Religious Holiday Statement

Provost Thomas Ehrlich reminds faculty and students that Rosh Hashanah is Thursday and Friday, September 21 and 22, and that Yom Kippur is Saturday, October 6. No examinations shall be given or assigned work made due on those days. Since each holiday begins at sundown of the day before the listed dates, late afternoon examinations should also be avoided on those days.

Some students also observe other important religious holidays in the fall term. The University policy on religious holidays (Almanac, February 20, 1979) does not prohibit examinations on those holidays, but students who are unable to take such examinations because of religious observances have a right to make-up examinations if they have made alternate arrangements with their instructors. University policy provides that students should inform their instructors of the need for such arrangements within the first two weeks of a term.

IN BRIEF

Death of Dr. Rainbow: Dr. Thomas C. Rainbow, assistant professor of pharmacology at Medicine, died Thursday, September 6, struck by a SEPTA train at Trenton Station. Further information appears in Deaths, page 8.

Music at Irvine? A feasibility study on redoing the interior of Irvine Auditorium to provide an acoustically efficient concert hall plus three floors of other facilities is outlined. For Comment on pages 4-5 of this issue. At a campus press briefing yesterday, Provost Ehrlich emphasized that the feasibility study was “on a single rather narrow question: Can you fit a modern concert hall into that building?” Music Chair Dr. Thomas Connolly asked: “If the administrators’ answer came back, ‘Yes, you can get a superb modern concert hall into that building?’ Music Chair Dr. Thomas Connolly said the architects’ and acousticians’ answer came back, ‘Yes, you can get a superb modern concert hall into that building?’ Music Chair Dr. Thomas Connolly said the architects’ and acousticians’ answer came back, ‘Yes, you can get a superb modern concert hall into that building?’

Afro-American Studies: Dr. Jacqui Wade

After two years of interim leadership, Penn’s Afro-American Studies Program has a new director. Dr. Jacqui Wade (right), lecturer in Social Work, has been named to the post effective immediately.

Dr. Wade has been acting director of the Women’s Center since May, while a search for Carol Tracy’s successor was under way—a search reportedly near completion. Earlier, Dr. Wade was part of VPUL James Bishop’s team sharing responsibilities for the Office of Student Life during the long vacancy now filled by Dr. Charlotte Jacobsen.

Dr. Wade, a graduate of Fisk, took her M.S.W. and Ph.D. in Education at Penn. She joined the Social Work school as an instructor in 1973, also heading the Penn Children’s Center. Later a Faculty Fellow of DuBois House, she formed and led workshops on racism following a rash of telephone threats to the House.

Professor Ralph Smith of the Law School, who headed the Afro-American Studies Director search committee, called Dr. Wade “our first choice, our only choice. We wanted her energy and intelligence.” At a celebration of her appointment last week at Greenfield Intercultural Center, Dr. Wade’s acceptance speech gave a pitch for enrollment: “We have twelve course offerings this fall,” she told the partly-student audience, “and you can still drop and add.”

Continuing Faculty Hospitality to Students

President Sheldon Hackney’s Fund for Student-Faculty Interaction is being continued this year, allowing full-time faculty members to draw reimbursement for entertaining groups of students either at home or, if that is not possible, in local restaurants.

The President along with Provost Thomas Ehrlich set up the Fund last fall with donated funds, and it was replenished at mid-year as informal gatherings multiplied.

Each faculty member is asked to limit himself or herself to one function per semester; invite no student more than once; and base reimbursement on figures set at $3 per student for receptions with light refreshments, $4 for brunches, and $6 for dinners.

A special form, which must be returned with originals of all receipts, is available from Dr. Francine Walker, Associate Director of Student Life, 110 Houston Hall/CU.

Note: This published notice is in lieu of direct mail to all faculty. Dr. Walker said. Deans, program directors and department chairs are especially asked to bring the President’s Fund for Student-Faculty Interaction to the attention of the full-time faculty.

New Faculty Orientation

Also continuing this year is the new tradition of orientation for new faculty—this time, followed by a visit to the President’s House.

On September 17 from 2 to 4 p.m. in the Faculty Club (36th and Walnut), new standing faculty members and their spouses are welcomed by the President, Provost and Senate Chair Jacob Abel.

Dean Joseph Bordogna of Engineering gives A Dean’s Perspective; the University Budget is explained by Budget Analysis Director Glen Stine; and the Libraries welcome faculty via Dr. Joan Gotwals, deputy director.

Knowing Your Benefits is the topic of Benefits Manager James J. Keller, and Vice President for Administration Gary J. Posner, who has oversight of the Human Resources Office, talks about People at Penn.

Information packets will be given to all attending.

The reception afterward takes speakers, new faculty and spouses to Eisenlohr Hall, the West Philadelphia mansion restored two years ago as the President’s Club, 3812 Walnut Street.
In the Committees

If one examines the organization chart of the University's academic enterprise and compares it with that of an industrial or governmental entity with comparable budget (ca. $300 million) and population (30,000), it becomes clear that our version is relatively sparse, yet the work gets done. What the chart does not reveal is the considerable number of faculty members who devote a very significant amount of their time to what are essentially administrative activities and which would be viewed as such in the business or government culture. The principal mechanism for the conduct of this work is the much maligned, ubiquitous, and essential committee. The formulation and review of policies touching as such in the business or government culture. The principal mechanism of collegial governance.

University, and is at the heart of the concrete realization of the abstract principle of collegial governance.

If you want to influence what happens here, join and work on a committee.

At present the Senate Consultation Subcommittee (the Chairs, past, present, and future) has a schedule dotted with appointments to meet candidates for the two vacant vice presidencies in the administration, finance and facilities. If you have advice on any aspect of this process please communicate it to me. The Senate Committee on Students will be lead by Professor Laura Hayman again this year and will continue its review (so well begun last year) of the impact of fraternities on student life. Professor Janice Madden has agreed to serve as Chair of the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty and will be working with the foundation of the excellent five-year plan developed by the committee under Professor Robert Summers last year with an objective of overriding importance which is to develop the advice of the Senate on salary matters in a timely fashion, synchronized with the University's budget-forming cycle.

There are still some openings on major committees—Economic Status, Administration, Faculty—and elections for the first and appointments for the others are in process. If you are interested in serving, let us know.

Jacoby Abel

---

DISCUSSION

Should the Faculty Grievance Procedure be Changed?

A 1983-84 Grievant's Views and the Deputy Provost's Response

Chronology of a Grievance

I write this letter in order to present some facts of my recent experience that, I hope, will encourage discussion of improvements in the University's Faculty Grievance Procedure. The chronology of this experience can be briefly given:

On 29 April 1983 I formally requested initiation of a grievance from the Faculty Grievance Commission, chaired by Dr. Adelaide Delluva. The subject of my grievance was the manner in which the English Department considered me for promotion to tenure.

On 30 March 1984—the eleven months later—the Commission's panel, which heard the case, rendered its decision. It was favorable to me.

On 13 April 1984 the Provost accepted the (majority) report of the panel. The English Department was then given the option of reconsidering my case (for a third time) or allowing my dossier to go directly to the Personnel Committee for an "unprejudiced reconsideration." The latter option was chosen. My dossier was duly sent to the Personnel Committee.

On 9 May 1984 the Deputy Provost informed me that the Personnel Committee, in view of the lateness of the submission, decided to consider and act on my case until the Fall Term. In the same letter, the Deputy Provost noted that "the fact that your appointment terminates on 30 June 1984 has no effect upon your standing as a grievant." (Technically, I was no longer a grievant, since a grievance ends when the Provost accepts a decision. On 13 April I in fact became an injured party.)

In late May some effort was made by the Deputy Provost to find an A-1 position (writing copy for the Publications Office, for example) for me to occupy while awaiting the Personnel Committee decision. In early June I informed him that this would be an unacceptable professional compromise and asked him to cease his efforts in this regard.

On 11 June 1984 the three members of the Faculty Grievance Commission (Drs. Delluva, Iraj Zandi, and Kenneth George) wrote a letter to the Deputy Provost unanimously recommending that—because the grievance procedure is "by nature a lengthy one" and because the Personnel Committee delayed its decision—"I be "permitted to retain [my] status for a year."

On 30 June 1984 I was terminated. I am now unemployed, without income, and without health benefits.

From the moment the Personnel Committee decided not to act, everyone has agreed that this is an unusual and anomalous situation—one that called for an ad hoc resolution of some kind. From the begin-

An anecdote in conclusion. When the favorable decision was announced, I casually asked the advice of two persons on campus who have had as much experience with grievances and personnel imbroglios as anyone. Both said, without hesitation: retain counsel. I was non-plussed. I remember the quizzical smiles when I asked why, since I had "won" the grievance. I now feel a bit of a damn fool to have waited these four months in hopeful expectation of the "right" thing being done before taking their advice seriously. The advice of these two persons and the actions I have had to take in recent weeks are a sad commentary on the conviction with which the University supports its own Grievance Procedures.

—Gary Schmidtall
Sometime Assistant Professor of English

Response Next Page

ALMANAC, September 11, 1984
Response and Request for Discussion

Dr. Schmidgall’s letter points out a problem with our present grievance procedure. It is possible that this procedure should be modified, and in the past two years I have had a number of conversations concerning this matter. So far, however, there has been no consensus for a change.

There seems to be general agreement that a faculty member’s right to file a grievance should not end when the individual leaves the University faculty. Circumstances can easily arise in which information suggesting the appropriateness of a grievance reaches the faculty member only after he or she has left the University payroll. Periods of from six months to two years beyond that time has been discussed, but no formal action has been taken. The Faculty Grievance Commission is presently free to accept a grievance at any time.

I am not aware of any proposal that University employment should be offered to a faculty member as a consequence of the act of filing a grievance after he or she has ceased to be employed at the University. However, when we turn to grievances filed while the grievant is a member of our faculty, we find a divergence of opinion.

Present policy does not relate termination date to progress of a grievance. If the grievance hearings or the implementation process is lengthy, it is quite possible that the faculty member’s appointment may terminate before the matter is resolved. This is particularly true of grievances filed during the last year of an appointment. Some persons have taken the position that the University should provide continued employment for any faculty member whose appointment terminates during the grievance process or its implementation—as a humanitarian measure. Others disagree—feeling that such an arrangement would cause grievances to multiply and encourage late filing.

The problem is most acute in cases of grievance based on denial of tenure. In such cases the University must be very careful to avoid any action that might result in an award of tenure by default while the case for tenure is still under review. There are at least three possible ways of dealing with situations of this sort.

The first way is to remove a period of time from tenure accumulation and let the grievant continue his or her academic activities. Such a move would require the grievant to sign a statement to the effect that such removal did not constitute a basis for a claim of tenure. The problem with this approach is that the individual in question can always claim in court at a later date that the signature was obtained under duress. Thus such signed statements might later prove to be ineffective protection against claims of tenure by default. Of course, if our rules were changed so as to make tenure by default impossible at Penn, as it is at most other major universities, this approach would become feasible.

A second way is to find the faculty member an administrative position for a period until the tenure issue is finally decided. This seems to be a viable solution in that it carries no risk of tenure by default. However, it does entail a complete change of activity on the part of the faculty member.

The third way is that contemplated under present rules. The appointment lapses, and the grievant is without any appointment until the tenure issue is finally decided. If the grievance implementation process results in a decision that the faculty member should attain tenure, then he or she would be reappointed retroactive to the previous termination date. In the interim, however, the grievant is in a difficult position.

Dr. Schmidgall is presently in that position. He was reviewed for promotion and tenure during 1982-83; the departmental decision was negative. In accordance with University procedures, he received formal notice on January 12, 1983, that his appointment would terminate on June 30, 1984. He then filed a grievance; it was heard during his seventh year, 1983-84. The grievance procedure took a long time—fifty weeks according to his letter of August 14, 1984. Along with other issues, this case underscores the importance of a prompt action as possible by the Grievance Commission.

The Faculty Grievance Commission’s letter transmitting the report of the Faculty Grievance Panel to the Provost is dated April 10, 1984, and was received by the Provost’s Office on that date. The Provost accepted the report of the Panel majority which called for additional review by either the Department of English or the Personnel Committee of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. A decision to use the second option was reached, and the dossier for review was received by the Personnel Committee on or about April 23, 1984. However, this committee declined to review the case because of the lateness of the submission. It suggested that its summer subcommittee might conduct the review. However, this would have constituted a significant deviation from normal procedure so a decision was made to resubmit the case to the full committee in the fall of 1984. In the meantime, Dr. Schmidgall’s appointment terminated on June 30, 1984, in accordance with the notice he received on January 12, 1983.

Dr. Schmidgall was willing to sign a document to the effect that removal of time from tenure accrual could not result in tenure by default. The administration was not willing to move in this direction, however, because of the danger that the document would later be held to have no force. On the other hand, the Administration was willing to seek an administrative position for Dr. Schmidgall. But, after initially expressing interest, he decided that he would not accept such a position, if offered. Our efforts along these lines had not reached the stage of identifying either a particular slot or set of duties.

The case will be submitted to the FAS Personnel Committee as soon as it becomes relevant in the fall; one hopes for a speedy resolution. I would be very glad to receive opinions on either the particular case or the general problem; my address is 106 College Hall and my Ext. is 3600. Should present rules be changed, and if so, how?

—Richard C. Cleland Deputy Provost

President’s Office: Mr. Owen, Ms. Stevens, Dr. Zingg

As former presidential Executive Assistant Denise McGregor left the University to join Fidelity Bank at summer’s end, Dr. Sheldon Hackney made internal shifts and added one new member from Yale for “zero population growth” of his administrative staff.

The new Executive Assistant is William G. Owen, a 30-year Penn veteran who has served as dean of admissions, secretary of the corporation and vice president for development. Since 1982 Mr. Owen has been special assistant to the President for special liaisons. Mr. Owen now directs the President’s Office and staff, and is the Administration’s representative to the Almanac Advisory Board.

Barbara Stevens, former associate director of community and state relations at Yale, is the new arrival. She is the president’s assistant with primary responsibility for Dr. Hackney’s work with civic organizations such as the West Philadelphia Partnership, Committee to Support Philadelphia Public Schools, Philadelphia Commission on the 21st Century, and Greater Philadelphia First Corporation. A graduate of California at Berkeley, Ms. Stevens worked in state government in Massachusetts and was associate producer of a syndicated educational television show in Boston before joining Yale.

Dr. Paul Zingg, who carried special assignments for the President’s office last year while serving as an A.C.E. Fellow, formally joins the staff as assistant to the president. He supports on-campus activities, especially responding to those that concern students, faculty and academic programs. Dr. Zingg, an adjunct assistant professor of American civilization, has previously served as SAS assistant dean for academic advising, assistant dean for undergraduate studies, and vice dean of the College. He is a graduate of Belmont Abbey College with a master’s from the University of Richmond and doctorate from the University of Georgia.

Among the Vice Presidents

In Almanac July 18, Senior Vice President Helen O’Bannon announced a major reorganization as Arthur M. (Bud) Hirsch left the University August 31 to enter real estate. Mrs. O’Bannon will publish additional details next week.
FOR COMMENT

Proposed Renovation of Irvine Auditorium

An exciting proposal has been made for renovating Irvine Auditorium to create a first-class music performance facility. We seek the comments and suggestions of the University community in considering this proposal that could fulfill a major unmet need for a music performance facility and also enhance student life and the informal curriculum.

A new facility for music is one of the few bricks-and-mortar priorities included in "Building Penn's Future," and the University's statement of key fundraising objectives. For many years the University has lacked practice and performance facilities that match its great Music Department, including an auditorium capable of serving the many needs of performing groups from the University and its community.

Initially, we assumed that a new building would have to be constructed. This raised a variety of problems: from the unresolved question of identifying a site with ready access to parking, to the inevitable addition to operating and maintenance costs involved in all new construction. The possibility of renovating Irvine Auditorium, the facility on campus with the largest seating capacity, and transforming it into a modern, acoustically superior auditorium had occasionally been suggested in the past, but a feasibility study had never been undertaken by architects and engineers.

Irvine Auditorium was built in the 1920s. As everyone who has suffered its inadequacies knows, the building is in acute need of repair. It is acoustically poor, its mechanical and electrical systems are obsolete, and its interior is embarrassingly deteriorated. It is stifling in the summer and incredibly expensive to heat in the winter. At the same time, it is structurally sound, one of Penn's historic buildings, and extensively used by student organizations and other campus and community groups.

Last spring, a group of individuals with a particular interest in music on campus prompted us to look into the possibility of adapting Irvine to modern standards and present-day requirements. As a first step, a preliminary study was conducted by the architectural firm of Bohlin, Powell, Larkin, and Cywinski, and the acoustical consultant firm of R. Lawrence Kirkegaard and Associates, who are leaders in the field, in consultation with the Department of Music and the Department of Facilities Development.

The resulting study was reviewed and approved by a University Design Committee comprised of Lee Copeland, dean of the Graduate School of Fine Arts, Adele Santos, chair of the Department of Architecture, Titus Hewryk, director of Facilities Development, Alan Levy, associate professor of Architecture, and John Larson, assistant professor in the School of Social Work.

The purpose of this preliminary study was to find out whether or not Irvine could be renovated to provide a new music facility on campus. The results are encouraging, and the time has therefore come for fuller exploration of the proposal, and for a complete review of current and potential uses of Irvine, by the entire Penn community. Before initiating the special fundraising efforts that will, in any case, be necessary for either renovation or a new building, we are seeking reactions from faculty members, students, and staff to all aspects of the proposal.

An architect's rendering, taken from the proposal, is printed here.

In the feasibility study, provision is made on the lower level for a superb 1,000-seat auditorium with excellent acoustics, and there is space for rehearsal, storage, and administrative support on three floors above. Additional space could also be available for other uses.

We estimate that renovating the entire building would cost about the same as the construction of a new 1,000-seat music auditorium without the other space provided for in the Irvine renovation proposal. It is unlikely that a new building would be as centrally or conveniently located on campus. It would certainly leave unmet the pressing need to renovate Irvine, which has long been recommended by the planning groups concerned with the Houston Hall-Irvine complex and student life. In our
view, this imaginative proposal suggests promising options for satisfying music requirements while enhancing Irvine as a facility for programs that support the informal curriculum and student life.

Aspects of the proposal would require some changes in current uses of Irvine. For example, it would not be possible to seat audiences up to 2,300 for such events as Freshman Convocation, Baccalaureate, and the Dental and Medical School graduations. The possible relocation of such activities to other sites, such as the Ice Rink and the Palestra, is among the most important considerations that must be discussed. Additional problems that have been identified include the possible need to relocate the set-construction site for theatrical productions by student groups. The renovation proposal would also affect the Curtis Organ, which is presently underutilized and in need of repair. Every effort would be made to modify this valued instrument. Failing that, we would consider giving it to a church or other appropriate organization.

The Office of Student Life, in cooperation with the Music Department, will coordinate the consultation process for the campus community, and plans for a series of open meetings on the Irvine proposal will be announced in the near future. In the interim, we invite your comments and suggestions. We emphasize that no decision has been made at this point, and that we do not currently have the funds either to build a new performance facility or to renovate Irvine.

The proposed auditorium would allow more music performances to be held at Penn. Last year six University groups presented 25 performances at facilities ranging from a student lounge to churches, as well as a number of different auditoria. The Penn Contemporary Players, for example, gives performances at Swarthmore College, which has a suitable hall but is inconvenient for Penn students who wish to attend concerts.

In addition to expanding programs for student performances, a new facility would also extend the possibilities for bringing professional musicians to campus. No 1,000-seat music facility suited for performances by smaller ensembles and chamber groups currently exists in Philadelphia. The renovated Irvine Auditorium would make it more attractive for groups, such as the Juilliard String Quartet, to concertize on campus, and would give the entire community new opportunities to attend first-class performances here.

Members of the Music Department, who were initially doubtful about Irvine's suitability for renovation as a performance facility, are enthusiastic about the results of the study. The Department would have priority in scheduling events in the concert hall. At the same time, we are confident that procedures could be established to ensure that campus groups interested in using the concert hall for appropriate programs would have access. The prospect of creating three upper floors with an atrium for other uses is an especially attractive feature of the architectural design.

The proposed auditorium would have an acoustically efficient ceiling of 45 to 50 feet. It would be designed for flexible use by small and medium-sized audiences as well as seating up to 1,000 persons. In addition to backstage storage areas, there would be a main rehearsal room of 3,600 square feet, two rehearsal rooms for medium-sized groups, six rooms for small ensembles, and twenty-five individual practice rooms. Dressing rooms, public facilities, including a foyer with a two-story high ceiling, ticket booths, a coat room, and concessions would be housed on the first floor.

Special attention has been given to maintaining the building's architectural features as far as possible. For example, the new balcony would make use of existing stair landings. The three upper levels would be organized around a central atrium illuminated from the tower. This atrium would give the upper three floors a visual focus and identity while preserving a significant portion of the building's extraordinary interior. Offices and rehearsal rooms on the second, third, and fourth floors would provide storage space for instruments, sheet music, and the needs of the Collegium Musicum and other groups that use Irvine Auditorium.

Additional rehearsal and practice rooms would benefit all music groups on campus including student groups such as the Penn Singers, the Gospel Choir, the Glee Club, and the various ensembles from the Music Department. The twenty-five new rooms for private practice would serve the many students and faculty whose study of instruments is frequently frustrated by the scarcity of such space.

We hope that the University community will be as excited as we are by the possibility of renovating Irvine to create a superb music performance facility and to expand facilities and programs in other areas of the building. We believe that creative renovation could serve long-felt needs related to student life while meeting the primary need for the performance of music.

During deliberations, it will be necessary to identify the various issues that are raised by the proposal so that they can be addressed in subsequent planning. We warmly welcome your participation in the consultative process.
Music on Their Minds

Whether the current Irvine proposal (see pages 4-5) or some other idea is chosen for building a music facility for Penn, the Association of Alumni have backed the University's commitment by starting a fund. A Garden Party Raffle in June (successor to the former Alumni Auctions set up to help create the E. Craig Sweeten Alumni Center) split its proceeds between the music goal and the continued support of the Alumni Center. Photos here are from two stages of celebration of the joint goal. Top left, the Benefactors' Party for those helping stage the raffle was hosted at the President's House. For the main event later in June, the alumni set awnings over Houston Hall's interior plaza to make a garden (top right). There the Raffle's chairperson Ione Straus called the winners under the eye of the late Provost Pepper, and alumnus Bobby Troup polished off the evening with his own music for Music's sake.

Volunteer Fair: September 25

Since the exchange at left (which occurred during the summer but was held for fall's return of students and faculty), Ms. Apfelbaum's office has set up Penn's 1984 Volunteers' Fair, in which students and others can pick up "job descriptions" and in many cases talk to representatives of 25 community and campus groups looking for volunteers. Requests for volunteer help come in annually at Penn—from organizations that need tutors to those who deal with the blind, the elderly, the physically disabled, children, and abused women. A vast array of agencies and organizations will be at the Fair Tuesday, September 25, 11 a.m.-4 p.m., along Locust Walk between Van Pelt Library and 36th Street.

Correction: Dr. Edward T. Lally, associate professor of pathology in the Dental School, received a tenure appointment this year, as should have been indicated by a bullet (•) in the list of appointments and promotions published in Almanac July 24.
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The Research Foundation: Fall Cycle Deadline... Recent Awards

A two-part report from Dr. Eliot Stellar, chairman of the University's internally-funded Research Foundation.

Fall Applications: November 1

Proposals to the University Research Foundation will be due November 1, 1984. Special consideration will be given to younger faculty members and to proposals within those disciplines that have little access to external funding sources. A limited number of awards, typically under $3,000, will be funded during this cycle. Appropriate proposals might include:

- seed money for initiation of new research;
- limited equipment requests directly related to research needs (not including word processors or computer terminals);
- improved research opportunities for minorities and women;
- travel for research purposes only;
- publication and preparation costs.

Proposals should take the form of mini-grant applications, three to five pages in length. The cover page of the proposal must include:

1. Name, Department, School
2. Title of proposal
3. Amount requested
4. 100-word abstract of the need
5. 100-word description of the significance of the project for the educated non-specialist
6. Amount of current research support
7. Other pending proposals for the same project
8. List of research support received during the past three years, including funds from University sources, such as school, department, BRSG or Research Foundation.

The budget should be detailed on the next page and should list and justify the specific items requested, and, if possible, assign a priority to each item. The proposal itself should describe briefly the research and the specific needs which the proposed grant will cover.

List your last five publications at the end of the proposal.

An original and eleven copies of the proposal should be submitted to the Chairman of the Research Foundation, Dr. Eliot Stellar, 243 Anat-Chern/G3 (Ext. 5778). Late proposals will be held for the next award cycle.

The Recent Awards

Norman Adler, Psychology—Effects of reproductive behavior on sperm transport.
Adel Alouche, Oriental Studies—Arabic papyri in the Library of the University of Utah, Salt Lake City.

James C. Aiwine, Microbiology—Regulation of gene expression in a DNA tumor virus.

Latifah Amini-Sereshki, Veterinary Anatomy—Central neural mechanisms involved in temperature changes during sleep.
Dorrit Billman, Psychology—Process in concept learning.

Francis B. Brevard, German—The German Volkskalender and other astronomical-astrological treatises of the late middle ages.


Hennig Cohen, English—Editing and writing articles based on Herman Melville manuscripts in the New York Public Library.

Robert Dyson, Anthropology—The development of bronze metallurgy in prehistoric southeast Asia.

Michael D. Fallon, Pathology and Laboratory Medicine—Mechanisms of joint destruction in rheumatoid arthritis.

John Furth, Pathology and Laboratory Medicine—Transcription of genomic DNA by RNA polymerase II.

W. Randall Garr, Oriental Studies—Dialect geography of Syria-Palestine, 1000-886 B.C.


Elaine P. Hammel, Veterinary Medicine—Development of equine model for human myotonic dystrophy.

R. Ian Harker, Geology—Quantitative modeling of magma crystallization at lower water fugacity.


Laurent L. Jacque, Finance—Oligopolistic pricing and currency pass-through.

Francis Johnston and Setha Low, Anthropology—Biocultural correlates of chronic protein-energy malnutrition in a resettled colony of Guatemala City.

Bruce Kogut, Management—Foreign commerce and managerial behavior in German Democratic Republic: A government perspective.


Robert Kraft, Religious Studies—Automatic encoding of the textual data for the computer-assisted tools for tooling manuscripts (CATSS) project.

Anna K. Kuhn, German—Christa Wolf: A Critical Study.

John McCarthy, German—Book-borrowing and reading interest among military personnel in Wiesbaden, 1750-1780.

James D. Muhly, Oriental Studies—The historical and economic implications of the development of metallurgical technology in the ancient world.


Maria Pennock-Roman, Education—Ethnic differences in test performance: Applications of the Del statistic and linear structural equation models.

Arnold J. Rosoff, Legal Studies and Health Care Systems—Implications of new competitive strategies for delivery of health services to the American public.


Harvey Rubin, Medicine—The molecular mechanisms associated with AIDS including viral-induced defects in purine metabolism.


Vivian C. Seltzer, Social Work—Publication preparation costs for study of who are the relevant reference group of adolescents and the domain of their influence.

Sandra Shuman, Neurology—Immunohistochemical studies of the effects of axonemal fragments on the synthesis of myelin marker constituents by cultured rat Schwann cells.

Candace Slets, Romance Languages—Transcriptions of contemporary Spanish miracle stories.

Wesley D. Smith, Classical Studies—Computer-assisted research on Greek texts.

Elizabeth S. Spekle, Psychology—Object perception in newborns.

Wendy Stein, English—Storyed pictures: Narrativity in painting and literature.

Celice L. Striker, History of Art—Preparation of publication of the Kalenderhane Archaeological Project, Istanbul.


David Webster, Education—Academic quality rankings of American colleges and universities.

Franklin Zimmerman, Music—Henry Purcell's music: Research and analysis.

Paul J. Zing, American Civilization—In search of the American national character.
Two Safety Programs:

Ruth Wells, director of victim support and security services in the campus Department of Public Safety, announces two upcoming safety sessions urging academic and nonacademic supervisors to encourage staff attendance:

**Public Security Open House:** Thursday, September 13. Meet Penn’s Uniformed Forces, Communications Unit, Detective Division, Computer Unit, ID Unit, Records Division, Crime Prevention, Victim Support & Security Services personnel. Refreshment will be served. Police whistles will be given to first 50 guests. 3 p.m. Department of Public Safety, 3914 Locust Walk.

**Safer Living Seminar:** Friday, September 14. Sponsored by Public Safety, Off-Campus Living and University Safety and Security Committee. Program includes video presentation of life in the city, tips on tips on personal safety, burglary and theft prevention, and the protection of checkbook, credit cards and money. Discussions and demonstrations will focus on safety procedures for our large urban campus and its environs. 5 p.m. Benjamin Franklin Room, second floor, Houston Hall.

DEATHS

Dr. Thomas C. Rainbow, an assistant professor of pharmacology in the Medical School, was fatally injured on September 6 as he tried to board a SEPTA train in Trenton, N.J. He was 30 years old.

A graduate of Penn—for both his undergraduate and graduate degrees—Dr. Rainbow continued his post doctoral studies at Rockefeller University in New York. He returned to Penn in 1982 as lecturer and was appointed assistant professor in 1983. His professional involvements included work with the Institute for Neurological Sciences, the Society for Neuroscience and Sigma Xi, as well as investigative work for the American Heart Association.

He was a recipient of the Alfred P. Sloan research scholarship for neuroscience and the Esther A. and Joseph Klingenstein Fund fellowship in neuroscience. Surviving are his wife, Marsha Kness; his parents, Delores and Thomas Rainbow, and his maternal grandmother, Lena DeCarlo. Contributions may be made in his name to the Thomas C. Rainbow Fund for Neuroscience in care of the Department of Pharmacology at the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine.

Norman Cochran, a mechanician who had worked at the University Museum for thirty-three years, died on August 29 at the age of 63. He started at Penn in 1951 as a carpenter and became a mechanician in 1981. He is survived by his wife Peggy and two children, Blair and Gail.

Dr. Julius Hiram Comroe, Jr., heart and lung physiologist who was professor and chairman of the department of physiology and pharmacology in the Graduate School of Medicine from 1946-1957, died July 31 at the age of 73.

Director Emeritus of UC-San Francisco’s Cardiovascular Research Institute, Dr. Comroe spent much of his early career as a student—first as a student—he obtained his A.B. in 1931 and M.D. in 1934—and then as an intern and faculty member of the hospital’s pharmacology staff, moving up the ranks to become professor and department chairman at the age of 35.

While at Penn, he helped build an international reputation for the department in the field of respiratory physiology. Later, he was recruited to UCSF to head the fledgling CVRI, which he turned into one of the largest and most respected centers of heart and lung research in the world during his 16 years he was its director.

Dr. Comroe is survived by his wife Jeanette Wolfson, a daughter Joan Catherine Von Gehr, two grandchildren, and a sister, Ruth Rosenthal. Memorial contributions may be sent to the Cardiovascular Research and Education Foundation Inc., UC—San Francisco, 503 Parnassus Avenue, 94143.

William J. “Mr. Houston Hall” Fitzpatrick, a retired custodian, died July 24 at the age of 63. He came to the University in 1954 as a custodian in Physical Plant and retired in 1983. He is survived by his wife Anne M.; daughters, Maryanne and Ellen Cannataco, and a son, William.