

Almanac

Tuesday, October 5, 1993

Published by the University of Pennsylvania

Volume 40 Number 6

INSIDE

- Senate Chair: Searching for a President, p. 2
- President: To the Two Communities, p. 2
- Council Site, p. 2 • Speaking Out, p. 2
- Enhancing the Tenure System, p. 3
- Responses to SAS Dean Re Closings: Religious Studies, p. 4; American Civ, pp. 4-5
- Regional Science, p. 5; Astronomy, p. 6
- Tanenbaum Hall/Biddle Law Library, p. 6
- OEHS Exposure Control Plan; Refresher, p. 7
- CrimeStats, Bulletins, pp. 7-8; • Update p. 8

Five-Year Plans...Departmental Closings

All twelve schools published five-year plans in *Almanac* between 1986 and 1988, and all are expected to publish their latest ones here in the near future. But none are formally released until they have been reviewed by the Provost and the Academic Planning and Budget Committee, a Provost's Office spokesperson said Monday.

The School of Arts and Sciences's *Strategic Plan: Priorities for the Twenty-First Century: 1993-2000*, is scheduled for formal review shortly. Dean Rosemary Stevens said she will release an executive summary for publication in *Almanac* next week.

In addition to detailing missions and goals, the plan discusses budgetary constraints and projections, but does not single out specific departments or graduate groups for elimination or merger.

Proposals to close five units were made separately, in a Dean's letter which appeared here last week. [See responses, pp. 4-6 of this issue.]

On Closings: In response to numerous inquiries, *Almanac* requested and received information from the Office of the Secretary and the Office of the Provost on establishing and closing departments and graduate groups:

1. Trustees Statute 9.5 sets out the procedure for creating a department: "Upon recommendation of the President, the Trustees may authorize the establishment of academic departments within a Faculty." The rest of the Statute deals with chairmanships.

2. On September 16, 1991, Provost Michael

Aiken sent to the Academic Deans a memorandum, *Establishment or Discontinuation of a Department*, which says that "Such an action requires a formal vote of the Trustees, either in the full Board or in the Executive Committee...."

"Trustee action is taken upon recommendation of the President and Provost following an earlier recommendation to these officers by the Dean of the school in question.

"Although the organization of a school into departments is an administrative decision, the Dean should make his or her recommendation only after a careful study, a dialogue with involved faculty, and a thorough discussion in a meeting of the standing faculty of the school [*]."

"This procedure has been followed in recent years in either establishing or terminating departments in the School of Dental Medicine, the School of Engineering and Applied Science, and the Wharton School."

3. Procedures on the establishing and closing graduate groups are given Of Record in *Almanac* September 29, 1981.

* Discussion on the recent proposals is scheduled for the SAS Faculty Meeting October 12.

'Ancient Nubia' Held Over

The University Museum's *Ancient Nubia: Egypt's Rival in Africa*, scheduled to close October 3, has been held over to November 7.

Strengthening the Community: A Progress Report

At its day-long meeting on September 21, the Commission on Strengthening the Community started its work of identifying issues that create misunderstanding and poor relationships among members of the community and seeking new ways to bridge misunderstanding and conflicts with the expectation that Penn can become a place where we live and work together with civility while acknowledging and benefiting from our differences.

At the plenary meeting Commission members made plans to participate in meetings with as many community organizations as possible in October. These meetings will include a town meeting (October 4), the A-3 Open Forum (October 7), the A-1 Executive Committee Open Meeting (October 19), Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting (October 20) and a plenary Undergraduate Assembly (first week of November) and others as dates and times are identified. In addition, the Commission will organize several open forums and small focus groups in-tended to bring together people from all sectors of the University. The Commission will also undertake a broad survey of University opinion on matters of free speech, race relations, sexual harassment and other topics.

The Commission also broke into working groups which were composed of Commission plenary members and participating graduate, undergraduate, A-1 and A-3 members. These groups tackled the topics of judicial procedures and policy; faculty, student, staff relations; issues of student life; and topics of communications. The working groups will meet independently during the next few months to identify problems, create a vision and seek ways of solving problems in these areas. One issue was identified as a result of the discussions: it became clear that many students do not routinely read *Almanac*, the University's publication of record and opinion, or *The Compass*, both of which are widely read by faculty, staff and administrators. Students are urged to read these publications, which present important and timely information about the University. Both are distributed widely around the campus.

—Gloria Twine Chisum, Chair of the Commission



Law Building Dedication:

Janet Reno as Keynote

The Law School will dedicate its new law library and student activities building, Nicole E. Tanenbaum Hall [see page 6], on October 14, with an academic procession, a convocation, and a ribbon-cutting ceremony.

U. S. Attorney General Janet Reno will deliver the keynote address at the dedication convocation, where she will be introduced by Professor Lani Guinier. The Attorney General will also receive Penn's Medal for Distinguished Achievement, to be presented jointly by President Claire Fagin and Provost Marvin Lazerson. The medal, a pewter edition of the silver one struck for the inauguration of President Sheldon Hackney, can be awarded by the Trustees to those who "embody the highest ideal of the University, which is to produce graduates who change the world through innovative acts of scholarship, scientific discovery, artistic creativity, or civic leadership."

The School's highest honor, the James Wilson Award for Service to the Legal Profession, will be given *in absentia* to Retired Supreme Court Justice William J. Brennan, Jr., a 1928 graduate of the Wharton School who was obliged to cancel his scheduled appearance at the last minute on orders from his physician. Dean Colin Diver will present the award, which commemorates the University's first professor of law, James Wilson, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, an architect of the Constitution, and a member of the first Supreme Court.

Other speakers at the Convocation will include President Fagin, Dean Diver, and Charles A. Heimbold, Jr., Chairman of the Law School's Board of Overseers and chairman-designate of Bristol-Myers Squibb Company.

Ceremonies begin at 4:45 p.m. with an academic procession from the Law School to Irvine Auditorium. The convocation, for which tickets are required, begins at 5 p.m. and will conclude at about 6:30 p.m., followed by an academic procession to Tanenbaum Hall and a ribbon-cutting ceremony.

Searching for a President: An Open Letter to the Search Committee

This is a crucial time for higher education, throughout the country and here at Penn, as we face significant challenges. The future of the University is dependent upon the way we address these challenges. Our response must be shaped by a strong leader. What then are the most important qualities for which we must search in the next president.

- The president must be a respected academic. The University is in the knowledge business and its chief executive must understand that balanced budgets are not goals in themselves and that the true success of the University is measured by advances in knowledge and the quality of education we provide for our students.
- The president must have a vision of the future. The academy is not a structure set in concrete. It affects and is affected by changing paradigms of learning and structures of knowledge. We are the guardians of past knowledge but at the same time we need to take imaginative steps to keep us at the forefront of knowledge.
- The president must have a record of innovation. As we face the challenges of the future we need to be led by a president who is not content to tinker at the margins. There are serious structural problems at Penn that will require strong and innovative leadership to solve.
- The president must be a skilled manager. We are in a period of constrained resources; yet we need new resources to take the bold steps required of us. This will require cost containment, reallocation of existing resources as well as finding imaginative new sources of revenue.
- The president must be a conciliator. As we face the challenges of the future we need to work together toward their solution. The president must be able to bring diverse views together to form a consensus.
- The president must have a commitment to the institution. The president's number one priority must be Penn. We have all seen high administrators who have feared to take decisive and perhaps controversial actions for fear that those actions could interfere with their next job hunt. We can not tolerate such an approach.

We wish you well as you search for the president. The task is great and our future depends upon your success.



Council: New Meetingplace October 13

To all members of University Council and the University Community:

Starting with the October 13, 1993, meeting, University Council will meet in McClelland Hall in the Quadrangle, located at 3700 Spruce Street. All Council meetings are scheduled from 4 to 6 p.m. Nonmembers who wish to attend must register their interest *in advance* at the Office of the Secretary, Ext. 8-7005. —Constance C. Goodman, Secretary of University Council

Following is the talk President Claire Fagin made to Penn's Way volunteers at the kickoff of the campaign Friday. Names of this year's coordinators are on page 3.

To the Citizens of Two Communities

I am delighted to be in such good company. Looking out across this room, I see many familiar faces and some new ones. To all of you, I want to say "thanks" before I say anything more. Thank you for being part of such a remarkable group of University citizens, and I want to emphasize "citizen."

It is a word we hear a lot these days, so much that I think it doesn't have the punch that it deserves. I have a very dear friend whom many of you must know too, Judge Lou Pollak, who used to be dean of Penn's Law School. As one of his duties, Judge Pollak swears in new citizens, people who came from other countries and have with determination and pride made this country their home. The swearing-in ceremony is an incredibly moving occasion whether or not you have a friend or relative among the group.

To be a citizen is to belong to a community in such a fundamental way that it helps us define who we are. Citizenship is a great elastic band that stretches to our farthest borders and catches all of us inside those boundaries. Citizenship marks out the territory where we live, the community where we discover our dependence on each other even as we go about living out our individual lives.

You are citizens of Penn, some of the very best that this University has. You are demonstrating all the attributes of citizenship through your commitment to Penn's Way, the University's charitable workplace campaign. You recognize that however short our own lives may fall from being perfect,

thousands of our Delaware Valley neighbors have physical and psychological needs that demand our attention, our compassion and our support.

We know who our neighbors are—some better than others—in both our neighborhoods. Yes, both our neighborhoods. You and I spend a significant part of our lives in this neighborhood, the University campus and the city that surrounds it. Many of us live in other neighborhoods as well, the places where our children go to school, where we buy our groceries and where we eat and sleep. As citizens of two communities who shuttle back and forth between different worlds, we see different kinds of needs and different ways of meeting those needs.

The sixteen Penn's Way partner organizations exist to meet the health, human service and educational needs of the young and old, women and men, and minority and majority residents who are our fellow citizens. I congratulate you for using your energy and drive to encourage Penn's Way.

When Walter Annenberg gave his extraordinary gift of \$120 million to the University in June he said "that was what good citizenship was about." While none of us here can duplicate the Ambassador's gift, you are here in the same spirit of defining your citizenship.

Many of us in the room know that we feel better about ourselves when we do things that serve others. Good citizens working together build strong communities. And strong, vital communities—in all our neighborhoods—are where we want to spend our lives.

Before I leave you, my special thanks to Dean Farrington for the unprecedented good citizenship that chairing Penn's Way for two years in a row represents. Thanks, too, to the members of the Penn's Way Campaign Committee, and a final thanks to you, our Penn's Way volunteers.

—Claire Fagin, Interim President

Speaking Out

DP Case: 'Troublesome Facet'

Professor Howard Arnold, in his capacity as Special Judicial Inquiry Officer, achieved a moderate, measured and meaningful resolution to what could have been yet another explosive issue at this institution. Because he sought to encourage reflection and not polarization, Professor Arnold obviously chose not even to mention one of the more troublesome facets of this case—the fact that the faculty member who filed the complaint alleging a violation of the Open Expression Guidelines was a member of the Committee on Open Expression and participated actively in the deliberations of the Committee on *this incident* without disclosing that he already had filed a complaint or recusing himself from the process.

Reasonable people might disagree on the appropriateness of a faculty member exploiting a student dispute to advance his own ideological agenda. There can be no disagreement, however, that guarantees of fairness and the appearance of fairness are essential to the integrity of our disciplinary processes. Those guarantees are savaged when faculty members willingly assume the roles of judge, jury and lynch mob.

—Ralph Smith,
Associate Professor of Law

Ed. Note: Right-of-reply was offered to the complainant.

Speaking Out welcomes reader contributions. Short, timely letters on University issues can be accepted Thursday noon for the following Tuesday's issue, subject to right-of-reply guidelines. Advance notice of intention to submit is appreciated.—Ed.

Correction: Research Foundation

In the Research Foundation Guidelines published September 21, a line was omitted in Type B, Section I.9. The notation “*If you were funded by the Research Foundation in the last three years, please submit a brief progress report with publications and grants proposed or received (no more than one-page)*” applies to both Type A and Type B proposals.—Ed.

Penn’s Way ‘94: School and Center Coordinators

Annenberg Center:
Stephen Goff and
Eileen Rauscher-Gray
Annenberg School:
Phyllis Kaniss
Athletics:
Debra Newman
Business Services:
Banoo Karanjia
Dental Medicine:
Michele Taylor
Development and University Relations:
Janice McGrath
Engineering:
Ave Zamichieli
Executive Vice President:
Bonnie Ragsdale
Graduate Education:
Elizabeth Deane
Graduate Fine Arts:
Mati Rosenstein
Hospitality Services:
William Haines
Human Resources:
Fina Maniaci
Info Systems and Computing:
Thomas Fry
Law School:
Rae DiBlasi
Libraries:
John Keane
Medicine:
Duncan Van Dusen
Morris Arboretum:
Marge Robins
Museum:
Diane Harnish and Lisa Prettyman
Nursing:
Marianne Roncoli
President:
Janet Dwyer
Provost:
Manuel Doxer
Public Safety:
Judith Wojciechowski
SAS:
Jean Marie Kneeley
Social Work:
Rosemary Klumpp
University Life:
Nancy McCue
Veterinary Medicine:
Chrisann Sorgentoni
VP, Facilities Management:
Virginia Scherfel
VP, Finance:
D-L Wormley
Wharton:
Carole Hawkins
Wistar:
Mary Hoffman

The authors of the following invite the opinions of colleagues.

Enhancing the Tenure System

Once again, tenure in our universities and colleges has been under attack as an anachronistic and outworn concept which provides a haven for incompetent and mediocre men and women. This attitude is now being fueled by a slow-moving economy, rising university costs, and a new “downsizing” pattern appearing in the nation.

We believe these criticisms are based on mistaken perceptions. Yet they suggest we examine ways to improve the tenure system.

The tenure system should be valued for its function in attracting superior minds and talents to university faculties. This is becoming increasingly difficult, but its success is all-important to the survival of our outstanding colleges and universities. Award of tenure is an achievement which all young faculty members aspire to attain and highly value. It provides local and national recognition as an award for outstanding accomplishment in research and teaching. In other words, the possibility of achieving tenure is a strong recruiting device, both in terms of professional award and an increase in salary. But there is another facet of tenure that is of comparable importance to the dedicated scholar: Lacking a tenure system makes the continued employment of a faculty member dependent on the possible biases of a chairperson or a university administrator which can lead to a wasteful intrusion to and a diversion of a faculty member’s main function: attention to long-term research and thoughtful, conscientious teaching.

Tenure has historically another valuable asset, namely to encourage faculty to speak out on important issues, both professionally and politically, and to protect them from harassment and persecution. In times of conflict, (such as the McCarthy era after the start of the Cold War or the period of the Vietnam war), it is especially important that faculty, who are the teachers of our young students, be free from reprisal. In fact, tenure ensures the freedom of speech of an important and influential sector of men and women with clear and significant influence on the development of the minds of our students. The qualifications for appointment to tenure should be high and vigorously applied; they should be based on superior scholarship.

A frequent criticism of tenure is that it is a sinecure and as such can be abused by those who lose their drive toward excellence in research and teaching. There is a mistaken perception that, because the normal teaching load may be as low as three class hours per week when the national work average is about 37 hours, the faculty is taking advantage of the system. In actuality, the majority of faculty work many more hours than 37 per week in order to do the research which is carried out in the laboratory or the library. First class scholarship is demanding and, for most professors, achievement in this area is the major reason they have entered academia. In short, professors work long hours because of this strong commitment. One of the rewards may be a promotion to tenure.

How do we deal with those who stop doing research some years after receiving tenure, in a sense changing the conditions under which the tenure decision was made? Without a system that sets clear expectations on job performance, without periodic assessments of performance, and without clear rewards related to performance, we risk a degradation of university quality easily recognized from within and without. This is leading to a perception of the university that is similar to the pervasive view that government agencies are bureaucratic and inefficient.

We believe there is a need to introduce a periodic assessment of tenured faculty. Such an assessment would not reverse tenure decisions. Its goal would be to provide both the faculty member and the department a periodic but well defined view of performance and to couple this assessment to faculty responsibilities. It would provide the basis for rewarding professors who are dynamic and active. Those who have become nonproductive could be stimulated to contribute once more to the intellectual enterprise of the university, either by a revival of their research program or the allocation of additional teaching or departmental duties, (e. g., an Associate Chair for Undergraduate Affairs).

Such assessment could be conducted every 5-10 years by the department head, along with a committee of peers who can judge the quality of the research and teaching and the professor’s overall contribution to the department, school, and university. That review might contain some of the same features as a tenure review in that it would utilize information such as publications, awards, invited talks, student evaluations, and academic service. Citation indices might be useful in assessing the quality of the work and of the journals in which the work appears. These materials could be collected by the faculty member to ease the burden on the evaluation committee. Of course different reviews, or even the period between reviews, would vary from discipline to discipline and need only follow some broad university outline.

In order for such a review to be successful, the University would have to establish mechanisms for evaluating the results of these confidential reviews. Such evaluation would be monitored by the respective Deans to ensure that the sense of the recommendations is being carried out at the Department level. We hope that this proposal to enhance the goals of the tenure system will lead to its consideration and amplification at all levels of our body politic, in the Administration, among our deans, within the University Senate, and among the faculty. The result of a fair and rigorous review would be to increase the respect for the tenure system and to acknowledge its virtue in protecting the political freedom of educators and of encouraging devotion to research and teaching which are the prime missions of a university. It would provide uniform information that would be the basis of an enlightened reward system.

— Sherman Frankel, Professor of Physics, and James Sprague, Professor of Neuroscience

Responses to the SAS Dean's Proposals to Close or Merge Departments

Religious Studies Graduate Group

The interdisciplinary Religious Studies Graduate Group [RSGG], composed of a wide array of talented faculty from across the entire School, met on Wednesday, September 29 to discuss the recommendation to close the Department of Religious Studies. The RSGG has authorized me as Graduate Chair to communicate the following four points:

1. The RSGG deplores the decision to close the Department of Religious Studies.
2. The RSGG, as a separate entity from the Department, most of whose members hold primary appointments in other departments, particularly deplores failure to consult with either the Department or the Graduate Group.
3. After extensive discussion, members of the RSGG are unable to see any merit whatsoever in the arbitrary decision to freeze graduate admissions for the coming year. We are concerned that this precipitous move would cause irreversible damage to graduate study of religion at Penn, which takes place across departmental lines. We recommend reconsideration of that decision in consultation with the RSGG.
4. The RSGG reaffirms its commitment to excellence in this area, and stands ready to work together with the SAS administration to enhance the graduate study of religion at Penn.

— *Stephen N. Dunning, Chair,
Religious Studies Graduate Group*

Religious Studies Department

On behalf of my colleagues, I wish to respond to the proposal of the SAS administration to close the Department of Religious Studies. I think it is necessary to begin by carefully distinguishing between the undergraduate study of religion at Penn and the existing interdepartmental Religious Studies Graduate Group [RSGG].

The RSGG is already made up of virtually all faculty in the School who have shown interest in the study of religion as an academic discipline. The contribution of the Department to the graduate program includes coordination and administration, which could be handled in other ways, and the locus for important core courses dealing with religion as a phenomenon, which would be very difficult to replace otherwise. Commonly, half of the course work taken by our graduate students originates in other departments.

RSGG members with appointments outside the Department play active roles in the training of every graduate student in the program through courses, final examinations, and throughout the dissertation process. In some cases the extra-departmental members of the RSGG serve as chairs of dissertation committees. We are perplexed, therefore, at the suggestion that the graduate program does not adequately reflect "the strength of interest in religious studies across the School."

That the graduate program does not attempt to encompass all possible specializations within the broad field of Religious Studies represents a consistent policy of the RSGG. We admit gradu-

ate students to our program only in fields in which we do compete successfully on an international basis, an assessment readily confirmed by both the quality of our applicants and by the success of the program in placing our Ph.D.'s in academic positions. Given this, we are mystified by the assertion that we are not in "a competitive position vis-a-vis other first-rate Departments of Religion or Religious Studies across the world."

Ironically, in this world of shrinking academic resources, Religious Studies is an expanding field. Even Cornell University, explicitly forbidden by its charter from religious instruction, is initiating steps to establish a formal program in comparative religion. This is a field which does offer careers for young scholars and teachers, and in which our graduates have competed successfully against candidates from programs with far better support.

With regard to the undergraduate program in Religious Studies, it is true that we consistently have a small number of majors, seldom more than ten. We think this is consistent with the atmosphere of undergraduate education at Penn. The Department offers both a coherent undergraduate major—invariably involving interdisciplinary study to the same degree as the graduate program—as well as a number of service courses at the introductory level. Despite our small size, we contribute regularly to interdisciplinary programs such as Comparative Literature, Jewish Studies, and Women's Studies. Our faculty has also participated generously in School-wide undergraduate seminar programs (Freshman Seminars, General Honors Seminars, "Writing About" Seminars). While we welcome the support (and resources) of the administration in helping us rethink the undergraduate program and course structures for the purpose of their improvement, we are at a loss to know how the closing of the Department would further the goal to "reconceive religious studies as an interdepartmental teaching program."

What disturbs us most of all is that the dissolution of the Department will make impossible the study of religion as a phenomenon. The study of religion is not circumscribed by isolated movements (e.g. Hinduism, Judaism), or specific approaches (e.g. sociology of religion, history of Christianity), or creative expressions (religious art, literature, music). It is a coherent field of its own.

We believe the deans of SAS are people of good will who have been basically misinformed and misguided about our department. It is easy to see how they were, since in our case, "no consultation" means no effort at all on their part to see what sort of program we have. The department has not been evaluated for over a decade, in spite of our repeated requests for an internal or an external review. Nor did the deans discuss our five-year plan with us before making this decision. Religious Studies is not a field that receives national rankings; but it would have been possible to make inquiries to other departments at Ivy League Schools and other competitive institutions, or indeed, to consult with us. To our knowledge, no such attempt was made before passing judgment.

It is the conviction of the Department of Religious Studies that the closing of the Department will culminate in the abolition of the study of religion as a coherent discipline at the University, a tragic move at a time when events all over the world fully demonstrate the need for critical academic understanding of religion as a distinct, discrete cultural phenomenon.

— *E. Ann Matter, Chair,
Department of Religious Studies*

American Civilization Department

The actions taken by the dean of SAS on September 22 should be a cause of deep concern to the faculty and students of the University of Pennsylvania. There are seven points in particular which are alarming.

1. *The way this action was done.*

This action marks the end of collegial government at Penn. Despite the fact that the dean has said this action was the result of a year and a half of planning, three of the departments affected were never consulted about these plans, and several had no prior indication that such an action was pending. Decisions were apparently made by the dean and one committee; no draft was circulated to the faculty; no faculty approval was asked, nor does she intend to ask for such approval. True, the University statutes permit her to make any recommendation she likes to the Trustees, but what action could more nearly concern the faculty of this school than the fate of its constituent departments? This is not the sort of governance which this faculty had a right to expect. We have all seen in recent years the gradual conversion of the University administration from the collegial form to the corporate one, in which "executives" decree and "workers" obey, but in no prior case has the administration's lust for power and disregard of its faculty been so blatant.

2. *Imposition of the decision.*

Not only were departments involved not consulted, but they oppose the actions of the dean. This is apparently a matter of no concern whatever to the dean. In the meetings with departments—held after the decision was announced—the dean refused to consider any change of her decree, despite the protest of those involved.

3. *The rationale for this action is dishonest.*

Why were these actions taken? We are told that the reason was not financial, that what was at stake was "effective and efficient organization of our intellectual resources." It is specifically stated in her news release that "I want particularly to see us design new undergraduate programs in American Civilization and Religious Studies that make Penn the acknowledged leader in these fields." The truth is that some of these departments already have distinguished reputations, and that some of them are now among the most "efficient" in SAS according to the dean's own measure of efficiency. It is absurd for the dean to say that she plans to make better programs in these fields when she has consistently starved these departments of the resources they needed. It is simply not true that efficiency or distinction

in these fields will be improved by destroying these departments, and the claim that such improvements will be attained is false.

4. *The dean's own statement shows that her claims are false.*

About the only believable part of the dean's statement is her assertion that she intends to "eschew investments where we do not have a good prospect of achieving distinction" and "cease making investments in areas no longer at the forefront of our endeavors." This shows what she really thinks of these departments and these fields. It also shows what the goal is. It is not to strengthen these areas; it is to withdraw resources from them and eliminate them as fields of study. In a world where religious conflict has become the major danger to world peace, we do not need to study religions. In a nation torn by dissension and self doubt, we do not need to study our own civilization. In a world where regionalism is becoming of increasing importance, we do not need regional studies. While the study of MACHOs is making the headlines, we do not need to study astronomy.

5. *This action calls into question Penn's status as an Ivy League school.*

This action is a confession that Penn cannot (more accurately, will not) attempt to match other schools which we have usually considered to be our reference group. Every Ivy League school has a religious studies department; we will not. Yale and Brown have American Civilization Departments; we will not. All of them have astronomy departments; we will not. The real question is not whether we are at the bottom of the Ivy League; the question is whether we qualify as Ivy League at all.

6. *The model of a university that informs these decisions is the Aiken model—eliminate the small departments, build up the big ones.*

That this has been the objective of the administration in recent years is too well known to need argument here. The point is that it is the wrong strategy. What has made Penn interesting as a place for students and many of its faculty has been the range of opportunities for study it has provided, particularly those offered by small departments. These have been among the best departments in the University, and they are departments which have excelled in undergraduate teaching. It is raised as a fault of Regional Science that other universities have not established such departments. A more insightful dean might have realized that having such a department is something that Penn can offer that other universities do not. What these actions do is to serve notice on all small departments at Penn that their days are numbered.

7. *These actions devalue the degrees which have been awarded to the graduates of these departments.*

Already the students are asking whether they ought to transfer elsewhere. After all, if Penn does not value these departments, who will? This action is a betrayal of the commitments that Penn made to its students when they came here to study in these fields. It is also a betrayal of the commitments Penn made to the faculty who came here to work in these fields. And it is a betrayal of the mission of this University.

The Penn community would do well to consider these actions with considerable care, for they show the shape of things to come. One should ask, is this the future we want—a future in which

departments are destroyed at a stroke of the dean's pen, without faculty consultation or approval, in which bureaucratic convenience is more important than academic excellence, in which the ignorance and prejudice of administrators determine what faculty may do. I think not!

—Murray Murphey, Chair,
Department of American Civilization

Regional Science Department

We, the members of the Regional Science Department, would like to take this opportunity to express our reaction to Dean Rosemary Stevens' recent recommendations with respect to our Department and its programs. To say that we were wounded by the actions taken doesn't begin to state the depth of our feelings, since we all believe very strongly in our field of study, its students, and our colleagues around the world. But this isn't an opportunity to recount our personal feelings about the matter: rather, we would like to focus on the academic and institutional nature of the decision.

Our concerns with Dean Stevens' recommendations are divided into three parts: (1) the process (or the lack thereof) used to support the closing of the Department; (2) the grounds cited for closing the Regional Science Graduate Group; and (3) the relationship of the Regional Science Department to the development of urban and regional studies within the University.

(1) Although there does not appear to be much experience in the proper procedures for closing departments in the School of Arts and Sciences, simply examining earlier experiences within the University would lead us to believe that, in the interests of effective decision-making and in keeping with the precepts of basic collegiality,

- (i) an internal and/or external review would have been undertaken;
- (ii) there would be thorough consultation with appropriate faculty committees;
- (iii) prior consultation with the members of the Department (or at least with the chairman) would have to be in order; and
- (iv) a review of the decision with the Department prior to its public announcement would have been initiated.

What happened, however, was an administrative decision which was arrived at it in secret, supported by a hand-picked committee which spoke to no one in the Department, and a published conclusion, circulated as a letter to the SAS faculty before those affected ever learned of it. This certainly poses a host of questions concerning the process with which the entire SAS faculty ought to be concerned. But from our point of view at this juncture it seems fruitless to do more than to tell the University community about these seemingly extraordinary procedures.

(2) The questions concerning the closing of the Graduate Group—a decision that must involve not only the Dean but the Provost—raises many of the same issues as for the Department itself. With respect to the Graduate Group, however, the matters are far more troubling intellectually. Although one might say that Regional Science never made a significant impression on the undergraduate academic life of the University (there are a host of its majors who would argue strongly against this position), there is no question that the Regional Science Graduate Group is known world-wide as a leader and center of true excellence, that it attracts highly qualified students,

has an outstanding record of graduate training, and places its graduates in excellent positions throughout the world. Last year we placed our four American students in tenure-track positions at Princeton, Illinois, Indiana and The New School for Social Research, and our foreign students went to comparably prestigious institutions in their own countries. By any standards, Regional Science has been a particularly successful graduate group at the University and, until recently when it was defamed by the administration, it had all of the prospects of continuing as such into the future. Again, however, the issue is not one of redress since the administration seems to be quite hard on this issue; what our colleagues at the University of Pennsylvania must appreciate, is that review and reflection do not seem to be playing a significant role in the current academic decisions and that only the need for immediacy seems to be pushing the matter.

(3) The final part of Dean Stevens' letter with which we are concerned is her perspective that, somehow, with the passing of Regional Science, there would be new opportunities for the development of urban and regional programs at the University, and that Regional Science is nothing more than applied economics or geography or a branch of city planning. Besides being a complete misunderstanding of the field, the suggestion, of course, is that Regional Science, as a Department and Graduate Group, has stood in the way of the development of such programs in the past. The Department does indeed have a stake in such programs, but we do not believe that we have been the roadblock in the University's growth of these programs. True, we have our intellectual perspective which we hoped would be included in the grand design. We never believed that urban and regional programs were "ours," and we would play the *sole* intellectual and visionary role in their development. No matter which way one looks at the issue, we do not believe that Regional Science is the problem, whatever difficulties Penn has had in developing this area more generally. We have tried to be cooperative and collegial and to see us as a roadblock is just misplaced causation—and a gratuitous slap under the circumstances.

All this adds up to a picture of a quick decision, though for who knows what reasons, done in a largely uncollegial manner that falls flat even by the standards of corporate downsizing programs. Indeed, Dean Stevens uses the term "streamlining" as if it has real meaning—when even in business the term is pretty much regarded as having virtually no substance. What has been presented is certainly not a picture of a collegially based review; it is certainly not a detailed analysis of what the potential of Regional Science is as a Department at Penn; and it is certainly not an analysis of the Graduate Group's reputation and its impact on the reputation of the University in the international community. Rather, what we find is something that has a sense of biased judgement supported only by the fact that Regional Science is too small to get recognition as a "pillar department."

—Masahisa Fujita, Ralph Ginsberg,
Janice Madden, Ronald Miller,
and Tony Smith, Professors;
and Stephen Gale, Chair,
Department of Regional Science

Next page: Astronomy Department

Astronomy Department

The decision of the SAS Administration to close three departments of the School of Arts and Sciences and merge the Department of Astronomy into the Physics Department, constitutes a move that will diminish the stature of our School and the University.

The Dean's letter pointed out that the issue is one of "effective and efficient organization of our intellectual resources" rather than "a response or a solution to ...financial exigency". Thus, in the name of intellectual efficiency, 15% of the departments of SAS are to be eliminated. Will this move contribute to learning and the expansion of knowledge? Will it enhance faculty and student morale? Will it contribute to our stature as a great university? Will it help in fund raising? I fear that the answer to these questions is NO.

It is intellectual breadth and diversity that makes a university great. It is the ability to pursue in depth many avenues of thought and knowledge that produces a truly eminent educational institution. The road on which we are about to embark leads only to diminished learning and shrunken choices, fear of further contraction of our intellectual horizons, lowered expectations on the part of students and faculty and diminution of the stature of the University. These are the sentiments we have all seen in the articles, editorials and letters to the editor in *The Daily Pennsylvanian* during the past week; this is what we know in our hearts.

Let me now address the specific issue of the imposed merger of the Astronomy Department into the Physics Department. The Department of Astronomy has a long and significant history

at Penn since its establishment 100 years ago. It was one of the founders of the American Astronomical Society at the beginning of this century. In 1913, the University Observatory, now the Flower and Cook Observatory, was established. A long period of impressive research, education of excellent graduate students and conduct of popular and exciting undergraduate courses ensued. In 1993, the department continues that past tradition. Its research efforts are still of world importance. Its total research funding is \$400,000 to \$500,000 per year. Its undergraduate courses attract 450 students per semester. *About half of all SAS students take a course in astronomy while they are at Penn.* In its recent evaluation of departmental efficiency, the Dean's office gave the Astronomy Department a very high rating. What then has happened? What have we done wrong? Why the merger?

As stated in the Dean's letter, the intent is to use the Astronomy positions to enlarge the astrophysics program in the Physics Department from the present four faculty to eight or nine. Astrophysics is a very exciting and promising field and one in which Penn's representation should and must be enlarged, but astrophysics is no more astronomy than chemistry is applied atomic physics. The merger is tantamount to dropping astronomy as an independent intellectual activity at Penn.

Is it perhaps that I have missed the point and not kept track of national trends? Hardly so. Virtually all of our peer institutions, the major research universities, have independent Ph.D.-granting astronomy departments while nurturing astrophysics programs in their physics departments. That is what we find at Harvard, Yale, Columbia,

Cornell, Princeton, Michigan, Chicago, Illinois, Texas, Berkeley, etc. Indeed, the trend is to separate joint departments. Maryland, for example, which for many years had a joint Department of Physics and Astronomy, with independent internal management, has just separated that department into two independent departments.

What is seen nationally and internationally is the spectacular growth of astronomy. Enormous telescopes, with eight-meter diameter mirrors are being built in both the northern and southern hemispheres. A series of space borne telescopes are either in place or to be launched in the coming decade. Planetary probes are throughout the solar system and unmanned landings on Mars are being planned. Every week we read of new astronomical observations, of new understanding of the astronomical realm. In the coming century we will embark on the GRAND ADVENTURE, the detailed exploration of the solar system and the possible establishment of human habitation outside the Earth.

What role will Penn play in this exciting new thrust? Will we develop a broad based multi-department and multi-school program that could lead in this GRAND ADVENTURE or will we retrench and shrink.

In last year's five year plan the Astronomy Department presented the Dean with a picture of how Penn could be at the forefront of this adventure, how Penn can lead. We still can achieve this goal.

What we decide now will shape our future. Let us decide wisely.

— Kenneth Lande, Chair,
Department of Astronomy

Tanenbaum Hall: 'a Students' Building' Housing Biddle Law Library and More



Almanac Photo by Marguerite F. Miller

The University of Pennsylvania Law School's new building will be formally dedicated during a convocation and ribbon cutting ceremony on October 14, beginning at 5 p.m.

Nicole E. Tanenbaum Hall is named in memory of the daughter of Roberta and Myles H. Tanenbaum. Mr. Tanenbaum is a University Trustee, a member of the Penn Law class of 1957, and the chair of the \$52 million fundraising campaign for the School.

The five-story hall was designed by Davis Brody & Associates and built by L.F. Driscoll Company; Floss Barber and Diane Boone were the interior designers. The top four floors are the new home of the Biddle Law Library, founded in 1886 and housed in Lewis Hall since its construction in 1900. The collection includes more than 540,000 volumes in paper and microform, and is the major law library between New York and Washington, D.C. Its foreign and international collections and rare-book collection are intensively used by the Penn community, other academic institutions, the Philadelphia Bar, and visiting scholars. The Library has been called the research laboratory of the School.

The new library is fully wired: each desk, carrel, and table will be connected through the Law School network to other computers in the University and remote research databases. All the classrooms in the library are wired for audio, video, and computer use.

"This is a students' building," said the Director of the Biddle Law Library, Professor Elizabeth Kelly, who also served as Chair of the Faculty Building Committee. "The interior is light and warm, and the design is conducive to studying." The first floor of Tanenbaum Hall will house the offices of career planning and placement, the public service program, the legal research and writing program, and the three student-edited law journals. This floor will also include a classroom and two seminar rooms, a student lounge, and a dining commons.

Update: Exposure Control Plan for Bloodborne Pathogens

In accordance with the OSHA Bloodborne Pathogens Standard, 29 CFR 1910.1030, the Office of Environmental Health and Safety (OEHS) developed a University of Pennsylvania Exposure Control Plan, which was effective May 5, 1992 (*Almanac* May 26, 1992). The plan established practices and procedures to eliminate or minimize occupational exposure to bloodborne pathogens, as defined by the OSHA standard.

An additional requirement of the standard is that the Exposure Control Plan must be reviewed annually. OEHS has reviewed the plan and an updated version of the plan is now available on PennInfo or in hard copy or floppy disk from:

OEHS
1408 Blockley Hall/6021
898-4453

The plan must be completed by *all principal investigators/area supervisors* who work with human blood, blood products and other potentially infectious materials such as Human Immunodeficiency Virus, Hepatitis B Virus, non-A non-B hepatitis virus(es), Human T-cell Lympho-trophic Virus type I, malaria, babesia, brucella, leptospira, arboviruses, relapsing fever, Creutzfeld-Jakob Disease and viral hemorrhagic fever.

The completed plan must be accessible to all employees who work with human blood, blood products and other potentially infectious materials in their area.

OEHS Refresher Course

The Office of Health and Safety (OEHS) is mandated by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) to conduct annual safety training for all personnel who work in laboratories.

Refresher training covers the University's Biosafety and Chemical Safety Programs, and attendance at a one hour session will be mandatory for all personnel who work in laboratories. Only those personnel who have had the initial Bloodborne Pathogens Training and/or Chemical Hygiene Training are eligible for the refresher training. Initial Bloodborne Pathogens Training and Chemical Hygiene Training will continue to be held on a monthly basis, for new and previously untrained laboratory personnel.

OEHS will hold the program on the following dates and times at Lecture Room B in the John Morgan Building, unless otherwise noted:

October 12	3:30-4:30 p.m.
October 13	9:30-10:30 a.m.
	3:30-4:30 p.m.
October 14	10:30-11:30 p.m.
October 15	10:30-11:30 a.m.
	(Class of 1962, John Morgan)
	3:30-4:30 p.m.
October 18	1:30-2:30 p.m.
	(Class of 1962, John Morgan)
October 19	10:30-11:30 a.m.
	3:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendees are requested to bring PennID cards to facilitate course sign in. Additional sessions will be scheduled throughout the academic year, for faculty and staff unable to attend any of these sessions. Contact Barbara Moran, in the Office of Environmental Health and Safety at 898-4453 with any questions.

—Office of Health and Safety

The University of Pennsylvania Police Department Community Crime Report

This summary is prepared by the Division of Public Safety and includes all criminal incidents reported and made known to the University Police Department between the dates of September 27, 1993 and October 3, 1993. The University Police actively patrol from Market Street to Baltimore Avenue, and from the Schuylkill River to 43rd Street in conjunction with the Philadelphia Police. In this effort to provide you with a thorough and accurate report on public safety concerns, we hope that your increased awareness will lessen the opportunity for crime. For any concerns or suggestions regarding this report, please call the Division of Public Safety at 8-4482.

Crimes Against Persons

34th to 38th/Market to Civic Center: Sexual assaults—1, Threats & harassment—5
09/28/93 10:12 AM Clinical Res. Bldg. Complainant received unwanted calls
09/28/93 6:05 PM Gimbel Gym Lewd act in front of complainant
09/29/93 11:48 AM Hamilton Walk 3 juveniles/no charges pressed
09/30/93 11:50 PM Lippincott Dorm Obscene calls by unknown male
10/02/93 10:34 PM Stouffer Triangle Complainant received death threats
10/03/93 12:17 PM Nichols House Desk person received unwanted calls

38th to 41st/Market to Baltimore: Rapes (& attempts)—1, Robberies (& attempts)—2
Threats & harassment—1

09/28/93	8:20 PM	4000 Blk Baltimore	Male stole complainant's wallet & watch
09/29/93	10:04 AM	40th & Walnut	Confidential report
10/01/93	3:53 PM	3900 Blk Chestnut	Complainant harassed
10/01/93	10:45 PM	200 Blk 41st	Police observed robbery/3 arrested

41st to 43rd/Market to Baltimore: Robberies (& attempts)—2

09/29/93	3:17 PM	4200 Blk Locust	Robbery at gunpoint/ppd arrest
10/03/93	11:03 PM	4100 Blk Pine	2 males robbed complainant/arrest

30th to 34th/Market to University: Aggravated assaults—1, Threats & harassment—1

09/28/93	11:42 AM	Franklin Field	Unknown male harassed complainant
09/28/93	2:52 PM	33rd & Chestnut	Currency & id stolen by unknown male

Crimes Against Property

34th to 38th/Market to Civic Center: Total thefts (& attempts)—15,
Thefts of auto (& attempts)—1, Forgery & fraud—1, Criminal mischief & vandalism—1

09/27/93	12:30 PM	Steinberg/Dietrich	Computer equipment taken from office
09/27/93	4:23 PM	36th & Locust	Gold ring taken from display
09/28/93	1:50 AM	100 Blk 36th	Dashboard & locks damaged
09/28/93	10:24 AM	Anat.-Chem.	Unauthorized use of calling card
09/28/93	12:37 PM	Bookstore	Backpack taken from unsecured locker
09/28/93	1:40 PM	Bookstore	Unattended backpack taken
09/28/93	4:09 PM	Houston Hall	Wallet & contents taken from purse
09/29/93	2:45 PM	Van Pelt Library	Unattended wallet taken
09/29/93	2:58 PM	140 S. 34th St.	2 males used stolen credit card/1 arrest
09/29/93	8:11 PM	Houston hall	Unattended wallet taken
09/29/93	4:44 PM	3409 Walnut St.	Theft of credit card
09/30/93	1:16 PM	Bookstore	Male took merchandise/apprehended
09/30/93	1:55 PM	Meyerson Hall	Unattended knapsack taken
10/01/93	12:45 AM	200 Blk 37th	Attempted bike theft/male apprehended
10/01/93	9:47 PM	Houston Hall	Unattended wallet taken
10/01/93	10:54 PM	3409 Walnut St.	Credit card & money from backpack
10/02/93	11:06 AM	38th & Baltimore	Car passenger window broken

38th to 41st/Market to Baltimore: Burglaries (& attempts)—4,

Total thefts (& attempts)—19, Thefts of auto (& attempts)—2, Thefts from autos—3,
Thefts of bicycles & parts—8, Forgery & fraud—1, Criminal mischief & vandalism—3

09/27/93	1:45 AM	3912 Pine St.	Rear window forced open/bike taken
09/27/93	10:19 AM	Veterinary School	Wallet taken from office
09/27/93	11:43 AM	3900 Blk Sansom	Tool box taken from auto
09/27/93	12:34 PM	Hamilton Court	VCR taken from residence
09/27/93	2:38 PM	Veterinary School	Backpack taken from office
09/27/93	4:19 PM	Harnwell House	Mail taken from mail box
09/27/93	4:33 PM	3929 Walnut St.	Male attempted to take wallet/fled area
09/27/93	9:10 PM	41st & Locust	Unattended bike taken
09/27/93	9:41 PM	Harrison House	Petty cash taken
09/28/93	4:27 AM	Harrison House	Money taken from cash register/1 arrest
09/28/93	8:30 AM	3900 Blk Spruce	Secured bike taken from rack
09/28/93	4:49 PM	4015 Walnut St.	Unauthorized male in building/1 arrest
09/29/93	5:25 PM	200 Blk Fels Walk	Secured bike taken from rack
09/29/93	6:32 PM	1925 House	Secured bike taken
09/30/93	3:00 PM	Chi Omega	Secured bike taken
09/30/93	5:08 PM	300 Blk 41st	Car taken
10/01/93	3:25 PM	4015 Walnut St.	Bike rear wheel taken
10/01/93	11:43 PM	40th & Pine	Books removed from auto
10/02/93	2:39 AM	300 Blk 41st	Vehicle taken
10/02/93	3:30 AM	Harnwell House	Water balloon thrown from window
10/02/93	10:52 AM	3900 Blk DeLancey	15 cases of soda taken from auto
10/02/93	12:35 PM	Delta Delta Delta	Wheel from secured bike on porch
10/02/93	2:54 PM	4053 Spruce St.	Knapsack taken
10/03/93	2:41 AM	Low Rise North	Window broken by unknown object
10/03/93	11:01 AM	3915 Walnut St.	Attempted use of stolen credit card/arrest
10/03/93	4:05 PM	4015 Walnut St.	Fecal matter found in stairwell
10/03/93	5:15 PM	3900 Blk Spruce	Secured bike taken

30th to 34th/Market to University: Total thefts (& attempts)—17, Thefts of auto (& attempts)—4,

Thefts from autos—1, Thefts of bicycles & parts—10, Criminal mischief & vandalism—3
09/27/93 4:46 PM Lot # 33 Car theft attempt/steering column damaged
09/27/93 6:19 PM Lot # 33 Driver's side rear vent window broken

sector continued on page 8

New Guide to Networking

Curious—or confused—about PennInfo, Gopher, E-mail, NetNews, telnet, file transfer, modems, network IDs, asynchronous, ethernet, and SLIP? Help is at hand.

PennNet PassPort, a guide to networking at Penn, has just been published by Data Communications and Computing Services (DCCS).

This 44-page overview of PennNet and the Internet, intended for students, faculty, and staff, introduces key services, software, and terminology in an attractive, non-technical package. Also covered are the services offered by DCCS, which operates PennNet and its connections to the Internet.

PennNet PassPort is available for purchase at Wharton Reprographics, 400 Steinberg Hall-Deitrich Hall, at a cost of \$2. In addition, for those with access to FTP (file transfer protocol) software, a master file in PostScript format is available for retrieval and laser printing from ftp.upenn.edu, directory pub/DCCS, document name PassPort_v1.1.ps. (The document is designed for back-to-back copying.)

The School of Engineering and Applied Sciences is making the PassPort available at no charge to all SEAS students, faculty, and staff in order to promote effective use of PennNet and the Internet; details will be posted in SEAS mailboxes. Other schools and departments are encouraged by DCCS to follow SEAS' lead.

— Dan Updegrove, Associate Vice President, Information Systems and Computing

Campus Crime Report continued from page 7

09/29/93	1:07 PM	Rittenhouse Lab	Secured bike taken from rack
09/29/93	4:24 PM	LRSB	Secured bike taken
09/29/93	4:38 PM	Weightman Hall	Computer taken from office
09/29/93	4:55 PM	3300 Blk Spruce	Rear tire & gears taken from secured bike
09/29/93	10:22 PM	Hutchinson Gym	Secured bicycle taken from rack
09/29/93	10:24 PM	Rittenhouse Lab	Secured bicycle taken from rack
09/30/93	9:54 AM	3000 Blk Market	Unattended Wallet/contents taken
09/30/93	10:25 AM	Chemistry Bldg.	Secured bike taken
09/30/93	12:21 PM	Chemistry Bldg.	Secured bike taken
09/30/93	4:56 PM	Rittenhouse lab	Secured bike & lock taken
10/01/93	3:48 AM	Bennett Hall	Window broken/alarm activated
10/02/93	12:12 PM	Franklin field	Secured bike taken
10/02/93	3:35 PM	Lot # 5	Vehicle taken
10/02/93	6:36 PM	Bower Field	Sprinkler system damaged/graffiti found
10/02/93	9:51 PM	Ice Rink	Vehicle taken
10/02/93	10:36 PM	3300 Blk Chestnut	Vehicle taken
10/03/93	6:38 PM	Rittenhouse Lab	Quick release for seat from secured bike
10/03/93	9:43 PM	3200 Blk Walnut	Rear window damaged/jacket & tapes taken

Outside 30th to 43rd/Market to Baltimore: Total thefts (& attempts)—1,
Thefts of bicycles & parts—1

09/30/93 12:01 PM 507 S. 41st Secured bike taken

Crimes Against Society

38th to 41st/Market to Baltimore: Disorderly conduct—1

10/01/93 11:02 PM 3942 Spruce St. Male arrested for disorderly conduct

18th District Crimes Against Persons

September 21, 1993 to October 3, 1993

Schuykill River to 49th Street, Market Street to Woodland Avenue

Totals: 30 Incidents, 7 Arrests

Date	Time	Location	Incident	Arrest
09/21/93	10:30 AM	3929 Walnut	Robbery	No
09/21/93	12:45 AM	3400 Spruce	Aggravated Assault	No
09/21/93	4:40 PM	4423 Locust	Robbery	No
09/21/93	8:25 PM	4700 Sansom	Robbery	Yes
09/21/93	8:45 PM	5400 Walnut	Robbery	No
09/21/93	9:28 PM	4700 Hazel	Robbery	No
09/21/93	10:02 PM	300 S. 43rd	Robbery	No
09/22/93	8:54 PM	4200 Locust	Robbery	No
09/24/93	7:10 PM	4531 Baltimore	Robbery	No
09/24/93	7:34 PM	4800 Woodland	Robbery	No
09/24/93	9:35 PM	200 S. 42nd St	Robbery	No
09/25/93	2:29 PM	4400 Pine	Robbery	No
09/25/93	12:19 PM	309 S. 43rd	Robbery	No
09/25/93	4:15 PM	251 S. 41st	Robbery	No
09/25/93	10:40 PM	3901 Walnut	Robbery	No
09/26/93	1:49 PM	100 S. 36th	Robbery	Yes
09/26/93	8:22 PM	4300 Chester	Robbery	No
09/28/93	8:00 PM	4037 Baltimore	Robbery	No
09/28/93	9:10 PM	4600 Spruce	Robbery	No
09/28/93	9:34 PM	4040 Market	Robbery	No
09/29/93	9:33 PM	4814 Spruce	Robbery	No
09/29/93	9:10 PM	600 S. 43rd	Robbery	Yes
09/30/93	6:45 PM	310 S. 48th	Robbery	No
09/30/93	8:25 PM	4600 Spruce	Robbery	No
10/01/93	10:45 PM	200 S. 41st	Robbery	Yes
10/02/93	3:04 AM	4322 Market	Robbery	No
10/03/93	1:15 AM	3801 Chestnut	Aggravated Assault	Yes
10/03/93	7:00 PM	3950 Market	Robbery	Yes
10/03/93	10:00 PM	326 S. 42nd	Robbery	No

Family/Medical Leave Forums

Representatives from Human Resources Benefits and Staff Relations will be on hand at two lunch-time Family and Medical Leave—October 7 from noon to 1 p.m. and again on October 13 from 1 to 2 p.m.—to tell staff members and their families more about Penn's new Family and Medical Leave Policy (*Almanac* September 7, 1993). Among the topics: who is eligible, how to apply, which benefits will continue during family/medical leave, and how to fill out sample forms. Both forums will be in the Ben Franklin Room of Houston Hall. For more information: Family Resource Center, 898-0313.

Update

OCTOBER AT PENN

CHILDREN'S ACTIVITIES

Recreation Class Registration; Saturday swimming, fencing and gymnastics classes October 23-December 18; \$80/8-week class; register in Hutchinson or Gimbel Gym; Info: 898-6102. *Register through October 19.*

TALKS

7 *Impoliteness Formulas in Egyptian Arabic;* Devin Stewart, Emory; 11 a.m., Room 421, (We East Center).

8 *Approach to Gastrointestinal Bleeding;* Gregory G. Ginsberg, Gastroenterology division; noon, Agnew-Grice Auditorium, 2nd floor Dulles, HUP (Medicine).

11 *Noise, Communication and Cognition: The Harvard Psycho-acoustic Laboratory and the Second World War;* Paul Edwards, Stanford; 4 p.m.; B-26 Stiteler Hall (Psychology).

12 *Adjuvant Therapy of Breast Cancer;* Kevin R. Fox, hematology/oncology division; 8 a.m., Medical Alumni Hall, 1st floor, Maloney, HUP (Medicine).

Money Matters for Women; Ann Diamond; noon; Alumni Hall, Faculty Club; Reservations: 440-5348 (Human Resources, Women's Center).

Deadlines: For the next monthly calendar, *November at Penn*, the deadline is noon October 12. For the weekly Update, the deadline is Monday for the following week's issue.



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 Mary Scholl
STUDENT AIDES Shari L. Bart, Melanie L. Chang, Suma C.M., Jahmae Harris, Stephen J. Sanford, Timothy D. Valuk

ALMANAC ADVISORY BOARD: *For the Faculty Senate*, Roger H. Walmsley (Chair), Phoebe S. Leboy, Barbara J. Lowery, Ann E. Mayer, Gerald J. Porter, Paul F. Watson; *for the Administration*, Stephen Steinberg; *for the Staff Assemblies*, A-1 to be named, Diane Waters for the A-3 Assembly; Mark Colvson for Librarians Assembly.