IN BRIEF

A-3 Assembly: Dr. David Stonehill, vice provost for computing, will speak at the A-3 Assembly’s general meeting November 8 at 1 p.m., in the Harrison-Smith-Penniman Room of Houston Hall. His topic is Computers, The University and Me.

Comment on Break: Dr. Herbert Levine reminds faculty, staff and students that commentary for the Committee to Review the Fall Break (experimentally inserted into this year’s calendar October 22-23) can be sent to him at the Economics Department, 373 McNeil/C.R.

Yale-Busting: Penn’s 34-21 win over the Bulldogs Saturday, plus Harvard’s 17-15 win over Princeton equals a still-running tie for first place in the Ivy at 4-0. Nearly 37,000 watched the Franklin Field victory, a new high for Homecoming in recent years. The rest of the Quaker season is all-Ivy: At Princeton this Saturday (1 p.m., not 1:30), at-home for Harvard November 10, and in Ithaca for Cornell November 17. Ext. 6151 has ticket information.
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Trustees: A New M.S. . . . Other Actions and Trends

At the October full board meeting, Penn’s Trustees approved a new master of science degree in epidemiology, as proposed by the School of Medicine on the basis of its clinical epidemiology training program for physicians from the U.S. and developing countries. Penn’s is one of three in the world that are funded by the Rockefeller Foundation, and the other two—McMaster in Canada and New Castle in Australia—had already instituted the master’s degree.

Eight capital-funding resolutions were passed, one of them enabling the University to replace all of its Bell-owned multi-line phones with University-owned instruments (as was done earlier with all single-line phones). Three others pave the way for renovations in medical labs—one at Richards and two at Anatomy-Chemistry. Three relate to Morris Arboretum: for restorations to the Widener Education Center under a Pew Memorial Trust gift; new access and parking; and deferred maintenance on water and electrical systems. The eighth authorizes renovations for Hill House’s kitchen.

Among faculty appointments, the Provost announced two that are tenure-significant: the return from Vanderbilt of Dr. Ivar Berg as professor of sociology (also now associate dean for undergraduate education at SAS) and the naming of Dr. William J. Norwood of Harvard as professor of cardiology. Dr. Norwood also heads children’s cardiology at CHOP.

The Trustees confirmed the selection of Frederick Saxe as Vice President for Facilities Management (Almanac October 23). Dr. Helen O’Bannon projected a $103,000 surplus on the nearly $750 million budget for FY 1985; and she described new initiatives in the University including an internal Purchase Fund which brings certain lease-purchase arrangements in-house for significant savings. She also emphasized a push toward faculty/staff fitness through new services being created.
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On page 2, Chair Jacob Abel previews some of the agenda items of the Fall Meeting and of Council’s session November 14.

Council: Political Participation

The University Council passed the following resolution at the October 10 meeting.

Resolved, that the University Council take an active role in fostering student political participation; and be it Further Resolved, that the Council communicate with all faculty members via Almanac urging them to spend the first few minutes of class on election day—Tuesday, November 6—discussing the importance of voting and announcing the locations of area polling places.

Penn dormitories lie in three wards, shown at left with the polling places’ addresses; places are subject to change up to 10 days before the election, and will be listed in area newspapers a few days before November 6 as well as on the election day itself. Hours are 7 a.m.-8 p.m., and for further information the number is 686-3469.

Ward 27-3
International House
3701 Chestnut
[Grad. Towers, Kings Court/English House, Law Dorms]

Ward 27-18
Harrison House
3901 Spruce Street
[High Rises, Lofts, Modern Language House]

Ward 27-19
HUP, 3400 Spruce
[Quad, Hill, Stouffer]
The report "Conduct and Misconduct on Campus" (Almanac 9/25/84) will continue to be discussed at the University Council on November 14th and at the December 12th meeting. The Steering Committee hopes to strike a reasonable balance between the competing needs for wide and free discussion of this report and for the development of timely advice to the administration. It must be noted that some of the recommendations in the report will be difficult to implement. The Committee on the Faculty whose chair, Professor Albert Lloyd, generously allowed an intrusion on their meeting of the Senate. Your advice or inquiries on the work of these and all committees are welcome.
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Speaking Out

On Software Policy

I am chairing a small committee of the Wharton School faculty appointed by Dean Russell Palmer to examine a policy with respect to ownership of computer software developed by Wharton School faculty members. It is in my capacity as chair of that committee that I am responding to the Draft Policy Statement on the Development of Computer Software published in the October 23, 1984, issue of Almanac.

The Wharton School committee is in strong support of the principle that there should be a uniform computer software policy for the University, but it believes that the policy should be one that is appropriate for, and accommodates the needs of, all schools of the University. It sees problems with the policy proposed by the University Committee.

Conceptually, one cannot quarrel with the underlying principles of the Draft Statement. The basic objective of the proposed policy is to provide maximum incentive to faculty members (and support staff) to develop innovative software, consistent with the University's claim to a share of the material rewards from software developed on University time and University facilities and with the assistance of University support staff. At first glance, the proposed policy—which derives from the University policy on patents—would seem to provide an acceptable balance between those two conflicting objectives. If all cases were to fit neatly into the two extreme categories, the proposed policy would be workable. It is the view of our committee, however, that most software developed by Wharton faculty would fall somewhere between the two extremes and, hence, the proposed policy would provide very little guidance in resolving the conflict of interest between the University and the faculty member. We suspect that this would characterize the bulk of the software generated within the University.

In recognition of the difficulty of developing—and administering—a software policy that can make fine distinctions among the circumstances under which the software emerges and in the interest of avoiding divisive and burdensome arbitration, our committee recommends that as a general principle, subject to exceptions as indicated below, ownership of computer software vested in the person or persons by whom it is developed. As a quid pro quo, the University should have the right to use the software for any or all internal purposes without charge. The University would not have the right to franchise or market the software. Except for free University use, this would be the same policy as that generally applicable to textbooks and other instructional materials. The committee recommends free use of computer software by the University in recognition of the high probability that University computer equipment will be involved to some extent in the development and testing of software by faculty.

Under such a policy there would be an assumption in every case that the computer software bears the name of the person or persons who developed it, but the University would have the right to challenge the presumption when observing that the general rule would result in unwarranted enrichment of the person or persons involved. For example, the University would be expected to intervene when the software was developed for University use by its own administrative and support staff or when it was produced by the University as part of the ongoing research activities of the organization. In all of these cases, the burden would be on the University to demonstrate that observance of the general rule would produce inequitable results.

The Wharton committee is sympathetic to the efforts of the University committee to develop an acceptable software policy and offers its recommendations as a basis for further useful dialogue on this sensitive subject. We hope that our proposal will find support in other schools.

Professor and Chair, Insurance

Teaching: Call for Nominations

Nominations should be submitted to the Committee on Distinguished Teaching, 112 College Hall, to the attention of Constance C. Goodman. They should be in the form of a letter, citing those qualities that make the nominee an outstanding teacher. It is particularly important to include the nominee's name, department and rank; how you know the nominee; your name, address and phone number. Additional supporting evidence, in the form of statistical surveys, curricula vitae, lists of course taught, etc., will also be helpful to the Committee in its selection process. Nominations open Monday, October 29, and will close on Friday, December 7.

In the criteria and guidelines for the selection of the award recipients, distinguished teaching is defined as "teaching that is intellectually demanding, unusually coherent, and permanent in its effect. The distinguished teacher has the capability of changing the way in which students view the subject they are studying. The distinguished teacher provides the basis for students to look with critical and informed perception at the fundamentals of a discipline, and how he/she relates this discipline to other disciplines and to the world view of the student. The distinguished teacher is accessible to students and open to new ideas, but also expresses his/her own views with articulate conviction and is willing to lead students, with a combination of clarity and challenge, to an informed understanding of an academic field. The distinguished teacher is fair, free from prejudice, and single-minded in the pursuit of truth."

Office of the Vice Provost for University Life

Revised IBM PC jr Pricing

There are two corrections to the IBM PC jr description and price list that appeared in the October 16, 1984, issue of Penn Printout. Due to a restatement of the PC jr prices by IBM, the prices quoted in the description for attachments are no longer correct. The price for the system unit remains unchanged at $1035. The correct prices for the attachments are listed below. We advise potential purchasers to price any such option at other local retailers, as the University pricing represents a rather small discount, and other retailers may be able to meet or beat these prices.

The second correction to the PC jr description is that the keyboard cord was incorrectly described as not being contained with the system unit package. The cord is included in the $1035 price.

Unchanged Price:
4860002 PC jr system unit with 128K, one 360K disk drive, PC jr Color Display, DOS 2.1, BASIC, keyboard and cord $1035

Revised Prices:
4860006 Power Expansion Unit $128
4860008 Internal Modem $169
4860009 Parallel Printer Attachment $85
4860010 Joy Stick $34
4860024 Speech Attachment $255
4860026 Adapter Cable for Serial Device $21
4860301 128K Memory Expansion Option $276

Free Individual Counseling

The Penn's Women's Center offers individual counseling for University staff members. The counselors are Ph.D. candidates in the Graduate School of Education, supervised by members of the University Counseling Service. The service is free and confidential. Anyone interested should call for an appointment at Ext. 8611.

Morocco-Penn Changes

The Office of International Programs notes a change in phone number for faculty who want more information about the Morocco-Penn Faculty Exchange Program (Almanac, October 16). Amy Shargel can be reached at GSE, Ext. 22. The Office also notes a change in the date of the deadline for application. The deadline has been moved up two months to March 1, 1985.

Editorial Advisory Board Chair, Jean A. Crockett; Jacob M. Abel, Carol P. Gernert, Leonard G. Owen, William G. Owen for the Administration; Thomas R. Evans, for the Faculty Senate; William G. Owen for the Administration; Carol Carr for the Librarians Association; Joseph Kane for the Administrative Assembly.
A Hundred Years of Health Care for Animals and Man

by Sheldon Hackney

At this special convocation marking one hundred years of veterinary medicine at Penn, we look back over a century of progress in service to animals—beasts of burden and livestock, pets and sporting animals. We are delighted to be gathered at the University Museum where the magnificent exhibition Man and Animals has been mounted for the occasion.

Recent improvements in healthcare for both humans and animals have come about because of the commonalities between man and animal at the molecular level; all the knowledge that has been acquired, including a number of stellar discoveries responsible for saving lives by the thousands, has only been won as a result of research and testing done with animals. Pasteur's discovery of vaccination, and his experiments in inoculating rabid dogs, resulted in development of a treatment for human rabies. Unlike polio, which has become a rarity since the vaccine was developed, rabies is currently a threat in the Mid-Atlantic area, to which Pennsylvania belongs. This dread disease rightfully strikes terror into the hearts of the population. While it has not been possible to eradicate this wildlife-carried scourge, the vaccine developed through experiments with animals makes it possible to protect domestic pets through immunization, and this is also the best hope for preventing fatal attacks on humans.

The fact is, whether new drugs and procedures have combated tuberculosis and diabetes, saved "blue babies," or provided information on the cause of infantile respiratory distress syndrome, virtually every treatment on which society depends has involved prior research and testing on animals.

Nevertheless, the successes of modern medicine, which have saved countless lives and untold suffering, are apparently less easy to keep before the public consciousness than the lurid misrepresentations that a small but virulent minority of those concerned with animals rights has resorted to. Individual scientists, here at Penn and elsewhere, have been subjected to libels and threats of violence. In criminal break-ins, animals that are maintained under strictly inspected conditions, meeting high standards for the sake of good science as well as humane values, have been harmed by untrained handling. Years of research, conducted by men and women who recognize the moral and legal obligations of their work, have been wasted, along with the lives of precious subject animals—and all because of the immoral, illegal actions of a few misguided people who prefer simple explanations to complex questions, and distorted accusations to rational discourse. Such wanton violence does a disservice to fair-minded people, researchers and supporters of animal welfare alike, as well as to our interdependent society of people and animals.

The propaganda of this small self-serving group loses credibility when it accuses the Veterinary School here of engaging in sadistic research, an absurd charge against a School that has, on the contrary, done so much to improve the lot of animals. But exaggeration is par for the course to those whose purpose is ultimately to block all research involving the use of animals. Thus a small, arrogant group is seeking, through terrorist intimidation, to impose its will on society—a society that has determined that continuing to maintain and improve the health of humans and animals is a worthy goal. As for the fact that medical centers are the object of attack: It is easier to misrepresent the individual researcher as a monster than to face up to the complex choices that must be made by society.

The question is, finally, not one of animal rights but rather of human duties towards animals. As a community, we at the University of Pennsylvania act according to our firm belief that we have duties towards animals. As much-needed research continues to be performed in a search for the cause of cancer, or infantile respiratory distress syndrome, or multiple sclerosis, or of new therapies for the treatment of high blood pressure, stroke, and mental disease, or orthopedic procedures for the benefit of accident victims (or racehorses) experimental protocols must be screened at the highest levels, and reviewed by bodies that include researchers and members of the general public. Where there is no alternative for obtaining information, we must insure that experimental animals are tended by a qualified veterinarian and treated according to the highest standards, and that their use involves a minimum of conscious suffering. Against a backdrop of strict humane and ethical controls, the School of Veterinary Medicine looks forward to providing its diverse patients with the highest levels of care, all predicated on the advances taking place in its labs, and in quality laboratories everywhere, for the benefit of society and for the knowledge from which future generations of people and animals will continue to benefit.