

Almanac

Tuesday, September 17, 1991

Published by the University of Pennsylvania

Volume 38 Number 4

INSIDE

- Senate: SEC Actions 9/11, p. 2
- Two SCAFR Reports, pp. 2-3
- Of Record: Change in Annuity, p. 3
- Comment and Draft on Harassment, p. 4
- Speaking Out: Religious Holidays; Parking; Smith Hall, pp. 5-6
- Statement on DOD Funding, p. 7
- CrimeStats, Update, pp. 7-8

Pullout: Locust Walk Committee Report



Lorene Cary

PEN at Penn: Three this Fall

Authors Lorene Cary, Bobbie Ann Mason and Susan Cheever are this autumn's PEN at Penn participants—the fifth time the in-residence program has brought prominent authors to lecture and live on campus. The program, sponsored jointly by the College of Arts and Sciences and the PEN American Center in New York, is funded by Alumnus Saul Steinberg. Dates for public appearances are:

September 26: At 4 p.m. Ms. Cary, a West Philadelphia native who attended Penn and Sussex University, will read from her work. As the second black female to matriculate at St. Paul's School, an elite New England prep school, Ms. Cary went on to a distinguished academic career and returned to St. Paul's as a teacher and coach. Now receiving critical acclaim for her latest work—*Black Ice*, an autobiographical document of her days as a student at St. Paul's—Ms. Cary

has been favorably compared to Maya Angelou and strongly identifies with the tradition of James Baldwin and Toni Morrison.

October 9/10: Critic and author Bobbie Ann Mason will read at 4 p.m. both days. The author of *Girl Sleuth* (1974), *Love Life Stories* (1989) and other works of fiction, Ms. Mason also wrote the critical work, *Nabokov's Garden: a Nature Guide to Ada* (1974). A graduate of the Universities of Kentucky, Connecticut and SUNY Binghamton, Ms. Mason now teaches English at Mansfield College in Pennsylvania.

November 12/13: Public readings are scheduled both days by Susan Cheever, a 1984 Guggenheim Fellow based in New York who is the author of *Looking for Work* (1980) and *Doctors and Women* (1987).

Locations for the public readings are to be announced. Additional information may be obtained from the SAS Dean's Office, Ext. 8-7320.

Institute for Advanced Science and Technology '...for the 21st Century'

A press package from the University's Office of News and Public Affairs, announcing the IAST as a "Research Center for the 21st Century," gave the description below and the statement by Vice Provost for Research Barry Cooperman, on Department of Defense funding, which appears on page 7. Also in the press packet, and scheduled for publication next week, are the names and research areas of individual faculty whose work is to move to the new facility.—Ed.

IAST will encompass five distinct but interacting centers:

- 1) The Center for Excellence in Computer, Information and Cognitive Science;
- 2) The Center for Excellence in Chemistry;
- 3) The Center for Excellence in Bioengineering;
- 4) The Center for Scientific and Technological Information Resources;
- 5) The Center for Technology Transfer.

Locating these centers in one facility encompassing about 160,000 square feet will enable scientists to integrate their efforts and promote cross-disciplinary collaboration. Among the many projects slated for this laboratory are studies in the molecular basis of life; new materials and bioengineering approaches to human injury and aging. It will also provide an updated facility to develop cognitive science; imaging and graphics; and ultrafast detectors.

Partnership with Government and Industry

The University, as is true of nearly all major research institutions, depends upon a variety of public and private sources to fund its research activities. Among those sources is the Depart-

ment of Defense which has contributed between \$8-9 million (constituting 4-5 percent of the University's total sponsored research programs budget) in each of the last five years.

By comparison, the University received about \$120 million in non-defense research funds from other federal agencies, such as the National Institute of Health and the National Science Foundation, during that period.

All sponsored projects, whether public or private, are accepted in accordance with strict guidelines established by Penn in the late 1960's. These rules stipulate that all findings and conclusions derived from projects must be free from control by the sponsor. "This policy has the effect of completely eliminating classified research, including weapons research, from Penn, while maintaining the freedom of inquiry of its faculty and the integrity of its scholarship," Dr. Cooperman said.

"Why then is the Defense Department providing money for IAST? It is because it considers a strong basic research effort in science and engineering at our major research universities to be a fundamental part of the strength of the United States. On this point, the interests of the University of Pennsylvania and the Department of Defense coincide," Cooperman said.

Penn's longstanding relationship with DOD support has led to many important developments that have contributed to the quality of life, economic viability and technological competitiveness of the United States.

Beginning with the world's first electronic computer, ENIAC, the federal government has backed Penn research with wide ranging results. The following are two examples of this spin-off research:

Dr. Norman Badler's "JACK" system was initially funded by the Defense Department agencies to assist in the design of helicopters, but there have been several practical and beneficial applications for the system: Badler used "JACK" to assist in designing plumbing functions aboard the space shuttle and recently tested the design of a commercial tractor. A graduate student of Badler's who is the set designer for the National Opera Company of Taiwan has used it to develop scene and lighting schemes for productions. And in Maryland, teachers are using the JACK system as an educational tool for instruction in science and math.

Dr. Alan MacDiarmid's work with conducting polymers was also funded by defense department agencies and, like Dr. Badler's work, has produced commercially useful products. Technology developed by Dr. MacDiarmid has led to lightweight batteries that are being used in the aerospace industry, commercial airlines and in industry.

Smith Hall: The Best Location?

After a thorough and exhaustive search for alternate locations, it was determined that the Smith Hall, located on 34th Street between

(continued on page 7)

Death of Dean Springer

At presstime *Almanac* was informed of the death Sunday of Dr. Otto F. Springer, the longtime dean of arts and sciences who also served as vice provost. He was 86. Additional information will be published next week.

SENATE

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 Louise Shoemaker or Executive Assistant to the Chair of the Faculty Senate Carolyn Burdon, 15 College Hall/6303, Ext. 6943.

Actions Taken by the Senate Executive Committee Wednesday, September 11, 1991

1. **Faculty Salaries.** SEC held a lengthy discussion in light of the restored State appropriation.
2. **International Programs.** Preliminary discussion was held regarding current and anticipated issues.
3. **SCAFR Vacancy.** Selected a nominee to fill a one-year vacancy.
4. **President and/or Provost meeting with SEC.** Agreed to continue the policy of inviting the President and/or Provost to alternate SEC meetings for 1991-92. They will be invited to the October meeting when

faculty salaries will be one of the topics discussed.

5. **Just Cause Procedure.** Unanimously adopted a motion to establish a Senate ad hoc task force to recommend means for a speedier procedure. The Chair of the Faculty Senate was empowered to appoint a 5-member group from nominations submitted by SEC members. Included in the group are to be recent members of the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility and of school academic freedom committees. A report is called for during the 1991-92 academic year.

Annual Report

1990-91 Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility

May 6, 1991

The Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (SCAFR) has spent much of its time this year on several cases arising in different parts of the University. These cases have raised fundamental questions about the scope and adequacy of the current draft Misconduct in Research Procedure, the structure of the Clinical Practices of the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania and its relationship to the rights of tenured faculty, the content of academic responsibility, the framework in which the administration can conduct investigations of alleged faculty misconduct and the scope of SCAFR's own investigatory powers. In addition to the specifics of those cases, five general issues are of particular consequence to the entire academic community.

Issues Related to Academic Freedom and Responsibility

1. **Auditing of Faculty Offices.** We have become aware that the administration has entered the offices of faculty members, at times, perhaps, without their knowledge, to investigate possible misconduct. While the University owns faculty offices, it does not have the right to enter them or search them unless it follows strict procedures to protect faculty members' constitutional rights as well as their academic freedom. Such procedures currently do not exist. It is SCAFR's opinion that the administration, in consultation with the Faculty Senate, must draft recommendations for review and approval by the Board of Trustees as soon as possible. The procedures should protect the faculty member as well as enable the administration to investigate possible criminal misconduct without tipping its hand. Because of the seriousness of this matter, we believe they should mirror procedures currently in place to protect citizens from unreasonable search and seizure. At the very least, they should include getting a "search warrant," obtained from an impartial party, as well as consultation with an appropriate faculty body.

2. **Procedure Concerning Misconduct in Research.** The Misconduct Procedure continues to be in conflict with the statutes of the University. Indeed, SCAFR informed the administration of this last year. Therefore, they are null and void and their use is unacceptable until key changes are made. As now written, they allow deans to do anything they want to a person accused of misconduct. We believe the Misconduct Procedure should protect people to the same degree as the Just Cause Procedure. The administration should rewrite the Misconduct Procedure over the summer to meet these concerns so that may be reviewed by the Faculty Senate in September 1991.

3. **Faculty Suspected of Involvement in Criminal Activity.** It has come to our attention that on some occasions, the administration has used its sole discretion to decide how to deal with faculty suspected of felony misconduct. We believe this is wrong, whether it results in either unilateral sanctions against faculty or in decisions enabling faculty against whom there is reasonable suspicion of criminal behavior to evade administrative and criminal sanction. The administration in

concert with the Faculty Senate must work out procedures to insure that there is adequate consultation with an authorized faculty group prior to taking an action. The administration and the faculty care deeply that everyone in Penn's community uphold the Code of Academic Integrity. We believe that that will be more likely if the faculty and administration set high standards for themselves and then hold themselves accountable to those standards. It is not a good example to anyone in the community if a suspected felon is given a golden parachute and sent off to practice his or her art at another university. Neither is it acceptable for people to be punished for infractions without benefit of due process of law.

Administrative Concerns of the Committee

1. **SCAFR Procedures.** During the course of the year, the committee has worked on several cases with histories extending back over several years. In addition, it has had five new requests for rulings. In trying to cope with all of these, it has become clear that SCAFR needs to develop standardized procedures for entertaining requests for review, collecting data and hearing cases. Next year, the Faculty Senate should appoint a committee consisting of past chairs of SCAFR to develop such procedures. In addition, the nature and complexity of cases before SCAFR this year suggests the committee should be chosen carefully to ensure as much continuity from year to year as possible. Finally, we think it would be wise for the Faculty Senate to assign a faculty member, well versed in the law, to be a regular consultant to the committee. Without someone like that this year, we have had to call on outside help regularly. Though we have gotten excellent assistance, it has required making excessive time demands on volunteers and has slowed the committee down because consultants cannot attend regular SCAFR meetings.

2. **Work Load.** SCAFR has developed an enormous work load. It meets weekly and members spend hours between meetings following up issues and investigating cases. It has become clear that this burden is too heavy without adequate administrative support. If it is to function in anything like a timely manner in subsequent years, the Faculty Senate must insure it is efficiently staffed.

*1990-91 Senate Committee on Academic Freedom
and Responsibility*

Howard Arnold (social work)
Deborah Dougherty (management)
Ian Harker (geology)
Igor Kopytoff (anthropology)
Peter J. Kuriloff (education), Chair
Vivianne T. Nachmias (anatomy/medicine)
Robert M. Schwartzman (dermatology/veterinary)
Joyce E. Thompson (nursing)
ex officio: Louise P. Shoemaker (social work), Senate Chair-elect

Report of the 1989-90 Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility

May 15, 1991

The 1990-91 Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (SCAFR) reviewed and supports the report of the 1989-90 SCAFR that appears below.

Professor Lionel A. Manson is a tenured member of the faculty of the University of Pennsylvania and has been for 36 years, i.e., since 1954. His assignment to the Wistar Institute carried with it all his academic rights and privileges regardless of any rules or practices to the contrary at the Wistar Institute.

Professor Manson was dismissed from the research staff of the Wistar Institute by actions of its director and board of managers, without any hearing, any presentation of charges or any other effort to provide even minimum due process. That action constitutes a severe and reprehensible invasion of his status as a professor of the University, assigned to the research staff at Wistar. That action is unacceptable regardless of any merit in the complaints which the administrator may have had.

No argument by the director or managers of Wistar that a person voluntarily waives rights and privileges he or she would otherwise enjoy as a faculty member of the University when he or she accepts an appointment to the research staff at Wistar (because the scope of rights for Wistar researchers is currently narrower) can be countenanced. Members of the University of Pennsylvania faculty on academic assignment in lieu of services rendered directly to the University cannot waive, whether implicitly or explicitly (e.g., by accepting a nominal title such as "Wistar Research Professor" which as condition of promotion requires waiver of tenure) rights and privileges they enjoy by their University appointment. Such an act is rendered void by the continuing status of the individual as a tenured faculty member.

Normally, to accord with the basic principles to which this University is dedicated, the Wistar Institute should offer Professor Manson reinstatement to his prior position and conditions of employment, and should do so publicly. Since, however, Professor Manson has made a private settlement with the University before this case came before SCAFR, SCAFR will not insist on this reinstatement.

However, these unacceptable actions by the director and managers constrain SCAFR, under its general responsibility for matters of academic freedom and responsibility in the University, to go beyond these observations on the Manson case. In Professor Manson's case, his tenure in the University, throughout his service at Wistar, protected his rights and privileges. There are, however, other research scholars at Wistar who apparently serve at the pleasure of the director and managers. Any member of the research staff at Wistar who holds an appointment in the

associated faculty or in the standing faculty or is otherwise within the definition of "academic staff" as defined by the Statutes of the Trustees, 1983, Art. 10, p. 20 of the Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators, has, of course, protection by the procedures of the University and may not be dismissed except at the end of a term of appointment or for just cause. At present, there is no analogue of a "just cause" procedure extant at the Wistar Institute. It is incompatible with the aspirations and commitment to academic freedom in the University that any researcher should serve at the day to day pleasure of the director of an institute.

We conclude that the Wistar Institute must bring its appointment policies and its review procedures into accord with the standards of the University. The institute must also formulate a procedure for dismissal for "just cause" that accord with the procedures governing the University as a whole and which will make the Wistar Institute a model of academic freedom and responsibility for similar research institutes closely connected with universities. It is important to point out here that the Wistar Institute is very closely affiliated with the University, inasmuch as it has a member of the University trustees and the University vice provost for research on its board, has direct considerable involvement with the teaching of students enrolled at the University, and has a number of its members who hold joint appointments in the University.

If the board of managers of the institute do not see the importance of establishing such principles, and do not implement this with appropriate procedures within a reasonable time, SCAFR will be required by its charge to take further action. In the meantime, SCAFR feels that it should be emphasized that all Wistar researchers that come under the definition of "academic staff" of the University are protected by the procedures of the University. Any researcher who is arbitrarily dismissed, censored or otherwise suffers invasion of academic freedom will be considered a case to be brought to the community opinion of the University by SCAFR. Research laboratories affiliated with universities have a special responsibility to follow and enlarge the principles of academic freedom and responsibility.

1989-90 Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility

Adelaide M. Delluva (biochemistry/veterinary)
 Deborah Dougherty (management)
 Ruben Gur (psychiatry)
 Alan C. Kors (history)
 Vivianne T. Nachmias (anatomy/medicine)
 James F. Ross (philosophy)
 Louise P. Shoemaker (social work), Chair
 Joyce E. Thompson (nursing)
ex officio:
 Almarin Phillips (public policy & management), Senate Chair-elect

OF RECORD

Change in Tax Deferred Annuity Plan for Monthly-Paid Staff and Faculty

The following change to the Tax Deferred Annuity Plan (Retirement Plan for Monthly Paid Staff and Faculty) became effective July 1, 1991:
Ability to draw on interest earnings while actively employed

A participant in TIAA is now permitted to withdraw interest on his or her account while actively employed if he or she is age 55 or older. This distribution option is called IPRO (Interest Payment Retirement Option). You must have a TIAA account to use this option. Formerly it was necessary to retire or terminate employment with the University in order to commence any sort of payment from the plan.

IPRO is a payment option initiated by TIAA in the recent past which allows an individual to be paid the interest being earned on his or her TIAA balance before cashing out or selecting an annuity payment option. An individual between the ages of 55 and 69 1/2 can select this option and be paid on a monthly basis the interest income which otherwise would have been credited to the TIAA account. Although this option

was available previously to retired and former employees, the option has become available to actively employed University faculty and staff who are at least 55.

What does this change mean?

The change enables active employees past age 55 to access monies while working, yet retain the principal of their retirement account intact.

It is believed that this new flexibility with the Tax Deferred Annuity Plan will be extremely useful to faculty and staff in certain situations. Questions regarding this change in policy may be directed to the Benefits Office.

Since the Internal Revenue Service assesses a 10% penalty tax in addition to normal income tax on payments from tax deferred annuities prior to age 59 1/2, faculty and staff are advised to consult their tax adviser and plan carefully when considering this new flexibility.

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

As Commentary on Proposed Racial Harassment Codes, a New Draft

Presumably because I was the most vocal opponent of the drafts on harassment that President Hackney presented to the Council last year, I received a note from him, towards the end of the last semester, asking me to indicate which of the two drafts on harassment that the Council had considered, I preferred. Since I did not approve of either draft, that was like asking me whether I had stopped beating my wife. I felt then and I feel now that the codes presented to us would not only constitute a violation of academic freedom but would establish a precedent for ever more serious infringements in the future. The consistency with which the courts have rejected such codes on First Amendment grounds confirms my belief that they threaten more harm than the good they promise. It would be disgraceful to hide behind the shield of the fact that we are a private institution and therefore not subject to the First Amendment. Instead of making a choice, I sent an alternative draft which I have since revised. The revised draft is presented below. I make no pretense at originality in either the draft or in the discussion which follows. I have copied and freely paraphrased parts of the AAUP proposed statement on "Academic Freedom and Tenure: A Preliminary Report on Freedom of Speech and Campus Harassment Codes."

—DRAFT—

Preamble: The Ideal of an Academic Community

The University of Pennsylvania is a community devoted to learning. It can sustain such a claim only if it provides the maximum latitude for the expression, examination and criticism of ideas. Indeed *the free and open exchange of ideas is the paramount value of the University community*. The intellectual freedom to which we aspire as a community requires that the University protect the rights of enquiry and expression of each individual member of the University community, and that it also sustain an atmosphere that encourages the full participation of each of its members in the intellectual and academic life of the University.

In order to attain this goal, the University must be ready to protect the utterance of ideas, opinions, information and knowledge even if deemed objectionable and insulting by some members of the University community. The best protection against abhorrent ideas is unfettered freedom of speech.

At the same time, the University must also try to preserve the ability of all members of the community to participate to the fullest extent possible in the life of the University. Words that are intended to inflict pain and suffering should not be condoned by any member of the University community. Even activity, particularly speech, that is not subject to penal sanctions can be reprehensible in terms of community standards. Even truthful statements intended only to inflict pain and suffering should be emphatically condemned though not made subject to penal sanctions. The University actively promotes an atmosphere of openness for all members of the University community and must continue to do so. Often people use words with the knowledge that they will hurt and sometimes with the desire that they hurt—this occurs in many contexts representing personal or political outrage, despair, etc., and while this expression should not be condoned, it should be tolerated unless the usage is dishonest. Some words can hurt as much as a physical assault. They should neither be condoned nor treated like a physical assault. Not only the harm caused but also the means used to cause the harm are relevant in evaluating and responding to the person who caused the harm. Causing harm by speech is often relevantly different from causing harm by conduct. Thus, all conduct, other than speech, which cause direct injury to an identifiable individual on the basis of race, ethnicity, or national origin is prohibited and may be the basis for the disciplinary action below•...

Definition of Racial Harassment

The University does not condone "racial harassment" defined as any verbal or symbolic behavior that:

1. insults or demeans the race, ethnicity, or national origin of a person or persons to whom it is directed, or
2. is intended by the speaker or actor to thereby inflict direct injury on the person or persons to whom it is directed.

- This note is a commentary, not part of the text. A policy prohibiting a variety of acts is, in effect, a penal code. If penalties are to be invoked when there is transgression, the range of those penalties, such as a mandatory apology to expulsion should be specified in the document identifying what is prohibited

As long as harassment is restricted to the content of speech, however objectionable or offensive it may be to some or even to the vast majority, the University will take no punitive action. The University, however, does prohibit acts of prejudice which consist of any of the following:

1. Incitement to direct and immediate violence against persons or property.
2. Denial of access to educational, extracurricular, research service, or employment resources of the University.
3. Obstruction of academic or work performance.
4. Discrimination in the administration of University policies or the conduct of University programs.
5. Acts of intimidation.

— END OF DRAFT —

The draft President Hackney presented to the Council dealt only with racial harassment. It should apply to all forms of harassment, including sexual and sexual orientation.

The preamble of a statement is hardly the place to explore adequately the merits of a position. At the risk of some repetition I append these additional comments to help clarify my position.

Clearly the principle of academic freedom is most severely tested when it is exercised to defame. Such defamation can cause great personal distress and harm. However, the appropriate response is not to curtail academic freedom, which is a denial of a university's *raison d'être*, but a refutation of the defamation and an active campaign to educate the campus and to expose the evils of such behavior. The faculty and administration of the University have an obligation to refute speech that creates or even threatens to create a hostile atmosphere for some members of the community. They have not only the right to criticize and condemn such harmful speech, they have an obligation to do so.

Neither threats of violence nor utterances that are clearly inducive of violence are protected by free speech. However, the "fire in the crowded theater" argument also lends itself to abuse. It is tempting to promulgate prohibitions under that umbrella, but reliance on that umbrella can easily lead to the erosion of speech protection it was never intended to cover. When Hitler robbed the Germans of their freedom and the Jews of their life, he did not do it in one swoop. He robbed by degrees so that no single step looked untoward in the light of the place from which the step was taken.

Abusive epithets conveying contempt, hatred or ridicule based upon characteristics that are central to personal identity have no place within an academic institution. However, even when the degree of personal abuse extends beyond the bounds of decency, prohibition by regulation should generally be eschewed, but the transgression should not be ignored or allowed to restrict the victims' educational opportunities. As distasteful as such epithets are, the free expression of ideas is significantly threatened by any broad prohibition of such speech. It is notoriously difficult to define the speech to be prohibited without impinging on the speech that should be free. Such prohibition invites overzealous members of the community to seek to silence those whose views they dislike. This can have a chilling effect on the academic community. The enforcement of prohibitions is simply too blunt to distinguish between speech protected and not protected by free speech. One of the prices we pay for free speech is the need to allow the expression of views that are repugnant, offensive, or emotionally distressing. Universities simply cannot perform their vital role if some ideas or expressions are ruled out of order.

With respect to speech the alternative to a disciplinary approach is obviously an educational approach. The latter has the distinct advantage not only of not needing to draw the line between the permissible and the nonpermissible, it can also be directed at the nearly nonpermissible. The University has a responsibility to develop a highly visible educational program to that end. It cannot wholly prevent the harm done to the subjects of verbal abuse, but by taking the matter seriously the University can minimize such abuse and provide community support for and aid and comfort to the victims.

Among the *positive* things the University can and should do are:

1. Vigorously indicate throughout the University community a commitment to eliminate bigotry in all of its manifestations from our community.
2. Utilize such resources as are deemed appropriate to reduce prejudice and to respond to incidents that are not condoned.

— Morris Mendelson, Professor of Finance

Speaking Out

On Religious Holidays

As many faculty members have expressed frustration over the religious holidays only to be totally ignored by the administration, I wish to reiterate my opposition to the University policy on religious holidays. This matter has been extensively discussed in the Faculty Senate but despite the objections voiced by the faculty, a memorandum is back with a few more holidays added to it.

The present policy on the academic calendar was formulated by Vartan Gregorian and revised by Michael Aiken. The revision was hardly noticeable and since 1979 the world and the academic community have undergone many changes. We should consider these policies seriously based on present considerations. The academic community is considerably more diverse than it used to be, and it is becoming increasingly difficult to satisfy everyone's private views. The reference to "holidays that involve most people" may no longer be current. Who are "most people"? Even with the addition of a few holidays, we are still ignoring important ones such as the Greek Orthodox Christmas and New Year, Chinese New Year, etc. A large number of our students also observe these holidays. In fact, we could go on forever, and probably every day of the year is a holiday for someone. So, let's be serious! We cannot add holidays ad nauseam and expect the faculty to bear the burden of this foolishness. Why should the faculty be obliged to accommodate five or six religious groups during the semester, while we are also trying to space our exams so the do not interfere with other exams (a more important consideration in my view). For those of us who give four exams a semester, it is almost impossible to avoid conflicts. To ask the faculty to make up extra exams because some individuals wish to worship on this day is unreasonable; there isn't such a thing as "to provide reasonable opportunities." The situation is even more serious for the laboratories. Many experiments require special equipment that is not permanent and cannot be set up again for a few students. Some experiments are not compatible and students doing different experiments for the class may be safety hazards. The materials needed for some experiments may not be saved because they do not keep. To make-up laboratory experiments is a hassle for the teacher and the other students. It is more than an inconvenience, it directly interferes with the learning process.

Both professors and students miss one or more classes during the year. Professors give talks, go to meetings, etc. They make sure their colleagues take over at such times and they do the same for their colleagues. Students also miss classes for interviews at graduate schools, athletic endeavors, personal obligations, emergencies, etc. They ask other students to lend them their notes and inform themselves

of what went on. All these absences are perfectly legitimate. I trust that collegiality still prevails on this campus and that both faculty and students will help their colleagues on such occasions by either giving their lectures or by lending their notes. Therefore, I strongly suggest that the administration publish a list of holidays that might affect more than one student, but allow the faculty the right to handle these absences as they see fit. With an ever shrinking academic calendar, it is already difficult enough to schedule exams so as to be fair to all students. Traditionally, the faculty has always exerted some degree of control over University policy. The administration is attempting to erode this control in subtle but effective ways. This is one more example of administrative interference in pedagogic matters: the administration is telling the faculty how to conduct their classes. I believe the faculty should strongly object to the present University policy on religious holidays, and regain control in the classroom.

—Madeleine M. Joulle
Professor of Chemistry

The Provost Responds:

As Provost, I probably receive as many complaints about our policy on secular and religious holidays as I do about parking. There are as many in the University who believe there should be more such holidays as there are who believe there should be fewer—or none. Our current policy was developed only after extensive consultation with faculty, students, and staff, as well as with many of our peer institutions. Revisions to it, no matter how minor, have also gone through such a review process. (Before implementing the most recent revision, which was prompted by a resolution from University Council of which Professor Joulle was a member, I consulted not only with the Faculty Senate but with the Academic Deans, the Council of Undergraduate Deans, the Council of Graduate Deans, GAPSA, GSAC, and the UA.) Because of concerns similar to those expressed by Professor Joulle, the Faculty Senate last year decided that it should reexamine our academic calendar and our current policy on secular and religious holidays. I welcome such a review and hope it can be completed during this academic year.

—Michael Aiken

A Parking Suggestion

The following was sent September 10 to Robert Furniss of Business Services.

I am writing to express concern over the parking conditions in the garage at 38th and Spruce Streets. I have been parking here for five years, and each fall the students and faculty return to occupy all the spaces on the first three floors. The majority of these vehicles have out-of-state licenses and are left here overnight and throughout the week, only to leave on the

weekend and return Sunday night, thereby ensuring them a spot on the first floors.

I arrive at 6:45 a.m., and during the summer I have a choice of spaces available on the first floor. This is most convenient and definitely safer than having to enter the stairwells at such an early hour. Now, however, I am forced up to the higher levels and feel that a better arrangement could be made.

Long-term parking is a common concept in most parking garages. I realize that implementation of such a policy might be difficult, but at minimum, the University could post signs defining long-term parking and directing such vehicles to the third floor or above. Periodically, an attendant checking for stickers could also look for violators whose vehicles have been left for more than two or three days.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

—Christine McDevitt, Programmer/
Analyst, Wharton School

Mr. Furniss Responds:

Penn's Parking Program issues parking permits to faculty, staff and students for specific lots or garages, but individual spaces within these facilities are not assigned. The enforcement alone of assigned parking, even in one particular facility, would be an enormous, ongoing and cost prohibitive venture and an impractical use of limited resources. The problem that Ms. McDevitt is experiencing in the parking garage (#14) located at 38th and Spruce Streets is one of convenience which, unfortunately, is characteristic of this facility. The garage was originally built to house long-term parking with five levels of secured parking, four stair towers (one at each corner) and no elevators. Over the years the type of permits assigned to this facility have changed to include two groups: 24-hour (primarily student) parking and commuting faculty and staff. The majority of parking in garage #14 is reserved for 24-hour parking, but commuting faculty and staff continue to be assigned to this facility. Granted, commuter permits move in and out of this facility on a daily basis and the lack of elevators make the trek to and from the upper floors quite cumbersome at times. However, those with 24-hour permits also make that same trek (maybe less frequently), but they encounter the same problems and they pay a substantially higher fee to park in this facility. The Department of Transportation and Parking is responsible for distributing Penn's parking resources in a fair, equitable and cost effective manner. We also make every effort to provide safe and clean facilities in which to park. Unfortunately, some of our parking facilities are not as user friendly and convenient as we would like them to be.

—Robert Furniss, Director,
Transportation & Parking

Speaking Out continues next page

History and Smith Hall

Controversy continues over the proposed demolition of E. F. Smith Hall and the erection, in its place, of a Pentagon-sponsored chemistry lab. Historical and moral questions continue to be raised about the long-term costs of this project: about the loss of an irreplaceable piece of campus history, and about the ethic of military underwriting of academic science. University officials have offered only bland assurances that no bombs will be built here, ignoring the subtle but insidious obligations that follow from military sponsorship. Also, they have systematically denigrated and distorted the historic significance of one of the oldest and most unusual buildings on the Penn campus. I would like, here, to set the historical record straight.

E. F. Smith Hall, on 34th Street at Smith Walk, was built in 1891-92 and was the first fully-realized hygiene laboratory in the country. That is, it was the first facility that was designed and built specifically and exclusively for research and training in the then-new science of bacteriology. It is one of five laboratories that were built at Penn during the provostship of William Pepper, and the only one that has escaped demolition. Architecturally, Smith Hall is also an unusual survival. Plain, unornamented, and understated, it is one of the very few buildings that is not British academic Gothic. In the shadow of the flamboyant Furness Building across 34th Street, it tends to be overlooked and undervalued as an effort at academic Gothic that failed for lack of imagination. In fact, Smith Hall embodies deeply-rooted values of an newly industrializing and urbanizing nation.

The deliberately un-academic look of Smith Hall was the result of four people coming together, with complementary vision. Dr. John Shaw Billings, the nation's leading public health expert, conceived the new design and directed the new institute. For him, the new hygiene lab represented an ideal workshop of applied science: functional, commodious, and open to anyone who wanted to add to scientific knowledge, whether or not they had academic credentials. For William Pepper, the new hygiene lab represented the ideal of a university that was not a Gothic ivory tower but a vital urban institution serving the practical needs of a growing industrial city. For the architect, the German-American Edward Collins, the new lab represented the fruition, in a new and unexpected way, a modernist style that developed in mid-19th Century Prussia. Ideals of scientific research, democratic education, and civic service came together in the architecture of Smith Hall. Few buildings on Penn's campus have such a rich historical meaning or embody their historic period in such an immediate and evident way.

The meaning of Edward Collins' archi-

tectural design is perhaps hardest to understand, because its roots in German history have only recently been recovered from long neglect by historian Mike Lewis. Briefly, the plain, functional style that Collins learned at Karlsruhe in the 1840's was an early form of modernism, favored for a brief time by reformers who were faced with the problem of constructing, fast and inexpensively, a national system of public schools and other civic institutions. These liberal, reforming civil servants saw, in a simple, functional and inexpensive architecture, an embodiment of their hopes for democratic and accessible institutions. Simplicity and modesty symbolized the break from an imperial past. The reformers were, of course, disappointed. The democratic revolutions of 1848 were crushed. New imperial governments preferred a more pompous and imposing style of architecture, symbolic of wealth and power. Edward Collins fled to the United States where, forty years later, his early hopes for a plain, democratic architecture were unexpectedly revived.

John Billings Shaw, too, believed in democratic national institutions that were freely accessible to anyone of talent and ambition. He believed in the transforming power of knowledge and research, and devoted his life to creating institutions for the diffusion and creation of useful knowledge. The National Library of Medicine and the New York Public Library were his brainchildren, and he envisioned the new hygiene Laboratory at Penn in the same way, as an exemplary civic institution for research and training in public health. The service aspect is crucial. A career Army surgeon, Billings was non-academic, even anti-academic, and the new Hygiene Lab was not just an academic department but a civic facility, to which Philadelphia physicians or officials could resort to be trained, carry out bacterial and chemical tests, and do research essential to the health of Philadelphians. For this purpose Billings envisioned a laboratory designed specifically and solely for the purpose of efficient work. Inside, every detail was designed for this end. Indeed, the building's plumbing, heating, and ventilating systems were designed to be sued for research on sanitary engineering and construction. The laboratory building itself was an instrument of research. Outside, Collins' plain, functional design symbolized Billings' belief that academic filigree was meant to challenge and provoke established academic habits of elitism and isolation, and it did.

Billings' vision of research was practical civic service and of a university as a serving, civic institution were fully shared by Provost Pepper, and by Henry C. Lea, the remarkable benefactor of the new laboratory. Lea was a noted historian, medical publisher and civic reformer, whose varied activities were all inspired by his belief that experimental science was the engine of progress from closed to open societies.

(His history of the Inquisition was widely read.) When approached about financing a bacteriology laboratory, Lea agreed on the condition that Billings be brought in to design and head the lab and that Penn modernize its medical curriculum. The Hygiene Laboratory—Smith Hall—remains the quintessential expression of Lea and Pepper's almost religious faith in the transforming power of science.

It was no accident that Edward Collins was Lea's chosen architect. Collins' plain, functional and pointedly unpretentious style, expressive of the liberal ideals suppressed in 1848, was no less expressive of Lea and Pepper's vision of experimental science as a reforming force in civic government and higher education. These ideals, so characteristic of their time and place, are visible in the architecture of Smith Hall, for those who have the historical knowledge to see them.

The hopes that Billings, Pepper, Lea and Collins held for the Hygiene Institute were partly realized. Many of the men and women who led Philadelphia's public health movement were trained in the Hygiene Lab. Research did become the basis of many practical professions, as Billings and Pepper had hoped. Architecturally, however, the provocatively unacademic and democratic style of Collins, Billings and Pepper did not catch on. British academic Gothic remained the norm. University officials on the make, socially elite trustees, and wealthy patrons generally preferred something more pretentious, more obviously fashionable and safe; something with more flash. Thus Smith Hall remained a singular, extreme case of a marriage of aesthetic symbols with socio-political ideals. It may best be seen, perhaps, as a variety of functional modernism that never became mainstream, caught in the still water between the utopia of European liberalism and the utopia of twentieth-Century modernism.

In no other building that I know of are the ideals of a democratic, public-service science so self-consciously expressed in architecture. That is what makes Smith Hall so special.

Buildings are historical documents, texts, so to speak, and like literary texts that need to be read and interpreted in their historical contexts. To those who are ignorant of history, Smith Hall naturally means nothing. It just seems out of place, an ugly ducking, a squatter on valuable real estate. So, too, did the Furness Library, once upon a time, because officials were ignorant of its history. So too with Smith Hall now. Its history is being ignored or distorted by University officials, and an irreplaceable historical text is again threatened with destruction. It would be like burning a book.

"History is bunk," said Henry Ford, and as history is being misused to devalue Smith Hall, old Henry was dead right.

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

Department of Defense Funding for New Research Facility

A Statement by Barry Cooperman, Vice Provost for Research

The proposal to demolish Smith Hall and build the Institute for Advanced Science and Technology (IAST) at the University of Pennsylvania has generated much discussion between various constituencies within the University community since planning for the project began several years ago. Until recently, that discussion has centered on whether Smith Hall should be preserved as an historic structure or removed in order to build an advanced research facility that would stress and interdisciplinary approach to science and engineering.

Now, however, after a ruling by the Philadelphia Historical Commission that demolition of Smith Hall for the purpose of constructing IAST was permissible, some opposed to the project are challenging its validity by claiming that IAST will be a "weapons factory." They further claim that because the new laboratory facility will utilize federal funds, including monies from the Department of Defense, there will be strings attached to information generated by IAST.

These claims are both false and misleading. Further, such inaccurate

statements ignore the efforts Penn has made to deal openly and fairly with community and University groups.

Penn, as is true of nearly all major research institutions, depends upon a variety of public and private sources to fund its research activities. The University has strict guidelines governing sponsored research. These rules stipulate that all findings and conclusions derived from the project must be free completely from Penn, while maintaining the freedom of inquiry of its faculty and the integrity of its scholarship.

Why then is the Defense Department providing money for the IAST? It is because it considers a strong basic research effort in science and engineering at our major research universities to be a fundamental part of the strength of the United States. On this point, the interests of the University of Pennsylvania and the Department of defense coincided.

We believe that through a partnership of government, the University and industry, this vitally needed research facility can be constructed so that Penn's research and advanced training programs can continue to be on the leading edge of American science and engineering.

IAST Location from page 1

Walnut and Spruce streets, was the only viable location for IAST. Although the prospect of demolition of Smith Hall has raised concerns from some who wish to preserve the structure on historical grounds, the project has received approval from both the city Historical Commission and the State Bureau for Historical Preservation. These reviews concluded that a building designed by the world-renowned architect Robert Venturi would renew and enhance the area rather than diminish it.

"This administration did not reach its decision on Smith Hall without wide consultation and consideration for Penn's past—and future. We must provide for progress if Penn is to remain at the forefront of research universities," said Penn President Sheldon Hackney.

Proximity between scientific facilities is a critical issue. IAST would be located between the Towne Building, which houses engineering, and the Chemistry building. A remote site for IAST would divide the programs, requires costly duplication of facilities amounting to nearly \$23 million and would divert resources that would otherwise be used in the preservation of four historically significant buildings within the science area: Towne, Morgan, Music and Hayden halls.

"Consistent with our commitment to preservation of historical sites, IAST will be designed to assure that it will blend aesthetically with the other historic structures to be restored and preserved within our historic science precinct," Hackney said.

(end of News & Public Affairs text)

Cancer Center on the Air

"On the Front Line Against Cancer," a prime time, one-hour documentary on the latest research and treatment of cancer at the University of Pennsylvania Cancer Center, will air Tuesday, September 24, at 8 p.m. on KYW-TV, Ch. 3. Penn Medical Center physicians and staff will be featured.

18th District Crimes Against Persons Report

Schuylkill River to 49th Street, Market Street to Woodland Avenue
12:01 AM August 11, 1991 to 11:59 PM September 8, 1991

Totals: Incidents-49, Arrests-11

Date Arrest	Time	Location	Offense/Weapon	
08/11/91	5:59 AM	4000 Baltimore	Robbery/strong arm	No
08/11/91	10:45 AM	4400 Walnut	Robbery/Strong arm	No
08/11/91	12:40 AM	4600 Osage	Robbery/stick	No
08/12/91	1:00 AM	4000 Sansom	Robbery/gun	Yes
08/12/91	7:00 AM	4800 Sansom	Robbery/knife	No
08/14/91	4:45 AM	4600 Market	Aggravated Assault/gun	No
08/15/91	10:27 PM	4600 Chester	Aggravated Assault/brick	No
08/16/91	4:49 AM	4700 Chestnut	Robbery/strong arm	Yes
08/19/91	9:30 PM	4618 Chester	Robbery/gun	No
08/19/91	11:33 PM	4600 Walnut	Robbery/strong arm	No
08/20/91	3:57 PM	4000 Chestnut	Robbery/strong arm	No
08/20/91	7:55 PM	Spruce	Robbery/gun	No
08/21/91	12:00 AM	4612 Spruce	Robbery/shotgun	No
08/21/91	4:45 PM	4400 Sansom	Robbery/strong arm	No
08/21/91	11:05 PM	4730 Warrington	Robbery/knife	No
08/22/91	12:36 AM	4100 Chestnut	Robbery/gun	Yes
08/22/91	10:05 AM	4233 Walnut	Robbery/strong arm	Yes
08/23/91	3:54 AM	4400 Market	Robbery/gun	No
08/24/91	3:40 AM	4709 Baltimore	Robbery/bottle	No
08/25/91	2:40 PM	3300 Market	Robbery/strong arm	No
08/25/91	3:27 AM	4800 Walnut	Robbery/gun	No
08/25/91	6:00 AM	4400 Spruce	Robbery/strong arm	No
08/25/91	2:45 PM	4000 Chestnut	Robbery/knife	No
08/26/91	12:22 PM	3333 Walnut	Rape/strong arm	Yes
08/26/91	8:13 PM	3819 Walnut	Robbery/strong arm	No
08/27/91	12:45 AM	4832 Spruce	Robbery/gun	No
08/28/91	1:20 PM	4527 Pine	Rape/shotgun	Yes
08/29/91	8:25 AM	4812 Sansom	Rape/strong arm	No
08/29/91	6:45 PM	4600 Sansom	Robbery/strong arm	No
08/29/91	10:20 PM	131 S 41	Robbery/knife	No
08/29/91	11:00 PM	4800 Paschall	Aggravated Assault/bottle	Yes
08/30/91	12:00 AM	4900 Woodland	Robbery/gun	No
08/30/91	3:38 AM	3400 Spruce	Robbery/gun	No
08/30/91	10:46 PM	4600 Osage	Robbery/gun	No
08/31/91	9:47 PM	4500 Spruce	Robbery/gun	No
08/31/91	10:40 PM	124 S 46	Aggravated Assault/gun	No
09/01/91	3:49 PM	3800 Baltimore	Robbery/strong arm	Yes
09/03/91	11:00 AM	5703 Cedar	Aggravated Assault/knife	Yes
09/03/91	11:22 PM	329 S 42	Robbery/gun	No
09/04/91	4:55 PM	4703 Cedar	Robbery/strong arm	No
09/04/91	7:40 PM	4832 Baltimore	Robbery/strong arm	No
09/05/91	5:05 PM	4000 Spruce	Robbery/strong arm	No
09/05/91	9:37 PM	3924 Pine	Robbery/strong arm	Yes
09/06/91	10:30 AM	4700 Walnut	Robbery/gun	No
09/06/91	9:49 PM	100 S. 37	Robbery/gun	No
09/06/91	10:50 PM	913 S. Farragut	Robbery/strong arm	No
09/06/91	11:20 PM	3600 Chestnut	Robbery/gun	No
09/08/91	2:11 AM	4000 Walnut	Robbery/gun	No
09/08/91	3:40 PM	4600 Chestnut	Robbery/strong arm	Yes

Graduate/Professional Student Fellowships to East Central Europe

The Institute for International Education (IIE) has a new fellowship program for young specialists in the fields of business and economics, law, journalism, public administration, and international relations. Fellowships are available to Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania or Yugoslavia. Financial benefits include round-trip international transportation, a monthly living stipend, health insurance and an allowance for books and travel within the host country.

The competition is open to U.S. citizens currently enrolled in graduate or professional school with at least two years of training or recent professional school graduates. The deadline for the receipt of applications is October 15, 1991. For more information and application forms contact Ann B. Hart, Office of International Programs, 133 Bennett Hall, Ext. 8-4661.

A Youngsters' Museum Guide

The World Within: the University Museum for Young Visitors, a guidebook for children and their families, is now available in the Museum's Pyramid Shop and Museum Shop. The World Within introduces children to the Museum and its functions, and explains how to look at archaeological and anthropological artifacts—taking young readers through twelve of the Museum's permanent collections. At \$2 it comes with a free return pass to the Museum.

The 35-page guide was written by Gillian Wakely, University Museum coordinator of education, in consultation with education department staff and guides, and is playfully illustrated by Laura M. Robinson Pritchard.

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 **September 9, 1991 and September 15, 1991.**

Totals: Crimes Against Persons-4, Thefts-35, Burglaries-2, Thefts of Auto-1, Attempt Thefts of Auto-1

Date	Time	Location	Incident
Crimes Against Persons:			
09/09/91	5:23 PM	3600 block Locust	3 actors robbed complainant's bike
09/11/91	9:23 PM	200 block 33rd	Female with knife demanded money /no injuries
09/13/91	5:53 PM	Dietrich Garden	Robbery/ jewelry taken
09/14/91	1:02 AM	3700 block Spruce	Attempted robbery/suspect fled no injuries

34th to 36th; Spruce to Locust

09/11/91	2:49 PM	Logan Hall	Cash taken from unattended purse
09/11/91	7:45 PM	Williams Hall	Bike taken
09/11/91	8:46 PM	Houston Hall	Rear tire taken from bike
09/12/91	12:03 PM	Williams Hall	Computer equipment taken
09/13/91	4:08 PM	Williams Hall	Front bike tire taken
09/15/91	7:20 PM	Furness Hall	Person investigated with bike seat
09/15/91	8:07 PM	Furness Hall	Bike seat taken from bike

32nd to 36th; Spruce to Locust

09/09/91	1:58 PM	Rittenhouse Lab	Secured bike taken from rack
09/09/91	1:58 PM	Rittenhouse Lab	Secured bike taken from rack
09/10/91	3:43 PM	Rittenhouse Lab	Bike taken from rack
09/11/91	9:23 PM	200 blk 33rd	See entry listed above under crimes against persons
09/12/91	10:55 AM	Lot #5	Sunglasses & change taken from secure auto
09/12/91	6:34 PM	Rittenhouse Lab	Unsecured bike taken

36th to 37th; Spruce to Locust

09/09/91	5:23 PM	3600 block Locust	See entry listed above under crimes against persons
09/12/91	1:04 PM	Steingberg/Dietrich	Unsecured bike taken
09/13/91	2:23 PM	3600 block Locust	Wallet & contents taken from backpack
09/13/91	5:53 PM	Dietrich Garden	See entry listed above under crimes against persons

36th to 38th; Hamilton to Spruce

09/10/91	9:14 AM	Stouffer Dining	Penn card & keys taken
09/10/91	1:02 PM	Chestnut Dorm	Secured bike taken from rack
09/14/91	1:02 AM	3700 block Spruce	See entry above listed under crimes against persons

09/14/91 5:44 PM Upper Quad Bike taken from rack

39th to 40th; Spruce to Locust

09/12/91	10:10 AM	Harrison House	Secured bike taken/cable cut
09/13/91	3:57 PM	Harrison House	Bike taken
09/15/91	2:16 PM	3900 block Locust	Wallet & contents taken from jogger

Safety Tip: What to do if you do become a victim? Stay calm, try not to panic or show any sign of anger or confusion. Try to compose an accurate description of the perpetrator to help police. Report all crimes to the University Police immediately at 511 or 898-7297.

For a four-week report on 18th District crimes against persons, please see page 7.

Update

SEPTEMBER AT PENN

MEETING

19 Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Staff and Faculty Association: Monthly Meeting; information, Bob Schoenberg, Ext. 8-5044.

SPECIAL EVENT

19 Penn Women's Center Open House; 5-7 p.m., Houston Hall Bowl Room, (Penn Women's Center).

TALKS

18 Medical Grand Rounds: Hepatitis C, Test & Rx: Christopher O'Brien, Gastrointestinal Section; 11 a.m.-noon, Medical Alumni Hall, Maloney.

19 Clinical Epidemiology Unit Seminar: Drug Induced Liver Disease; Jeffrey Carson, UMDNJ; 9-10 a.m., 313 Nursing Ed Bldg. (General Internal Medicine).

Clinical Conference: Consult Service Case-of-the Month; David Goldmann, Dieder Mendle-brot; noon-1 p.m., General Medicine Conference Room 3, Silverstein Pavilion. (General Internal Medicine).

The Chemical Revolution; Harry B. Gray, CalTech 8 p.m., Room 102 Chemistry Building.

23 Geriatrics Conference; 8-9 a.m., New VA Nursing Home, 1st Fl. Conference Room. Info: 662-7623. (General Internal Medicine).

PARSS Seminar on Afro-American Intellectual History: Cultural Studies and Black Liberation; Bell Hooks; 4 p.m., Annenberg Room 110. (PARSS).

The Design of Non-Bubble Aeration Systems for Plant and Animal Cell Culture; Arthur Humphrey, Lehigh University; 3:30 p.m., Alumni Hall, Towne Building. (Chemical Engineering).

An Evolutionary Perspective on Sex Differences in Spatial Ability; Steven J.C. Gaulin, Pittsburgh, 3:45 p.m., B-26 Stittler Hall, (Psychology).

24 Journal Club: Journals of Choice; Grace Cordts, Harv Feldman, Susan Shepard; 8-9 a.m., General Medicine Conference Room 3, Silverstein Pavilion. (General Internal Medicine).

Introduction to Liberation Theology; weekly; 4:30-6 p.m., Christian Association. (CA).

Putative Roles for the TGFB's in Mammary Development and Differentiation; Rosemary Akhurst, Glasgow; 4:30-5:30 p.m., Hirst Auditorium; Information: 662-6064. (Ob/Gyn).

Correction: Last week on page 1, we incorrectly identified Drs. Cochran-Smith and Lytle as chairs of the Penn Ethnography and Education Forum. They chair its session on teacher research, but the chair of the Forum itself is Dr. Frederick Erickson, professor at GSE and director of the Center for Urban Ethnography. We regret the error.—K.C.G.

Almanac

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

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

EDITOR Karen C. Gaines
ASSOCIATE EDITOR Marguerite F. Miller
EDITORIAL ASSISTANT Peter Baker
STUDENT ASSISTANT Shari Bart, Elana Bercovitch, Gina Bloom, Bill King and James Rhodes

ALMANAC ADVISORY BOARD: For the Faculty Senate, June Axinn, Charles D. Graham (Chair), Almarin Phillips, Louise P. Shoemaker; for the Administration, Stephen Steinberg; for Staff Assemblies, Deverie Pierce (A1), Judith A. Vaughan-Sterling (Librarians); Shirley Purcell (A-3).