair, SCUE

## Speaking Out

### More on D.O.D. Sponsorship

Barry Cooperman's and Amos Smith's defense of the proposed Institute for Advanced Science and Technology raise more fears than they allay (*Almanac* March 19 and 26).

Take the question of military funding. One might think from Professor Cooperman's remarks that the Defense Department is putting up \$10 million so that academic chemists and engineers can carry on their academic researches. The "Draft Program," he reassures us, was drawn up strictly on the basis of ongoing research, not Pentagon needs. "It is possible that some of this work will have special interest for the Department of Defense," he admits, but by and large it will be academic business as usual. So it may appear from where they sit.

The strings attached to DOD funds are more apparent, however, if we take the point of view of the Pentagon and Congress. Take a look at the text of the original bill (H.R. 4739) that provides for funding of the Institute (see below). The ongoing researches that interest the DOD and Congress are military sponsored researches. The official purpose of the new facility is to house "mutually supportive technology research" in areas of need identified by the Department of Defense. The Pentagon's strategy is to build a broad base for projects that are specifically identified as being sponsored by Army, Navy, Air Force, and Pentagon grants and contracts.

Professor Cooperman assures us that his academic dancers will be calling the tune. The military piper seems to have different expectations.

Likewise, Professor Smith assures us that one of the basic purposes of the Institute is to improve teaching and research opportunities for a few dozen chemistry majors. I see no evidence that the Pentagon and Congress see things in that way. Quite the contrary.

Obviously, the chemists' "Draft Program Statement" was designed to be as permissive as possible within these basic technological limits. Like advanced R&D labs in high-tech industries, the proposed Institute is intended to do foundational advance work in areas where new technologies—military in this case—are expected in future. The postwar partnership

of Pentagon and universities is indeed a tolerant one, but the purpose of it all is never in doubt. The piper simply does not demand payment up front. That comes later.

Professor Cooperman assures us that most of the work of the Institute will result in benign technologies: new drugs, medical prosthetics, computer graphics, conducting polymers and so on. No doubt that is true. The problem, however, is that those same technologies that produce new drugs and the rest can also be used—and are funded so as to be used—for military purposes that are anything but benign.

Item: Bio-engineering and fermentation technologies that are used to design and produce new therapeutic agents (Draft Program 1a) can also be used to mass produce biological toxins. Not at the University of Pennsylvania, of course, but perhaps with knowledge and techniques developed here. We can hope for the best but must keep in mind that the DOD's "Critical Technologies Plan" has a military purpose.

Item: Basic research on semi-conducting organic polymers that may bring us better batteries will also be used—here at Penn, apparently—to develop fast-burning propellants (Draft Program 1b). It does not take much to see the connection with Star-Wars anti-missile technologies. Do we want our University to be involved in such work?

Item: U-fast detecting and data-handling technologies will be used to improve medical diagnostic imaging and basic particle physics research (Draft Proposal 2c and 2d). These same technologies can also be used to develop ever-smarter and more devastating weapons systems and to encourage Star-Wars fantasies of space shotguns and space lasers.

Many modern technologies have this ambiguous multipotential quality. Historians of technology and science have studied many such cases, from Autobahnen to nuclear fission. Pentagon sponsorship, including its sponsorship of the proposed Institute, is designed to exploit this inherent potential for its own military ends. Obviously we cannot prevent the DOD from making such use of basic knowledge. But do we want to systematically encourage it?

Professors Cooperman and Smith point to the good academic benefits that will come should the proposed Institute be built. They miss the point. They fail to acknowledge the moral ambiguity that is built into modern military technology and into the system of military sponsorship of university research and teaching. If they think they can control the relationship with their military patron, then they deceive themselves. Good intentions will not guide us through a reality that is inherently ambiguous, technologically and morally. The chemists should read more history and they should peer deeper into the future. Sooner or later the piper will have to be paid.

—Robert E. Kohler, Professor of History and Sociology of Science

### Attachment:

Sec. 243 Grant for an Institute for Advanced Science and Technology.

(a) Authority to Make Grant.—Of the amount appropriated pursuant to section 201 for the Defense Agencies, \$10,000,000 shall be available for a competitively awarded grant to an institution of higher education to establish an institute for advanced science and technology.

(b) Qualifications.—The institution selected must—

(1) have been funded by the Army as a Center of Excellence for artificial intelligence research and education;

(2) be carrying out research on conducting electronic polymers by nonredox processes under the Department of Defense's University Research Initiative (Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency);

(3) be conducting research programs in airborne vision systems and scene segmentation funded by the Navy; and

(4) be performing research in nonlinear optics and in models for visual texture analysis funded by the Air Force.

(c) Limitations.—The grant shall be available for initial construction of a cost-shared facility, the Federal share of which may not exceed 50 percent of the total cost, designed to support mutually supportive technology research currently underway at the institution in response to the critical technologies research needs identified by the Department of Defense in its Critical Technologies Plan as required by Public Law 100-456.

**Ed Note:** Dr. Cooperman is away; his office has indicated that he will respond in a future issue.

# 1991-92 Charge Schedules for PennNet Services

In the spring of each year for the past two years, the Office of Data Communications and Computing Services, (DCCS), has published its charge schedule for connections to PennNet, the University's computer network, and for its services for the following fiscal year. This year, DCCS's fiscal 1991-92 charge schedule includes new prices for continuing services, including electronic mail and document transfer services on the computer host RELAY.

The PennNet connections prices are valid for the entire 1991-92 fiscal year. Prices for commercial hardware and software products distributed through DCCS are subject to change based on vendor pricing.

In the near future, this announcement will be available on NETINFO, PennNet's electronic information service.

## Background

When PennNet construction was authorized, the University provided funding to establish a backbone network. This network provides points of access through wiring closets in non-residential locations throughout campus. It was then determined that the individual client would be responsible for paying for the additional cost of installation and maintenance of the electronics equipment and wiring necessary to connect to the campus backbone. The charges described here are concerned with those individual costs.

In 1988, DCCS developed a PennNet Charge Schedule to provide the flexibility to accommodate different budgetary circumstances. This schedule included a Leasing Plan enabling clients to pay one kind of monthly fee to cover DCCS's costs of operating, maintaining, and amortizing the electronic equipment that provides PennNet access. In 1989, DCCS added a new Prepayment option for clients with available grant funds, or other funding sources for one-time expenses, so that they could pay for more of their PennNet costs up front and reduce their ongoing costs of connecting to the network.

In 1990, DCCS developed in consultation with the Network Policy Committee a new pricing strategy to spread the costs of Central Network Services more equitably among its users. Central Network Services include, among others: the Ethernet-asynchronous gateways, dial-in and dial-out modem pools, network connections to external networks such as the Internet, network monitoring, and DCCS planning. Directly connected asynchronous PennNet port users have recently been bearing a disproportionately high burden of the costs of Central Network Services. In the same interval, Ethernet port users on locally-maintained local area networks (LANs) have benefited from access to Central Network Services without incurring any direct charge. Since Ethernet-based services and facilities are becoming more common, DCCS has experienced an increase in Ethernet-based connections. Thus, the new DCCS plan provides a phased approach to redistribute actual Central Network Service costs over four years. Last year's charges reflect recovery of about 15 percent of the actual per capita cost of Central Network Services from Ethernet users. This year's charges reflect recovery of about 35 percent of these costs.

Last year, DCCS created an option that provides a discount toward the Central Network Service charge for those clients who qualify to supply most of the end-user support for their network connections.

Below are the Charge Schedules for the PennNet Leasing Plan and the Prepayment Plan, followed by the Central Network Service Charges for incremental connections to DCCS-supported Ethernet connections. These charge schedules are followed by explanations of the terms used, including explanation of the qualifications for the self-maintenance discount for the Central Network Service charge. Finally, examples of common circumstances are offered to clarify options. You may choose whichever payment option best suits your budgetary and technical needs.

## PennNet Connection Charge Schedules, 1990-91

<b>A. Leasing Plan</b>		
	<b>Asynchronous</b>	<b>Ethernet</b>
Total Average Wiring Cost (One-time)*	\$450.00	\$450.00
Connection Lease Charge	\$22.00/Mo.	\$31.50/Mo.
Access Credit Rate	\$5.00/Mo.	\$10.00/Mo.
<b>B. Prepayment Plan</b>		
	<b>Asynchronous</b>	<b>Ethernet</b>
PennNet Access Charge (One-time)	\$250.00	\$700.00
Average Wiring Cost (One-time)	\$450.00	\$450.00
Total Average Installation Cost*	\$700.00	\$1150.00
Connection Service Charge	\$15.50/Mo.	\$17.00/Mo.
Equipment Support Period	30 Months	46 Months

## C. Monthly Central Network Service Charge for Incremental Connections to DCCS-Supported Ethernet Connections:

Type of Connection	No Discount	Discount
Single Asynchronous or Ethernet Workstation	\$ 3.60	\$ 2.50
Single Ethernet connection with multiple devices "daisy-chained" through connection	\$30.00 plus \$ 3.60 per computer	\$30.00 plus \$ 2.50 per computer
16-Port Terminal Server	\$28.80	\$20.00
32-Port Terminal Server	\$57.60	\$40.00
Ethernet-connected host computer with "n" number of terminals hard wired to it	n x \$1.80	n x \$1.25

\* See "Additional Costs" section below for explanation of Average Wiring Costs and costs of equipment for Ethernet services.

For those who rely on DCCS for terminal server support, DCCS will be in contact with you. Pricing for those services is not yet complete.

**Connection Lease Charge:** This is the monthly fee if you lease PennNet services. It covers DCCS's ongoing costs of operating, maintaining, and amortizing the specific equipment needed to provide data communications services for each PennNet connection and the equipment associated with the centrally-provided network services and facilities.

**Access Credit Rate:** DCCS uses this rate, a portion of the monthly charge, to calculate the amount of credit applied toward the prepayment of the PennNet Access Charge if you decide to convert from leasing to prepayment after the initial installation. It is also applied if the real useful life of PennNet connection equipment turns out to be less than the Equipment Support Period.

**PennNet Access Charge:** This one-time, non-refundable charge prepay your portion of the cost of the electronic equipment used to provide data communications services for each PennNet connection. Prepaying the PennNet Access Charge has the effect of reducing the ongoing monthly fee from the Connection Lease Charge to the Connection Service Charge.

**Connection Service Charge:** This is the monthly fee you are charged if you prepay for PennNet services. It covers DCCS's ongoing costs of planning, operating, and maintaining the equipment that provides communications services for each PennNet connection and the equipment associated with the centrally-provided network services and facilities. The Connection Service Charge is less than the Connection Lease Charge because it excludes the cost of the electronic equipment amortization.

**Equipment Support Period:** An expected useful life is assigned to each PennNet connection. The Equipment Support Period is the time period that DCCS forecasts it will be able to maintain the specific electronic equipment to provide individual PennNet connections. It will determine DCCS's obligation, should maintenance of service cease before the end of the Equipment Support Period.

**Central Network Service Charge:** This is the monthly fee that covers the ongoing costs of planning and operating Central Network Services and Facilities. This fee is on a sliding scale designed to reflect that it is individual users who consume the central network resources. Devices supporting more than one individual are charged a higher fee. However, school and department computers serving multiple clients do not incur this charge unless they have hard-wired terminals or dedicated terminal servers associated with them.

The Central Network Service Charge is currently 35 percent of DCCS's actual costs of providing Central Network Services. This fraction will increase over the next three years, eventually to reflect the actual central service operating costs.

**Daisy-chained Ethernet Workstations:** Ethernet technology allows you to "daisy-chain" Ethernet-compatible computers from a single connection, so that clients with physically proximate computers can use one PennNet connection to connect many devices to the network.

**Terminal Servers:** For those clients who do not have Ethernet-compatible computers, or the hardware and software to make them so, terminal servers are a cost-effective way to provide access to Ethernet-based services and facilities from several asynchronous computers, terminals, or workstations in one area.

**Local Support Requirements:** DCCS provides a 30 percent discount on the Central Network Service costs for all connections of those clients who meet the following qualifications:

- The client must provide a single point of contact for all support from DCCS.
- The client must provide first-level end-user network support.
- There must be established a clear delineation and separation between DCCS and client-owned network electronics, particularly in the wiring closet.
- The client is responsible for the purchase, installation, operation, and

(continued next page)



maintenance of all network electronics beyond the building connection to PennNet (DCCS is willing to assist in the planning and installation efforts on a time and materials basis).

—The client must meet the standards established in "Connection Guidelines to PennNet" to be connected to PennNet.

In addition, those clients are not subject to monthly connection charges because they are responsible for the maintenance of those connections.

### Additional Costs

The cost of wiring PennNet outlets is not included in the PennNet Access Charge. PennNet wiring and outlets work much like those of telephones. First, they are uniform for connections to different devices. Second, as with commercial telephone wiring, clients (as individuals, offices, departments or schools) are responsible for the one-time cost of wiring a PennNet outlet where none existed.

DCCS has found that the average cost of wiring a PennNet outlet is \$450. This is an increase of \$25 from the last report, and reflects revisions that come from recent surveys of actual installation costs.

Actual individual cost can vary greatly from that average, depending on the specifications and restrictions in each building and office. DCCS Operations representatives perform a site survey and provide you a written estimate of the actual wiring costs before the work is done.

If you move office locations after having prepaid for PennNet Access, your prepayment credits are still good, and you still have access rights to PennNet. However, as mentioned above, if your new office does not have PennNet outlets, you must assume the cost of installing the PennNet wiring. If PennNet wiring exists in the new location, you pay only for the time and materials required to activate the existing PennNet outlets for your use.

### Ethernet Services

If you want connections to use Ethernet services, you need particular hardware and software to attach to the devices which DCCS provides. The costs of this hardware and software can be significant; they vary according to the services you desire and the equipment you already own. If you chose to connect your IBM PC, PS/2 or clone to PennNet Ethernet Services, DCCS supports either Western Digital hardware coupled with FTP Software, or Ungermann-Bass Ethernet hardware and software.

For the Western Digital/FTP Software option, the client is responsible for purchasing the hardware through the vendor or its manufacturers' representatives. DCCS is the site license holder for FTP Software and its support. DCCS has determined that the cost of the FTP Software site license, the supporting documentation, the diskettes, and the technical support is \$260.00 per user. The Ungermann-Bass equipment can be purchased through the vendor or its manufacturers' representatives. Call the PennNet Service Center, 898-8171, for details about Ethernet services, hardware and software.

### Converting to Prepayment From Leasing

If you are thinking about converting from leasing to prepaying for PennNet access to reduce your monthly connection charges, contact the PennNet Services Center at 898-8171 for more information.

### Accommodating Changing Technology

DCCS developed the Equipment Support Period as the probable useful life of the PennNet Access Equipment. It is DCCS's intention to provide access with the current equipment for as long as possible. However, data communication technologies are advancing at a rapid rate. Changing technology is not just a likelihood; it is a certainty. Planning for and anticipating how it will change will save all of us time, money, and frustration, while taking advantage of the available technological advances.

When the time comes for your equipment to be replaced, DCCS will endeavor to offer similar options to those presented here, again to allow you maximum budgetary flexibility and control.

If you have been leasing a connection, you will be offered a replacement connection with the new, equivalent technology. You may then continue leasing your connection at the current rates at the time of the change. If you prepaid for your PennNet access, you will receive credit equal to the Access Credit Rate for each month that DCCS was unable to support the connection before the Equipment Support Period expired.

For example, if you had paid the \$700 PennNet Access Charge for 46 months of Equipment Support specified for an Ethernet connection and DCCS could support the connection for only 38 months, you would receive a credit for the remaining 8 months based on the Access Credit Rate of \$10/month, or \$80. This credit would be applied to a new PennNet Access Charge for the new supported technology.

### RELAY ALL-IN-1 Accounts

DCCS has developed two billing options for ALL-IN-1 accounts on the central electronic mail computer host, RELAY. Option 1 is for low-volume, light users of electronic mail, and Option 2 is for heavy e-mail users. Charges have increased slightly from 1990-91 prices.

The charges are as follows:

Option 1		
Component	FY 1990/1991	FY 1991/1992
Service Charge	\$3.00/Month	\$5.00/Month
Connect Charge	\$6.00/Hour	\$6.00/Hour
Storage Charge	\$0.025/Block	\$0.025/Block

### Option 2

Component	FY 1990/1991	FY 1991/1992
Service Charge	\$37.50/Month	\$39.00/Month
Storage Charge	\$0.025/Block (after 1st 200 blocks)	\$0.025/Block (after 1st 200 blocks)

With Option 1, users pay for the time they are connected to RELAY, as well as a base monthly service charge, and storage charges, with one block equalling roughly one-third of a standard typewritten page of text.

Option 2 is offered to heavier e-mail users, who are charged a higher, flat-rate monthly charge and the same storage rate as lighter users, except that the first 200 blocks of storage are free; they also are not charged for their time connected to RELAY.

### Billing

DCCS has been assigned budget subcode 303 for PennNet charges, including installations and monthly fees for both connections and services.

### Where to Go for More Information

If you are interested in connecting to PennNet, converting payment plans, or need more information about Ethernet equipment cost itemization and availability, call the PennNet Service Center, 898-8171, or send electronic mail to [psc@dccs.upenn.edu](mailto:psc@dccs.upenn.edu) for more information.

—Valerie Glauser, Senior Technical Writer, DCCS

## Schedule for CRC Chargeback Services

The Computing Resource Center offers many classes and services at no charge to members of the University community. However, it does charge for rental of its training facilities, and as the site license owner, for copies of the statistical packages SAS and BMDP for DOS-compatible computers. Following are the prices and explanations of those services.

### CRC Training Facilities

All CRC training facilities are available for rent to University offices and departments. However, these rentals are limited because the facilities are also used to offer the standard complement of free weekly computer training courses from CRC to the entire University community.

The CRC has three training areas—two labs and one seminar room. The Macintosh lab is equipped with 12 Apple Macintosh IIsi computers, asynchronous connections to PennNet, and a monochrome video projector. The IBM lab is equipped with 15 IBM PS/2 Model 50 computers, asynchronous connections to PennNet, and a monochrome LCD projector. The seminar room holds 25-30 people and is equipped with a Macintosh IIsi, a Dell 333-D (IBM compatible), and a monochrome LCD projector.

These training facilities are rented on half and full day bases, and the fees are as follows:

	Half Day	Full Day
IBM & Mac Labs	\$250	\$500
Seminar Room	\$150	\$300
Projection Equipment	\$ 75	\$ 75
Set-up and clean-up fee (if needed)	\$ 50/hr.	\$ 50/hr.

Billing is done by journal entry. For more information, call the Training Department of the CRC at: 898-9085.

### SAS and BMDP for DOS Computers—Software and Licenses

The CRC has been designated as the University's site license holder for the statistical packages SAS and BMDP for DOS computers. Under the vendor agreement, both of these packages are available only to faculty and staff.

To obtain a copy of either package, users must do the following:

- \* Borrow the master disks to copy, obtain documentation and, if necessary, other supporting software and instructions. If you are renewing your license, you need not borrow any disks.
- \* Copy and return the master disks by the appointed time to avoid the lateness surcharge.
- \* Pay for the software by personal check or budget code.

Charges for licensed copies of the software are as follows:

Software	License Fee	Lateness Surcharge
BMDP	\$200 (one-time)	\$100
BMDP Upgrade	\$ 75 (one-time)	\$100
SAS	\$100 (annual)	\$100

The current version of BMDP has a \$75 per year maintenance fee which gives you free technical support. The above information is subject to change. Contact the CRC at 898-9085 for more information.

### How to Affiliate with Writing Across the University

Writing Across the University has been inviting course affiliations for the fall on a first-come-first-served basis since late January. Although the deadline for being listed in the *Timetable* has already passed, we are still accepting requests. The three main criteria for affiliation are an emphasis on good academic writing, manifested by the writing assignments in the course, a predominantly undergraduate course enrollment, and a willingness to require drafts and conferences. If you will be teaching a course that meets these criteria, consider affiliating your course with WATU. For more information or an Affiliation Request Form (if you haven't already received one), please call 8-8525 or 8-4566.

—Peshe C. Kuriloff, Director, WATU

### 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 April 1, 1991 and April 7, 1991.

**Totals:** Crimes Against Persons-1, Thefts-29, Burglaries-2  
Thefts of Auto-1, Attempted Thefts of Auto-0

Date	Time	Location	Incident
<b>Crimes Against Persons:</b>			
04/02/91	6:30 PM	Zeta Beta Tau	Female sexually assaulted
<b>34th to 36th; Locust to Walnut;</b>			
04/01/91	8:10 AM	Van Pelt Library	Disc drive processor taken
04/01/91	9:28 PM	Van Pelt Library	Cash taken from wallet
04/03/91	2:33 PM	Meyerson Hall	Bike taken from rack
04/04/91	12:48 PM	Phi Kappa Sigma	TV taken from house
04/05/91	3:00 PM	Van Pelt Library	Unattended wallet taken from desk
04/05/91	3:23 PM	Meyerson Hall	Unattended wallet taken from unsecured room
<b>34th to 36th; Spruce to Locust</b>			
04/01/91	12:10 AM	Williams Hall	Room broken into/items taken
04/03/91	1:07 AM	College Hall	University flag taken
04/03/91	10:34 AM	Williams Hall	Rear wheel taken from bike
04/03/91	2:26 PM	Logan Hall	Unattended jacket taken from unsecured room
04/06/91	11:59 PM	Houston Hall	Credit cards, cash and watch taken
<b>37th to 38th; Spruce to Locust</b>			
04/01/91	3:28 PM	Phi Delta Theta	Wallets, watch taken from unsecured room
04/07/91	5:52 PM	Phi Delta Theta	Bike taken from basement
<b>38th to 39th; Spruce to Locust</b>			
04/02/91	6:30 PM	Zeta Beta Tau	See crimes against persons
04/06/91	8:35 PM	Harnwell House	Secured bike taken from rack
<b>39th to 40th; Locust to Walnut</b>			
04/02/91	1:13 PM	Low Rise North	Bike taken
04/05/91	6:20 PM	High Rise North	Bike taken

**Safety Tip:** Protect your property—Engrave your property and keep a record of serial numbers... Don't leave wallet, purse, books or other portable items on desks or in plain view... Register your bike with the University Police and use kryptonite locks to secure it.

### 18th District Report

Schuylkill River to 49th Street, Market Street to Woodland Avenue  
12:01 AM March 24, 1991 to 11:59 PM March 31, 1991

**Totals:** Incidents—12, Arrests—4

Date	Time	Location	Offense/Weapon	Arrest
3/24/91	12:05 AM	108 S. Farragut	Robbery/gun	No
3/24/91	9:00 PM	546 S 48	Aggravated Assault/knife	No
3/25/91	10:55 PM	1 S. Farragut	Aggravated Assault/gun	No
3/25/91	10:30 PM	3900 Spruce	Robbery/strong-arm	No
3/26/91	2:30 AM	4000 Locust	Robbery/gun	No
3/26/91	11:55 AM	3000 Walnut	Rape Attempt/strong-arm	No
3/27/91	7:45 PM	4700 Chester	Robbery/gun	No
3/28/91	6:37 PM	4508 Walnut	Robbery/strong-arm	Yes
3/28/91	9:00 PM	4935 Baltimore	Aggravated Assault/fists	Yes
3/30/91	2:49 AM	4901 Baltimore	Robbery/strong-arm	Yes
3/30/91	10:28 PM	4200 Baltimore	Robbery/gun	Yes
3/31/91	12:37 AM	5 S. Farragut	Robbery/knife	No

# Update

APRIL AT PENN

## CONFERENCE

**12** *New Perspectives on Evolutionary Questions*; symposium dealing with the insight into evolutionary processes based on paleobiological work; lunch and dinner included, call Ext. 8-5724 for reservations; 11 a.m.-6 p.m., Room 358, Hayden Hall (Department of Geology).

## TALKS

**11** *Antero-Posterior Axis Determination in Xenopus*; Ken Cho, UCLA; 4 p.m., Wistar Auditorium (Wistar Institute).

*Parent-School Partnership in Special Education*; Ellen Siciliano, parent involvement coordinator, Pennsylvania Department of Education Bureau of Special Education; 4:30-6 p.m., Room B16, GSE (Graduate School of Education).

*Rabbinical Response During the Holocaust—The Rule of Law in a Time of Catastrophe*; Benjamin W. Mintz, visiting professor; 4:30 p.m., Room 213, Law School (Law School).

**15** *The Role of Communication and Media Studies in the Liberal Arts: A Place of Honor*; Willard D. Rowland, Jr., dean, School of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of Colorado at Boulder; 5 p.m. Room 110, Annenberg School (Annenberg School).

*London Underground: the Blitz, Shelters, and Art*; Christopher Rolphe, Polytechnic University of North London; 5:30 p.m., Rosenwald Gallery, 6th floor, Van Pelt-Dietrich Library (Friends of the Library).

**17** *Suzanne Gordon*; on themes and ideas in her recent book, *Prisoners of Men's Dreams: Striking Out for a New Feminine Future* with book-signing and reception to follow; 4 p.m., Nursing Education Building Auditorium (Student Forum of the School of Nursing).

## Deadlines

The deadline for the May at Penn pullout calendar is April 9. The deadline for the weekly update is each Monday for the following week's issue. (See addresses below.)

In the last regular issue of the spring term, May 28, *Almanac* will again publish the Summer at Penn wrap-up including summer educational programs as well as public events between June 1 and Labor Day. Its deadline is May 14.

## 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  
Peter Baker  
Jennifer E. Burke, Ashley M. Dupuy, Phuong Nguyen, Shauna Seliy, Amy Sykes, Lynn L. Westwater

ALMANAC ADVISORY BOARD: For the Faculty Senate, June Axinn, Charles D. Graham (Chair), Almarin Phillips, Louise P. Shoemaker; for the Administration, William Epstein; for Staff Assemblies, Deverie Pierce (A1), Judith A. Vaughan-Sterling (Librarians); A3 representative to be named.