Death of Arthur Letcher

Arthur Letcher, assistant dean for corporate relations and director of Wharton Graduate Placement, died October 19 at the age of 62, following a long illness. He had been with the University for thirty-two years.

Mr. Letcher came to Penn in 1952 as a member of the Admissions staff. He moved to Placement in 1964, serving as director of corporate relations and placement for the University until 1980, when he joined Wharton Graduate. Since 1974, he had also held the rank of lecturer in management with the Wharton School.

He is survived by his wife, Sue (nee Gillmore); three sons, Todd Phillips Letcher, Scott Gillmore Letcher, and Thomas Shaw Letcher; two grandchildren; and a sister, Betty Sullivan. Services will be private. The family asks that contributions be made to Pancreatic Cancer Research, c/o Department of Medicine, Thomas Jefferson University. (See other Deaths, page 8.)

V. P. for Facilities Management: Frederic Saxe

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute's director of engineering and manager of design, construction and facilities will join Penn on November 12 as Vice President for Facilities Management.

Frederic B. Saxe, an R.P.I. alumnus in civil engineering, will oversee the planning, design, construction, renovation, maintenance and utilities management of University buildings and grounds. Senior Vice President Helen O'Bannon said.

At Rensselaer, Mr. Saxe has been responsible for numerous multi-million dollar projects including a $65 million facility housing hi-tech computer graphics, manufacturing and integrated electronics operations. An unusual project in 1978 was the $2.9 million conversion of an old chapel into a computer center.

Mr. Saxe spent five years as a civil engineer and planner for William H. Parry, Incorporated, and ten years as a partner in the consulting firm of Blydenburgh and Saxe, before joining Rensselaer in 1973 as director of engineering. He moved up to his present post in 1980. He teaches and lectures in construction, management and civil engineering, and has long-range interests in the integration of architectural, mechanical and electrical systems with new technologies.

A $6 Million Center for Medical Imaging

With the opening of the David W. Devon Medical Imaging Center adjacent to Silverstein Pavilion, the University now has one of the largest magnetic resonance installations in the country.

The Magnetic Resonance Imaging device (MRI) is the latest in a stream of noninvasive diagnostic techniques, making images without radiation and with no known side effects. Its copper, donut-shaped magnet is housed in a “radio frequency room” shielded to ensure that signals received from a patient’s body are analyzed accurately. The Center was designed in a pyramid shape specifically to house the magnet, which is the first of two devices to be located there.

The Center is named in memory of an alumnus of the School of Medicine who died of cancer at the age of 31. The late Dr. Devon’s family provided a substantial private gift toward creating the Center, and a further gift was made by General Electric. Also contributing to the Center were NIH, the School, Department of Radiology research dollars, and HUP clinical patient studies funds.
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**Speaking Out**

**To Set the Record Straight on ‘Aftermath’: The True Story**

It happened on Friday, August 10, 1984, at approximately 4:30 p.m. It had been raining heavily but I waited for the downpour to lighten before heading home. As I walked to my car, which was parked in the University lot at 12th and Chestnut Streets, I was forced at knifepoint into my car and brutally assaulted by a young black male. This man, after his arrest, was later quoted as confessing to a homicide detective that “he was looking for a car.” By threatening me with the knife, he forced me to lie low in the back seat of my car. Admitting to me several times that he in fact did not know how to drive a car, he desperately raced through the streets, for over half an hour during rush hour, to a secluded street. Again at knifepoint, he forced me to climb into the small trunk of my car.

Throughout the ordeal, he constantly threatened and ordered me to “stay quiet” while he recklessly drove through the streets of Philadelphia. In this manner, I was held prisoner in the trunk of my car for over 31 hours, when my family was finally able to locate and rescue me.

The frantic search by my family and friends had begun as soon as I failed to return home for dinner on Friday. Their tremendous efforts finally paid off when a friend of the family, who works for a security agency located in North Philadelphia, was given a clue by a coworker that my car was spotted at a gas station at 12th and Spring Garden Streets early Saturday evening. Acting upon this hopeful information, my family raced to their cars—but after another long and unsuccessful search returned home despondent.

Later that same evening, at about 11:30 p.m., two people in each car, which enabled them to slowly and thoroughly comb every street in the area. My car was first spotted by a relative in the area of a North Philadelphia housing project.

My relative followed the car to 12th and Spring Garden where a George Automatic Teller Machine was located. My abductor, who was using my bank card to withdraw money from my account to buy weapons and drugs, stopped in front of the machine and left the car to make a transaction. Seizing upon a perfect opportunity, my relative rammed his car into the side of mine which pinned it to the curb rendering an escape by automobile impossible. Unfortunately the man, realizing he was in trouble, fled on foot before anyone was able to catch him. Suddenly, from inside the trunk, I heard the voice of my father. At that moment, still conscious after 31 hours, upon hearing my father’s voice I was able to bang and scream for help. My family, with their bare hands, lifted the trunk open and pulled me out to safety.

Three days after his escape the man again forced a woman into her car, this time at gunpoint at 4:30 p.m. in the parking lot of the Casa Vecchia Restaurant at 39th and Chestnut Streets. After holding four people hostage for four hours in the offices of the Center for the Study of Adult Development, above the restaurant, he was then finally apprehended by the police.

If the police had been at the scene of the incident at 12th and Spring Garden, they might have been able to catch the man before he made his getaway on foot. Then he wouldn’t have had the second opportunity to endanger the lives of people by taking hostages three days later.

I am terribly bitter that the University had not taken any security precautions which could have prevented such an awful crime from ever happening on our ground. I feel angry about the continued neglect of the issue. I am also very disgusted and furious at the determination and efforts of my family, relatives and close friends, are the sole reasons that I was able to survive this traumatic ordeal.

—Name Withheld

Note: The letter above was written in response to the piece entitled "It's All Over But the Aftermath," Almanac: September 4, page 1. The writer's name is withheld under a provision of the Almanac Guidelines for Readers and Contributors in which the contributor's identity is known to two persons mutually agreed upon, usually the editor and the chair of the Almanac Advisory Board. The two persons who know the contributor's identity shall thereafter not reveal that identity unless required to do so in a legal proceeding.

This writer's identity was revealed to Dr. Jean Crockett, chair of the Almanac Advisory Board, and Karen C. Gaines, editor. Dr. Crockett also monitored adherence to further applicable guidelines, including those on offering right-of-reply in the same issue. —K.C.G.

**Evaluation of Fall Break**

Monday and Tuesday of this week, Penn experimented with a fall break for students, based on 1983-84 Council discussions of stress.

An ad hoc Committee to Review the Fall Break is chaired by Dr. Herbert Levine of economics, and includes in its membership Drs. Edward D. Glant of chemical engineering, David Pope of materials science, Thomas Ricketts of philosophy, and Roger Walmley of physics; Dr. Kim Morrison of the VPUL Office, Dr. Steven Mullinex, director of University Counseling; and students Gwen Jaga-way of Annenberg and Louis Schacter of Wharton.

Faculty, staff or students who wish to offer comments can address Dr. Levine at 373 McNeil/CR.

**Football**

It took an Army to stop the Quaker winning streak, 48-13 at West Point Saturday. Unaffected is the Ivy ranking to date, where Penn and Harvard are in tandem again:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Win</th>
<th>Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penn</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Yale game is at home this weekend (Homecoming); Princeton is next week (away) and Harvard comes to Franklin Field November 10. The season ends at Ithaca November 17.
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The Space Crisis in the Geology Department by Robert Giegengack

Summary

The Geology Department of the School of Arts and Sciences has been directed to vacate Hayden Hall, the space in which it now conducts its research and teaching. No acceptable alternative space is available to accommodate those programs.

A series of administrative discussions in the fall of 1983 led to the decision to accommodate the projected expansion of programs in the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences by transferring Hayden Hall from SAS to SEAS. The Geology Department, the principal tenant of Hayden Hall, was neither involved in those discussions nor informed of their outcome; indeed, the Department was actively deceived by the University Administration until formal notice of the proposed move was announced to me on March 13, 1984; we have not been told the whole story even yet.

Search for alternative space for Geology elsewhere in buildings under SAS jurisdiction has not been successful.

The Geology Department offered the proposal that Hayden Hall be partitioned, accommodating Geology in a partially renovated south section while SEAS assumed responsibility for the larger north section. In response to that suggestion we have been directed to move to the south side of Hayden Hall by January 1, 1985, and to submit, by July 1, 1985, a plan to vacate Hayden Hall entirely. Since the south section of Hayden Hall would represent only temporary space for Geology, no significant renovation could be undertaken there. We are thus directed to move to inadequate space that will remain inadequate, where we will await a move to other space already acknowledged not to exist.

The Geology Department has expressed its willingness to move once, if that is perceived to serve the best interests of the University, but only to space in which we can pursue our research and teaching activities, and only to space where we can remain. If those minimum requirements cannot be met we prefer to stay where we are, where our needs are effectively if inelegantly met, while we await identification of adequate facilities that we can occupy for the foreseeable future.

The present impasse is a predictable consequence of a policy of selective consultation. That policy has led to a chain of uninformed errors of judgment that now threatens the survival of a department—the Geology Department—that all participants in these discussions have insisted they intend to retain and strengthen. The Geology Department has been repeatedly threatened that its future welfare in SAS will be jeopardized if it fails to accommodate itself to a self-destructive move.

If present plans are realized, the Geology Department will become an early casualty of an administration that places short-term fiscal expediency above long-term academic priorities, and chooses to act without essential information in the interest of conducting its business in secret.

Outline of Events

The text that follows represents an attempt to outline the sequence of events, to the extent that they have been revealed to me, that has led to a chain of ill-considered administrative decisions undertaken in an information vacuum that was totally unnecessary. As Chairman of the Geology Department, the constituency most adversely affected by those decisions, I have only recently been informed of the administration's intentions with respect to our building and the programs housed therein. The inability of the administration to explain to me the necessity of the proposed move leads me to suspect that the rationale for this move has yet to be fully revealed. My understanding of the events that have led to the present crisis is based on my reconstruction after the facts; that reconstruction may thus be incomplete.

At some time during the fall of 1983, a series of discussions was initiated to identify a site appropriate for the projected expansion of programs in SEAS. A wide range of options, including both construction of new facilities and reallocation of existing space near buildings now assigned to SEAS, was considered. These discussions coincided with the deliberations of many different planning committees, some of which were also addressing the future of Geology in SAS. At some time around the end of the year an administrative decision was reached that the most efficient and least expensive solution to the growing pains of SEAS would be to transfer Hayden Hall from SAS to SEAS. That Hayden Hall was selected should surprise no one who realizes that the Geology Department, the principal tenant of Hayden Hall, was neither invited to participate in those discussions nor informed that they were taking place. Quite apart from the surreal quality that the absence of information from the most adversely affected constituency must have imparted to those discussions, the failure to solicit information from the Department and the failure to inform it of the outcome of those discussions represents an unconscionable breach of the minimum standard of collegial courtesy that this institution acknowledges to be appropriate.

Late in February, Lee Copeland, Dean of the Graduate School of Fine Arts, informed students and faculty participating in the programs housed in the studio on the upper level of the north section of Hayden Hall that the building would be transferred to SEAS in the summer of 1984. That decision led to a demonstration consisting of banners in the windows of the studio that prompted a telephone call to the Geology Department from the Dean of SEAS, Joseph Bordogna, who inquired as to the meaning of the demonstration. I told him that I knew nothing about it (in fact I had not yet seen it), and asked if he might know more; he assured me that he knew nothing about the basis of the demonstration either.

On February 23 and 24, an External Review Committee of four distinguished Earth scientists came to Penn to evaluate the Geology Department and make recommendations to the Dean of SAS as to the future of the Department, given the caveat from the Dean that no resources would be made available to expand its size. In response to our concern about the rumors then circulating widely that the building we occupied would soon be transferred to SEAS, the Chairman of the External Review Committee explored the question of our occupancy in Hayden Hall with Joel Conarroe, Dean of SAS, and was assured that "space is not an issue" in the future of the Department. We were advised by the Committee to ignore the rumors and attend to the business of our science.

The Committee pointed out to the Dean of SAS that the quantity of research produced by the Department was adversely affected by the demands on faculty time generated by large and growing numbers of talented students at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. (This circumstance was the primary justification for the proposal to increase the size of the Geology faculty that was a central feature of the 5-year plan the Department submitted to the Dean early in 1983.) The Committee recommended that the University seek a distinguished new Chairman from outside the University to assist present members of the Department in reducing their commitment to educational programs in favor of a stronger emphasis on faculty research, since the Department's strategy to correct that imbalance—a modest increase in the size of the Geology faculty—would not soon be realized. Dean Conarroe
informed the Department by his letter of Feb. 29, 1984, that he intended to follow the Committee's recommendation.

On March 13 I attended a meeting called by Walter Wales, Associate Dean for Administration of SAS, to discuss the issue of "space." At that meeting I was informed, for the first time, that SAS had been directed to turn Hayden Hall over to SEAS and to accommodate Geology elsewhere in space assigned to SAS. In the course of that meeting it became clear that the administration of SAS was unaware of how Hayden Hall was then used, and had no notion of the minimum facilities that are necessary to run a modern geology program. It also emerged that the discussions that had led to the decision to accommodate SEAS's expansion in Hayden Hall had been similarly uninformed. I was nonetheless directed to consider relocating the Department in alternate space elsewhere in SAS-controlled buildings, specifically a number of unconnected spaces in David Rittenhouse Laboratory. These spaces represent about 25% of our minimum space needs and an even smaller percentage of our requirements for specialized research facilities. Use of those spaces for any departmental activity other than storage of a portion of the departmental collections would have the catastrophic effect of widely dispersing our faculty (seven* tenure-track appointees) to the detriment of the collaborative research and teaching efforts that have enabled us to compensate in part for our small size.

We advised Walter Wales that the space identified in DRL would not be adequate to house the Geology Department; he informed us that he would continue looking for alternative space.

Late in the spring term I talked with the Provost, Tom Ehrlich, who outlined the following reasons for moving SEAS into Hayden Hall:

1. SEAS needs space to accommodate the expansion of its program in Computer and Information Science, a recent recipient of several large grants.
2. The University does not want to construct new space at this time.
3. Hayden Hall is an historic building in need of renovation; SEAS has funds for renovation of any new space it will occupy.
4. SAS will save $200,000/year if it moves its programs out of Hayden Hall. [One wonders if SAS could save even larger sums by relinquishing other expensive buildings, especially if limited funds and only token effort will be expended to accommodate the minimum requirements of other programs so displaced.—R.G.]

Much of the summer of 1984 was spent in an unsuccessful search for acceptable space for the Geology Department elsewhere in SAS buildings, and a somewhat more successful campaign to educate the administration of SAS as to the minimum requirements in space and facilities necessary to conduct a modern Geology program, with its attendant necessary laboratories and collections. The latter campaign was rendered immeasurably more difficult by the fact that SAS had apparently already agreed that it could do without the space it occupied.

On July 13 I met with Tom Ehrlich, Walter Wales, Joseph Bordogna, and staff members assigned responsibilities for space supervision to consider a proposal from Joseph Bordogna dated July 3, 1984. In that proposal, we would vacate 90% of Hayden Hall, including the entire south section, renovated in 1973 expressly for the Geology Department, by August 1, 1984. 28 days later, from the time of the proposal, the Geology Department would vacate its space. A 4th floor, for which detailed working drawings had already been generated, was eliminated in the interests of economy.

3. As portions of the 3rd and 4th floors of Hayden Hall become habitable, Geology will vacate space now occupied in the north section of Hayden Hall and relocate to the south section; SEAS may occupy space in the north section as it is vacated by Geology.
4. Hayden Hall would thus be partitioned, with Geology occupying a renovated south section and SEAS free to modify the north section according to its needs.

By this plan, Hayden Hall would be fully renovated, SEAS would acquire substantial additional space, SAS would save at least half of the $200,000/year it pays for occupation of Hayden Hall, and the Geology Department would survive with hope of achieving its promised excellence intact.

Discussions of this counter-proposal (from which Geology was excluded) led to a letter from Joel Conarroe (dated August 3, 1984) containing the following points:

We have agreed with the Provost that the Geology Department will relinquish all of the space it now uses in the north section of Hayden Hall by January 1, 1985. Although we expect to have some funds available for more space for some renovation, no major renovations, either to Hayden Hall or to the David Rittenhouse Laboratory, will be possible at this time.

The Provost has asked to receive, by June 30, 1985, a plan to move the Geology Department entirely out of Hayden Hall.

The letter also includes the first of several threats that the future of the Geology Department in SAS will be in jeopardy if the Department fails to accommodate itself to a self-destructive move. (Were the women of Salem advised that their future status in the community would be jeopardized if they declined to cooperate with the society that undertook to burn them as witches?) Specifically, we request that the search for a new chairman be initiated have been answered with the statement that search will be undertaken only after the space issue has been resolved.

We responded to the Dean's letter by pointing out that the Department will be crippled by a move to space that is either inadequate or temporary; space identified in the proposed plan will represent both. We prefer to remain where we are until space is identified that is adequate to meet our minimum requirements where we can expect to remain for the foreseeable future.

As chairman of the Geology Department, I am in receipt of two sets of conflicting instructions:

1. For the last six years, I have embraced the responsibility to exercise thoughtful stewardship over the resources and programs of the Department, and to apply those resources and direct those programs in a manner to benefit the professional development of faculty, staff, and student members of the Department.
2. I have just been directed to undertake a move that will seriously diminish those resources, to the level where we will no longer have access to the minimum facilities necessary to maintain our research; that will cripple both our undergraduate and graduate educational programs; and that will represent a serious reversal to the professional development of all members of our departmental community.

I see no alternative but to attempt to honor the first of those responsibilities. Here is where we stand:

1. SEAS insists it needs all of Hayden Hall; the Provost understands that SAS has agreed to relinquish it.
2. The needs of the Geology Department are adequately, if inelegantly, met.
3. The University refuses to renovate the south section of Hayden Hall to accommodate the research and teaching activities of the Geology Department.
4. We will follow the plan as it is currently conceived, we will be forced to move to space in which we can adequately pursue neither our research nor our teaching; there we will wait and whither while SAS looks for space already acknowledged not to exist.
5. We are willing to move once, if that is perceived to represent the best interests of the University (of this we remain unconvinced), but only to space adequate to meet our minimum needs where we can expect to remain to reconstruct our professional lives when the considerable disruption of a move is behind us.

It is a measure of how far from reality these discussions have drifted that we are being forced to defend a position as eminently reasonable as that summarized in point 5 above. The present impasse is the predictable consequence of a policy of selective consultation. That policy has led to a chain of uniformed errors of judgment that now threatens incalculable damage to a department that all participants in these discussions insist they mean to retain and strengthen.

It now seems prudent to roll this process back to where it stood in the fall of 1983: a comprehensive assessment of the relative merits of various alternatives to accommodate the projected expansion of programs in SEAS. The Geology Department is prepared to participate constructively in those resurrected discussions.

*One of these positions was vacated by the departure of Yoshihiko Ohashi in December 1983: we have not yet been authorized to replace him.—R.G.

Dr. Giegengack is associate professor and chair of the Geology Department.

Response next page
Response from the Dean: A Report on the Geology Department

A year and a half ago the School of Arts and Sciences began a serious effort to develop a coherent plan for its own long-range development. A Faculty Advisory Planning Committee was named to advise the Dean on goals and priorities for the School. Development plans were solicited from each of the School's academic and administrative departments, graduate groups, and undergraduate programs. In reviewing individual plans the Committee considered an enormous range of factors: a department's intellectual quality, the national status of the field, whether the field was considered a core discipline, the department's interaction with other departments, the department's size and enrollments, and the department's objectives and the resources needed to achieve those objectives.

It was agreed that as a School our priorities must be to: (1) maintain or enhance those departments which have already achieved excellence; (2) improve those departments which have nearly achieved excellence; and (3) identify any core departments that are threatened with mediocrity and work to improve them. There were a few departments that did not fall into any of these categories or that were too small to achieve the sort of excellence we want in the School of Arts and Sciences. Since financial constraints in the foreseeable future preclude providing additional resources from the School to these departments, we reluctantly concluded that they must either remain static or be forced to decline in size to provide resources for higher priorities.

The Department of Geology was identified at an early stage as a department facing difficulties. It is a very small department with only six* standing faculty members. While it offers an excellent undergraduate program, the Department is overextended and its graduate and research program suffers. It is clear that during the past two decades the Department has not received the resources that would have assured the achievement of excellence. It is also clear that the School of Arts and Sciences cannot now provide those resources.

Since it appeared that the work done by some of the faculty in the Geology Department complemented the work done by some of the faculty in the School of Engineering and Applied Science, the Faculty Advisory Planning Committee suggested that an accommodation with that School be explored. That exploration was undertaken but was unsuccessful.

Last February a committee of geologists from other institutions was invited to the campus to provide an independent judgment of the Geology Department's scholarship and to advise us on how we might strengthen the Department without increasing the resources provided to it. The report of that committee confirmed our judgment of the Department's scholarship and indicated that there was no realistic prospect that the current faculty in the Department would make the changes necessary to improve the situation. The report did suggest, however, that there was some potential for finding an external chairman who could redirect the energy of the Department, build linkages with other programs within the University, and revitalize the scholarship of the faculty. We are now inquiring whether appropriate candidates exist for this challenging task.

The Geology Department is, relative to its size, its research, and its teaching, one of the most expensive departments in the School of Arts and Sciences. This is in part due to the fact that research and teaching in the natural sciences is more expensive than in other areas, and in part due to the fact that the Department now occupies, in Hayden Hall, a great deal of space for which the School of Arts and Sciences must pay. The School of Engineering and Applied Science, which has experienced significant growth in its student body and which has developed new resources for its research, has been in need of additional space. Accordingly, we began to consider whether it might be possible to move the Geology Department to other space and move some of the activities of the School of Engineering and Applied Science into Hayden Hall. These moves would simultaneously allow the University to avoid very expensive new construction and allow the School of Arts and Sciences to eliminate significant annual expenses for an underutilized building.

The timing of the proposed move makes the search for an external chairman more difficult. We have decided, however, that the prospective cost savings, both to the School and to the University, justify exploiting this opportunity. The original plan called for the complete removal of the Geology Department from Hayden Hall by the end of the summer of 1984. Since no adequate alternate space was identified, the plan was modified to a two-stage move. The first stage is a compression of the activities of the Geology Department into the south section of Hayden Hall and into some additional space in the David Rittenhouse Laboratory. This stage will be completed by January, 1985. The second stage, for which we expect to have a plan by July, 1985, would remove the Geology Department entirely from Hayden Hall. We expect that this plan will have the following features:

1. It should provide space for the Geology Department's faculty and administrative offices.
2. It should provide adequate and reasonably convenient space for the faculty's research and teaching.
3. It should provide graduate students with ready access to the research facilities and to the faculty.
4. It should not present any significant disruption to the activities of other departments in the School of Arts and Sciences.
5. It should provide the School of Arts and Sciences with appreciable net savings compared with the cost of allowing the Geology Department to remain in the south section of Hayden Hall.

The new space may not house all of the teaching, research, and administrative functions of the Geology Department in a single building as is now the case. This convenience is a luxury that many of our departments do not now enjoy and that we may no longer be able to afford for the Geology Department.

I think it is clear that our communications with the Geology Department have not been entirely successful. Although this is in part due to the fact that the Department has been understandably reluctant to accept the bleak message we have tried to send, we must take responsibility for failing to assure ourselves that our colleagues in the Geology Department were kept fully informed of the evolving plans for the department.

We plan to proceed as outlined above. We regret the disruption to the Geology Department but see no reasonable alternative that makes more sense for the future of the School of Arts and Sciences. We intend to try to maintain an invigorated Geology Department within the School of Arts and Sciences. Our priorities, however, preclude diverting to the Department those resources it believes it requires. We hope we can work with the Geology Department to resolve the problems we now face, since it is only with the Department's cooperation that any lasting solutions can be found.

—Joel Conarroe, Dean
School of Arts and Sciences

*See footnote p. 4.
Shanghai Jiao Tong English Teacher Program

To foster the growth of international understanding and harmony by encouraging the exchange of ideas and friendship, the University of Pennsylvania and Shanghai Jiao Tong University (SJTU) in the People's Republic of China have entered into an informal agreement [but see note For Comment below] whereby Pennsylvania will select 10 individuals to teach English conversation under the direction of the Department of Foreign Languages for Science and Technology at SJTU.

Members of the faculty and staff are urged to alert students and alumni to this exciting new international teaching opportunity. The Committee is seeking participants who are juniors or seniors, students in the graduate/professional schools or Pennsylvania alumni. Although no previous teaching experience is required, candidates must have an excellent command of the English language. They must show evidence of maturity, adaptability, and resourcefulness and be strongly motivated to live in China.

Although the participants will be responsible for their own international travel, Jiao Tong University will provide housing, medical care and an ample living allowance. The initial commitment for each teacher will be for one semester but will be extended for the second semester if mutually agreeable. Orientation programs will be provided both at Pennsylvania and at Jiao Tong before the beginning of the academic year.

FOR COMMENT

The 1983-84 Committee on Research has drafted the following Policy Statement on the Development of Computer Software, and offers it now for comments by the University community. If the reaction is generally favorable, we shall make any necessary revisions and submit the statement to the Administration and to the University Council for adoption.

Helen Davies (microbiology in Med), Chair
Morris Hamburg (statistics)
Robert A. Kraft (religious studies)
Alfred Mann (physics)
Janet Meininger (nursing)
Evan Miller (finance)
Gary Saul Morson (Slavic languages)
Janet Pack (public and urban policy)

H. W. Penning (pharmacology)
Eric Weinberg (biology)
Jay Zemel (electrical engineering)
Prashant Vankudre (Gr Fac)

Barry Cooperman (vice provost for research), ex officio
Anthony Merritt (director, Research Administration), ex officio
Arnold Kleinzeiler (physiology in Med), consultant

Draft Policy Statement on the Development of Computer Software

With the increasing availability of computers, members of the University community are in an environment in which they have the capability to develop computer software. The development of such software is likely to become a very lucrative area. Recent events in other universities indicate that misunderstandings can arise concerning the ownership and protection of such software. With a view to protecting the interests of the developer and the University as well as encouraging the development of high quality software, the following policy statement has been formulated.

University employees, faculty members and students under their supervision who, with the aid of University resources and/or University time, develop computer software which has commercial value have a responsibility to inform the University of this development. In this instance, University resources refers to the use of University owned or controlled computers (mainframes, or personal computers) as well as other research facilities provided by the Trustees.

In general the ownership of the new software will reside with the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania following the model of the University's patent policy. It is recognized that in some circumstances exceptions will exist (e.g. prior contractual arrangements with research sponsors and others). The University will seek, with the advice of licensing experts, the most appropriate means by which it can protect its ownership (copyright versus patentability) and by which it can financially benefit the University person responsible for the development of such software.

The University may also enter into contractual arrangements with software companies to market the computer program. It is recognized that companies may invest considerable resources to market the software and that in such instances the University will expect to recover a smaller percentage of the profits. In every instance it will be the responsibility of the University to return a percentage of the profits back to the source of the software (whether it be faculty, student or employee).

The following examples define the limits of this policy:
(a) A faculty member who develops computer software (whether it be for research purposes or for some other reason) on a University owned or controlled computer, during University time and with the aid of University support staff should feel obligated to follow this policy.
(b) Faculty members who develop software on their own time and personal computers that they have purchased are sole owners of the software and are not covered by this policy.

It is recognized that a number of situations can arise that are not covered by this policy statement. In such instances the decision of whether to inform the University of the development of computer software will reside with the individual programmer.

1. The patent policy of the University is as follows: "The Trustees have declared it to be the policy of the University of Pennsylvania that any invention or discovery which may result from work carried out on University time or at University expense (whether a grant of outside or of the property of the University. Patents on such inventions or discoveries may be applied for in any country by the University in which case the inventor shall assign his/her interest in the patent application to the University. The University will exercise its ownership of such patent, with or without profit, with due regard for the public interest as well as the interest of all persons concerned. Procedures for implementation of this policy shall be developed and promulgated by the President of the University." (January, 1966)

The Procedures for implementing the Patent Policy set forth a formula for sharing of royalties which initially provides 50% of the royalties directly to the inventor(s), an additional 35% to the inventor's laboratory department and school, and the balance to the Research Foundation.

2. The Committee on Research is cognizant of the fact that facilities to commercialize a product that may be developed under this policy do not exist. We therefore invite suggestions for an effective mechanism.
A year ago the A-3 Assembly placed a survey questionnaire in Almanac regarding the Houston Hall food services situation. The returns we received were quite helpful when we advocated important changes that have now taken place.

This year's survey is a very broad one: We hope to find out how the majority of A-3 employees feel about certain issues in regard to their employment. The questions below were gathered by the Coordinating Committee, elected from across the University and including men and women of many ages, origins and experience levels in the University.

Please fill out the questionnaire or a photocopy of it and return it to the address below as soon as possible; we hope to tabulate and publish the results within the next two weeks. You need not sign your name, and do feel free to attach additional comments if you wish.

—Russell Muth, Spokesperson

### General Issues in Employment

**Benefits**

How do you feel about the changes in the benefits program over the past year? (Check one).

- Feel the benefits program was significantly improved
- Feel the benefits program was slightly improved
- Feel no differences occurred
- Feel the benefits program was slightly diminished
- Feel the benefits program was significantly diminished

Are there any changes you would like to seek made in the benefits program?

Would you prefer cafeteria style or a flexible benefits program wherein an employee could choose the combination of benefits that best suit his or her particular life style?

- Yes
- No

Would you like to see an eye prescription or drug prescription benefit available as an option?

- Yes
- No

Do you feel you have adequate access to University courses?

- Yes
- No

**Work Milieu**

Do you feel the psychosocial working conditions at the University of Pennsylvania are satisfactory?

- Find them to be optimal
- Find them satisfactory
- Neutral
- They need improvement
- They need significant change

Do you find the new grievance procedure and its associated grievance mechanism to be effective, reasonable and valid?

- Yes
- No

Do you understand fully the new grievance procedure?

- Yes
- No

How would you rate the quality of the supervisor's leadership abilities in your cost or reporting center?

- Receive very good leadership or supervision
- Receive satisfactory leadership or supervision
- Neutral opinion
- Leadership needs improvement
- Find leadership or supervision to be unsatisfactory

Do your opinions or suggestions carry weight, i.e. are they acknowledged, accepted and sometimes implemented?

- Yes
- No

### Specific Areas of Concern

**Women's Issues:**

Do you feel women have adequate promotion opportunities at the University of Pennsylvania?

- Yes
- No

Do you feel women are appropriately compensated?

- Yes
- No

**University of Pennsylvania as an employer:**

Are salary increases determined fairly?

- Yes
- No

Do you feel the faculty think of the staff as "second-class citizens"?

- Yes
- No

Do you feel the administration thinks of the A-3 staff as "second-class citizens"?

- Yes
- No

Does the University of Pennsylvania make an honest attempt to resolve difficulties in employee/employer relations?

- Yes
- No

Does the chain-of-command transmit to you all of the information you need?

- Yes
- No

Are you given independence in performing your assigned responsibilities or tasks?

- Yes
- No

Do you feel the University's job classification system is a good one?

- Yes
- No

Are your facilities adequate?

- Yes
- No

### Other

Would you like to see an employee advocate, an individual who would champion the rights of A-3 employees?

- Yes
- No

Do you feel you receive sufficient orientation and training to do your job?

- Yes
- No

If you could change one thing at the University, what would you like to see changed?
SAS 10th Anniversary Celebration

Upcoming events commemorating the School of Arts and Sciences’ tenth anniversary include the following:

October 24 Dean’s Forum: A Conversation with Arthur Miller; discussion with the author of Death of a Salesman, The Crucible, A View From the Bridge, and other plays; 20 students will receive academic achievement awards; 8 p.m., Room B-3, Meyerson Hall.

October 25 A Conversation in honor of the School of Arts and Sciences; 4:15 p.m., Room 200, College Hall.

October 26 Finals of Dean’s Faculty/Student Tennis Tournament; 1 p.m., Lott Tennis Courts.

Student Performing Arts Festival featuring performances by Bloomerooms, Counterparts, the Balaikia Orchestra, Quaker Notes, Anarchist Chord on Blues, the Society for Creative Anarchism, and other campus groups; 3 p.m., Blanche Levy Park, next to Van Pelt Library (rain location, Bodek Lounge, Houston Hall).

October 27 SAS Homecoming Lecture—Penn’s Chariots of Fire: Paris 1900: E. Digby Baltzell, professor of sociology; 10 a.m., Room 200, College Hall.

Humanities Week

October 29 An Afternoon with Margaret Walker, author of Jubilee and the forthcoming The Daemonic Genius of Richard Wright; 4 p.m., Room B-3, Meyerson Hall.


October 30 Penn Faculty Perspectives on Religion and Politics in Contemporary America: a panel featuring visiting lecturer Harvey Cox; Sheldon Hackney, president; Elizabeth Flowers, professor of philosophy; Bruce Kakuk, professor of history; and Joseph Washington, professor of religious studies; noon-1:30 p.m., Room 214, College Hall.

Humanities Majors Fair: presentation by Humanities Departments to aid students in choosing majors, with alumni speaking; 4-6:30 p.m., Bodek Lounge, Houston Hall.

Minority Perspectives on Religion, Politics and the Humanities: Black Women Writers Babbbling to Endure and Create: a forum with Toni Cade Barbana, Kristin Hunter Lattany, Deborah McDowell and Sonia Sanchez; 7 p.m., Room B-3, Meyerson Hall.

October 31 Undergraduate English Club Fireside Chat with a member of the English Department; 4:30-6:30 p.m., Bennett Hall.

The Transformation of Philadelphia, 1750-1850; Professor Richard Beeman, director of the Philadelphia Center for Early American Studies; 7:30 p.m., Room B-21, Stulken Hall.

November 1 Penn Faculty Perspectives on Religion and Politics in the International Setting; a panel featuring Ahmet Evin, director of the Middle East Center; Ann Mayer, associate professor of legal studies; and Donald Smith, professor of political science, with Guy Welton, professor of religious studies, moderator; 4-6:30 p.m., Second Floor Lounge.

Christian Association.

Militarization of Women’s Lives: Why Does it Matter in 1984?: a discussion of gender, politics and conflict; Cynthia Enloe, professor of government, Clark University; Kay Camp. Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom; 8 p.m., Room 17, Logan Hall.

More Events: Social Sciences Week (November 5-9) and Natural Sciences Week (November 12-16) events will appear in Almanac next week.

DEATHS

Nellie Lee Holt Bok, a civic leader who was a member of the Advisory Board to the Vice Provost for University Life for over twenty years died October 7 at the age of 83. The 1973 Distinguished Daughter of Pennsylvania was also a member of the family who gave Irvine Auditorium the Curtis Organ.

Dr. Bok worked on behalf of women’s education, mental health and the humane treatment of prisoners. She helped organize the Fellowship Commission of Philadelphia and the Community Relations Division of the American Friends Service Committee. In earlier years she was a member of the faculty of Stephens College in Missouri.

Mrs. Bok is survived by her daughters, Rachel Bok Goldman and Enid Curtis Bok Shontell, her stepsons, Derek and Ben; a stepdaughter, Wilmot Roland-Holt; and sixteen grandchildren. Contributions in her name may be made to the Curtis Institute, the American Friends Service Committee, or the Penn Society.

Frank J. Carey, a special assistant in the Albright Music Library who joined Penn as a Ph.D. candidate in music in 1967, died October 3 at the age of 51. A 1956 graduate of Juilliard with a master’s in music from the University of Colorado, Mr. Carey enrolled in musicology here after a career as a pianist and teacher. He taught piano at the Vermont Conservatory of Music beginning in 1956, and was an instructor, then an associate professor, at Milking University from 1962-67. He also taught widely in the greater Philadelphia area—at Penn, La Salle College, Philadelphia Community College, and Franklin and Marshall College.

He is survived by his mother, Opal Carey Arnston, and his brother, Dr. Thomas B. Carey. In memory of Mr. Carey, members of the University community may contribute to the Albright Music Library. Checks should be made payable to the University of Pennsylvania Libraries.

Frances Finkelstein, a long-time administrator in the economics department, died on September 25 after a long illness. She started at the University in 1967 as a secretary and became an administrative assistant in 1969. From 1980 she was fiscal coordinator, keeping track of grants and payments to graduate students. She is survived by three sons, all of whom are lawyers: Matthew, Richard, and Jonathan.