Open Expression: the Committee on Open Expression's investigation of the February 13 demonstration in Senior Lecturer Murray Dolfman's classroom finds a violation of the Guidelines; see report, p. 3.

DLAM Settlement: A dispute in the Division of Laboratory Animal Medicine has been formally settled, with two supervisors removed from DLAM assignments; the director to attend awareness sessions; and caretakers to train as veterinary technicians. Full text of the Statement of Understanding is on page 6.

Research Tapes: In the wake of a PETA announcement that copies of 60 hours of videotape stolen last summer from a Penn research lab would be sent to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Penn was informed by USDA last week that several cassettes have been received. USDA has not advised whether it has received copies of all of the tapes. "We are awaiting further word from USDA," said General Counsel Shelley Z. Green.

Crowds In View: In addition to Penn Relays' 40,000 spectators this Saturday, the campus area is expected to have added congestion from two other events April 27. The inauguration of Drexel's eighth president, Dr. William S. Gaither, starts at 10 a.m. and has events running through mid-day. A march of animal rights activists from the Civic Center to College Hall has been announced for noon. Members of the University are advised by the Office of Public Safety to plan routes and schedules around the possibility of heavy traffic and dense parking at the eastern end of the campus.

Assault: A student walking home from a campus library at 2 a.m. Monday was forced into the subway/motorized stop at 36th and Sansom where she was robbed and sexually assaulted. University police report. After the unidentified male assailant fled, the victim used an emergency phone at the station to reach University Public Safety, and was taken by Ruth Wells to Jefferson Hospital for further examination and released. The case is now under investigation by the Sex Crimes Unit of the Philadelphia police and by SEPTA police. On page 6, Ms. Wells gives information on escort services as part of a general safety advisory prepared earlier.

Senate: Unanimity and Division at Spring Meeting

At the April 17 spring Meeting the Faculty Senate adopted unanimously the reports of its Economic Status Committee and Committee on the Faculty (re faculty involvement in five-year plans), but divided 32-23 on a floor motion involving the Dolfman case.

Economic Status: To her published report (Almanac April 2), Dr. Janice Madden added data on salaries and increases for Penn and peer institutions (to be published), showing a competitive lag despite real-dollar growth. She also outlined some benefits questions affecting total compensation: loss of eligibility for aid elsewhere when using the Penn tuition-away benefit, and federal taxation of graduate-level tuition benefits starting in July. EconStat is following a Personnel Benefits study of "cafeteria" style benefits, she said, adding that if changes are contemplated the Administration should (a) grandparent past benefits levels for current faculty and (b) give advance notice with time to study and debate proposals.

Five-Year Plans: Dr. Albert Lloyd summarized his report (April 16) calling for faculty input into each of the Schools' five-year plans, and Provost Thomas Ehrlich reiterated his response in the same issue. From the floor, members applauded Former Senate Chair Phoebe Leboy's protest that deans should be listening but were absent.

SCAFR/Dolfman: After Dr. Seymour Mandelbaum's example as a substitute motion which failed, 32-23. Dr. William Pierskalla, Deputy Dean for Academic Affairs at Wharton, said the Dean was not requiring Mr. Dolfman to eliminate the final phrase as redundant—Dr. Jacob Abel (right) becomes past-chair in the changeover, which takes place at SEC's last meeting tomorrow; and the three men then constitute Senate's committee on consultation which meets regularly with the President and Provost for information and to advise. See tally of votes, page 3.

SCAFR/Dolfman: After Dr. Seymour Mandelbaum's example as a substitute motion which failed, 32-23. Dr. William Pierskalla, Deputy Dean for Academic Affairs at Wharton, said the Dean was not requiring Mr. Dolfman to attend. The membership passed, by voice vote with few "nays," an action to . . . reaffirm our belief that due process in adjudicating conflicts on campus is the best and the only way that guarantees justice for all concerned, including items of concern to minorities.

Senate: Unanimity and Division at Spring Meeting
Chair's Report, Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility 1984-85

The Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility met only twice this year. Both meetings were in the fall and dealt principally with the case of Dr. Gary Schmidgall. Our deliberations resulted in a letter to President Hackney subsequently published in Almanac on December 4, 1984. There has been no reply from the President but we understand that the administration has accepted our financial recommendation but not our proposal that Dr. Schmidgall retain his status as an assistant professor during 1984-85.

Dr. Schmidgall's appeal to the committee revealed that there was a gap in the Handbook. There was no rule specifying the rights of a successful grievant whose appointment had expired but who had not yet been properly evaluated for tenure. We specified what we thought was a sensible procedure to follow in the particular case before us but agreed that a well-conceived general rule should be added to the Handbook. With the advice of Robert Gorman, Professor of Law, Jacob Abel drafted a rule and shared it with Shelly Green, General Counsel of the University. Her reply was not satisfactory to the Chair of the Senate but negotiations on a revised version have been delayed by the press of other business. Professor Abel still hopes, I believe, that he will succeed in developing with the administration a draft which can then be reviewed by the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility and other relevant groups. For the moment, therefore, we serve by waiting.

The Committee has also been sitting in the wings during a spring semester which has been alive with issues of academic freedom and responsibility. While I have been active on several fronts, I have wanted the Committee to maintain a distance from controversies until a specific issue has matured sufficiently to require our collective judgment. I think it appropriate, however, to share with you my personal perspective on both the events of the past months and on what may very well be a difficult fall.

I first discussed the Murray Dolfman case with Almarin Phillips, the Chair of the Wharton School Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, in late February. We subsequently met with Jacob Abel on March 1, and discovered that we shared a common perception of three faces of the emergent case:

1. While public events focused on College Hall, the Wharton School was the primary arena in which a decision would have to be made. The President and Provost had little if any formal authority to shape the course of events.
2. While there had been a great deal of talk about "due process," the rules on suspension and termination for just cause applied explicitly only to members of the standing faculty. We were in the unhappy position of simultaneously inventing a process and defending its legitimacy.
3. The Wharton School Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility had agreed to investigate the Dolfman case in response to a request from the Dean. A public meeting was already scheduled for March 12; we were all concerned lest that meeting endanger the detached role of the Committee as a court to hear a charge from the Dean or an appeal from Mr. Dolfman.

We agreed to advise The Wharton Committee that the school should act as if Mr. Dolfman were a member of the standing faculty should the Dean press for suspension or termination for just cause during the current contract year. In order to preserve the Committee's status in the event of such an action, we suggested that it merely "report the facts" of the case to the Dean and avoid judgment.

There was, of course, no "just cause" action. The Committee gave Dean Palmer a tape of the March 12 meeting with a simple letter of transmittal. He quickly made it clear that he wanted an assessment of events against a standard of academic responsibility in order to inform his decision about Mr. Dolfman's 1985-86 contract. The just cause provisions did not apply since he did not intend to bring any action within this contract year.

The committee's report and the Dean's action are now matters of public knowledge. I don't want to comment on the details of the case since some issues may come before the Senate committee. Two rather general points do, however, seem to me to require comment since they are likely to appear in several different guises in the year ahead. (I emphasize again that the comments are mine and not those of the Senate committee as a whole).

1. Primary Responsibilities

I believe that the Wharton committee was wise to respond to the Dean's request for an assessment of the case. The alternative seemed in mid-March to be a public dispute over responsibilities—a dispute which would not have served Mr. Dolfman, the School, or any aggrieved party. I hope, however, that no academic freedom and responsibility committee faces a similar request in the future. Deans and departments share the principal responsibilities for attending to the behavior of individual faculty members. They carry the burden of investigation, counseling, public statement (if such is required in unusual cases) and personnel action. If the role of academic freedom and responsibility committees is enlarged so that they share (or even largely assume) these burdens, then they cannot act as courts of appeal. Enlarging the role of the committees or of other similar agencies threatens to weaken—while overtly seeking to bolster—the ties of academic responsibility.

2. Awareness Workshops as Official School Activities

The Dolfman case encouraged a commitment to the development of racial and sexual awareness workshops in the school. I am persuaded—as, I suspect, is the central administration—that requiring such workshops would engender enormous faculty resistance. I assume that the sessions will be voluntary.

I am, nevertheless, deeply troubled by the prospect of planning the workshops or choosing a trainer. My disquiet will not be stilled by merely staying away. We are, I believe, a community bound by a narrow but precious set of values. We resist—for good reason—extending those values or collectively exploring their implications lest we shatter our collective peace. No one who has read the report of the Wharton committee on the Dolfman case can now believe that it provides us with a simple opportunity to renew a commitment to shared values. Instead, it tests and extends those values and divides us. The Wharton committee judged that Murray Dolfman's use of a powerful Jewish image of liberation in a particular context and a particular style should not be "condoned." I doubt that even the strongest proponents of that judgment want department or school faculty meetings to articulate—let alone vote upon—the generative principles which justify the decision. Indeed, I suspect that many would find even a discussion of such principles in a departmental or school faculty meeting threatening.

The genie is, however, out of the bottle and will not be put back easily or perhaps at all. I hope that we will attend to the issues raised by the workshop proposal seriously. School faculties should consider the deep implications of mounting or commissioning even a voluntary workshop. It is not too late to refuse official sponsorship and to encourage instead diverse unofficial discussions.

If faculties decide to go ahead with official sessions, I hope that academic freedom and responsibility committees will monitor the sessions closely. A complementary monitoring effort may also proceed at the Senate level. At the end of the year we should all be able to appraise in a new way the execution of the workshops, their appropriateness and their efficacy. I start with a guess that—if they are done at all—they will be well-done, inappropriate and ineffective. I am, however, open to surprise on all three dimensions.

—Seymour J. Mandelbaum
Department of City and Regional Planning
April 17, 1985
On 12 March 1985, at the request of a member of the University community, the Committee on Open Expression (COE) began an investigation of whether a violation of the Guidelines on Open Expression occurred on 13 February during Mr. Murray Dolfman’s two afternoon classes. The committee’s jurisdiction to conduct such an investigation is described in sections II. B. 8-9 which defines the committee’s role as follows:

1. An active continuous campaign should be undertaken to make the University community aware of the Guidelines on Open Expression.
2. A brochure containing key University regulations, including the Guidelines on Open Expression, should be produced by the Office of the Vice Provost for University Life and distributed to all current administrators, faculty members, and students. The brochure should also be distributed on an annual basis to new administrators, faculty members, and students, as well as to the chairs of all student organizations.
3. The Committee on Open Expression should conduct an information session on the guidelines each fall for the appropriate University Life staff and the representatives of each school.

The guidelines resulted from a general lack of communication between representatives of the Office of Student Life and those of the Wharton School. In particular, the designated Wharton School administrator present at the demonstration lacked knowledge of the provisions of the guidelines and the Vice Provost’s representative did not effectively assume the appropriate role nor utilize the authority needed to maintain the right of open expression as stated in sections II. A and B of the guidelines:

A. It is the responsibility of the vice provost for University life (hereafter referred to simply as the “vice provost”) to protect and maintain the right of open expression under these guidelines.
B. Observation of meetings or demonstrations, when deemed necessary by the vice provost to protect and maintain open expression, shall be the responsibility of the vice provost, who may delegate such responsibility. This delegate shall have full authority to act in the name of the vice provost under these guidelines.
4. There is a general lack of knowledge of the guidelines within the University community among students, faculty members and administrators.

As per section II. B.9b cited above, the committee recommends the following remedies for the kinds of failures in communication evidenced on 13 February:
1. An active continuous campaign should be undertaken to make the University community aware of the Guidelines on Open Expression.
2. A brochure containing key University regulations, including the Guidelines on Open Expression, should be produced by the Office of the Vice Provost for University Life and distributed to all current administrators, faculty members, and students.
3. The Committee on Open Expression should conduct an information session on the guidelines each fall for the appropriate University Life staff and the representatives of each school.

Given our finding of violations of the guidelines, all evidence as well as our conclusions have been provided to the Judicial Inquiry Office, as stipulated in Section II. B.9c.

Ira Harkavy, Chair
Susan Cohen
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David Frank
Marion Friedman
Henry Hiz
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Dr. Mary C. Glick 564
Dr. Adrian Morrison 529
Dr. Daniel Malamud 526
Dr. James Ross 490
Dr. Elsa Ramsden 436
Dr. Ralph Smith 434
Dr. James Mulhy 407
Dr. Horst Daemmrich 370
**Funding SAS's Future** by Malcolm Campbell

I'm enough of a closet anarchist to delight in the fact that the *Almanac* recently published two issues* numbered 23, then omitted number 24 and proceeded to number 25. I am concerned, however, that the duplication of issue numbers will lead some *Almanac* readers to overlook, as I did initially, issue 23 of February 26 and thus miss the comments of Professor Kravis published therein concerning the planning document "Investing in Penn's Future." There should be no need to rehearse the points raised in Dr. Kravis's statement, the most important critique to date elicited by the "Building Penn's Future" manifesto. Indeed, the gracious and constructive response of President Hackney to Dr. Kravis's discourse in the same issue augurs well for further, much-needed discussion.

With all due respect, the fund-raising efforts of the Administration on behalf of SAS and the sums generated to date, however generous, however laudable, are grossly inadequate. The millions raised in support of SAS must be compared to Harvard's special campaign of hundreds of millions solely for Harvard College (the equivalent of our SAS). Of course the difficulty of the effort before us must be acknowledged: there are Sisyphean dimensions to the task faced by SAS's development office. Furthermore, it is generally true that as prospects are surved from sciences to social sciences to humanities, the difficulties of securing development funds ascend in quantum leaps. The further removed intellectual inquiry is from some form of practical, commercial or governmental application, the fewer the donors and the smaller the sums likely to be forthcoming. (A standing joke among my colleagues in Renaissance studies is that it would be a grant-laden windfall for us if Italy turned communist or if oil were struck in Vatican City. In the meantime, much of the research carried out by faculty in this area is

*Readers who maintain a back-issue file should alter the February 26 issue to #24.—Ed.*

---

**Speaking Out**

**Unsatisfied Re DLAM**

I have been considerably disturbed by the recent coverage by *The Daily Pennsylvanian* of the allegations of racial discrimination against the animal caretakers in DLAM, the Medical School animal facility. This facility has maintained for me a number of experimental animals for several years, and I am in close contact with Dr. Shalev, Bob Appell, and Joe Dupree, against whom the claims have been made. I have discussed with them from time to time certain instances of poor care of my animals by the caretakers, and have had frequent contact with them during transportation in one of the University vans for several years now. Never in any of these encounters have I heard either man make racial remarks. I felt that these experiences justified serious questions about the validity of these charges.

I have been aware that over the years several of the animal caretakers have filed grievances with their union claiming harassment and racial discrimination. These charges were not supported either by the union or by the Office of Labor Relations of the University (Director: George Budd).

These latest charges were initiated by one of the caretakers who apparently also went to the union (Local 473, Firemen and Oilers) claiming racial discrimination by his supervisors against him. The union again did not recognize this claim, nor did the Office of Labor Relations.

As I understand it, this caretaker then went to the *DP* which sent him to the Ombudsman, who referred him to Ms. Helen O'Bannon, Senior Vice President. Since then, charges of racial discrimination have been repeatedly over and over by the *DP* without substantiation. Ms. O'Bannon was quoted in the *DP* implying mismanagement, racism or both in DLAM. Neither Budd nor O'Bannon has given Dr. Shalev, Mr. Appell or Mr. Dupree opportunity to respond adequately to these charges of racial discrimination and mismanagement nor has there been evidence that they examined the books to substantiate the basis for disciplinary action against the animal caretakers.

Moreover, without properly investigating both sides of the problem, Mr. Budd publicly asked Dupree and Appell to resign, an action in which due process is clearly lacking. These men have been commanded by the Administration in the pages of *The Daily Pennsylvanian*. They were accused of attitudes and behavior which are unproven, but will form a negative mark on their records for future employment.

The latest chapter in this deplorable episode was summarized in the *DP* of April 17, 1985, and must be read by those who think we are running a University. Among other things it was stated that the Administration did not conduct a full investigation of the charges because it would stir up further charges and countercharges! Mr. Budd now ingenuously explains that Dupree and Appell "have not been found guilty of anything," nevertheless, they have been removed from their jobs, and Dr. Shalev will be expected to attend a workshop for interpersonal awareness, instead of spending his time, every minute of which is needed, in taking care of the animal facility. The President is quoted in the *DP* as saying that he was "very glad the situation is resolved to everybody's satisfaction." This writer is one person who is not satisfied, and I suspect there are many more.

There is another factor here. In addition to the harassment of Dr. Shalev, Mr. Appell and Mr. Dupree by the Office of Labor Relations and the Senior Vice President, Mr. Budd and Ms. O'Bannon have demoralized those many more who have been successful in breaking up the organization of DLAM which has been functioning well in recent years in its primary job—maintenance and care of experimental animals. For example, Dr. Shalev has recently been successful in obtaining an NIH grant to upgrade the diagnostic facilities at DLAM. They have been invaluable to me, and I am sure to other investigators. The research grants funded by NIH and awarded to Dr. A. C. Rosenquist and me are dependent on this animal facility. Hence one of the primary purposes of this university—research—has been undermined by this careless meddling of the Office of Labor Relations.

Those who should be removed from their jobs are Budd and O'Bannon. Here is mismanagement indeed.

—James M. Sprague
Joseph Ledyard Professor of Anatomy

**Ed. Note:** Right-of-reply was offered to Mr. Budd and Mrs. O'Bannon.

See also DLAM settlement agreement, p. 6 of this issue.
else be challenged. As a member of this faculty since 1961, I am well aware that a long-standing tradition implicit in the fund-raising activities of our professional schools has been the assumption that the alumni of our colleges (new SAS) who hold advanced degrees in professional schools were—and still are—assumed to be prospective donors to the professional schools and exclusively so. Furthermore, given this climate of opinion, it is scarcely surprising that the alumni of our professional schools frequently have been approached without regard for distinctions between their vocations and avocations, even when the latter aspect of their lives has been clearly a consuming passion. Let me cite two specific cases which are now past history. (1) If a successful graduate of one of our professional schools devotes his/her life to being a patron of the fine arts, it would seem logical to have taken this fact into account when offering an honorary degree and seeking this individual’s financial support, but both degree and proposal for support were focused exclusively on the individual’s vocational field—and both were refused. (2) If a graduate of the School of Arts and Sciences chooses to direct his or her gifts. Very few of the major alumni gifts are intended to treat them as Penn alumni whose interests are not necessarily concentrated on presenting technological and medical developments to the public’s interest in health care). With strong leadership from a new Dean of the University that it totally support on my departmental budget. The staffs in SAS and generous participation by the faculty, all of us in the central administration are committed to the cause.

The multi-million dollar Harvard College Campaign to which Professor Campbell refers does not cover only Arts and Sciences. Rather, it encompasses all of the elements at Harvard that touch undergraduates. In this sense, it roughly parallels our Building Penn’s Future agenda, not the SAS fundraising effort. Harvard, of course, at the undergraduate level is a bit simpler than Penn; it contains no business school, no nursing, and insignificant engineering. Therefore, Harvard’s Arts and Sciences benefits from greater academic homogeneity among its alumni.

No one in my office is satisfied with the level of fund-raising in behalf of the School of Arts and Sciences. In a subsequent Almanac article, I shall describe the successes and difficulties of SAS efforts. Suffice it to say at this point that the School of Arts and Sciences usually ranks fourth among the 12 schools at Penn. Because of its size and centrality to Penn, it ought to stand first or second (Medicine would be extremely difficult to exceed because of the public’s interest in health care). With strong leadership from a new Dean of SAS and generous participation by the faculty, all of us in the central administration are committed to the cause.

The author is Vice President for Development and University Relations.
Memorandum of Understanding on Division of Laboratory Animal Medicine

Preamble

The University's Administration has been actively seeking an understanding of the allegations raised by members of the collective bargaining unit in the Division of Laboratory Animal Medicine through the Ombudsman and The Daily Pennsylvanian. Meetings have been held under its auspices with the DLAM collective bargaining unit and the supervisory staff.

During the course of discussions with the involved parties it became clear that the members of the collective bargaining unit believed that the workplace rules had been arbitrarily enforced, that supervisory authority had not been well defined, and that respect for the dignity of the individual had somehow been lost. They believed that the supervisory actions were racially motivated.

On the other hand, the supervisory staff believed that it was acting in accordance with University and School policies and the terms of the collective bargaining agreement as they responded to the many criticisms both internally and externally of the quality of animal care and the physical condition of the workplace. This, in their opinion, required that the rules of the workplace and terms of the collective bargaining agreement be stringently enforced. They did not believe that their actions were racially motivated.

There were no simple answers to either position since the parties held steadfastly to their views. Thus, there was the prospect of continuing dissension and lack of harmony in this critically important Division that supports School of Medicine research. If an exhaustive investigation could prove the right or the wrong of the contentions, then it would be the proper course to follow, but the Administration is of the opinion that little would be accomplished by such an effort other than to harden positions and create further bitterness, charges and counter-charges. After considerable discussions, the Administration believes that the supervisory staff did not act from racial motives but did use a management style that gave the appearance of being insensitive.

The parties concluded that there must be a new beginning in the relationship between the supervisory staff and the members of the collective bargaining unit. This will require compromise and acts of good faith by all of the parties.

Items of Understanding

Accordingly, the University Administration, the School of Medicine, and the members of the collective bargaining unit wish to establish, under Dr. Moshe Shalev's leadership and the terms of the collective bargaining agreement, improved working relationships and a standard of animal care consistent with that defined by appropriate professional and federal agencies by taking the following actions:

1. That effective April 15, 1985, Mr. Robert F. Appell and Mr. Joseph Dupree shall no longer be assigned to DLAM. These actions are taken without prejudice to Mr. Appell and Mr. Dupree but recognize that they could no longer supervise effectively because of the working environment tensions with which they are identified.

2. That interpersonal awareness discussion and workshops shall be made available for all DLAM staff on a voluntary basis. Dr. Shalev, in the interest of improving the working relationship, will participate.

3. That all applicants for supervisory and administrative positions will be screened in accordance with University policy for interpersonal skills and attitudes essential to maintaining a positive work environment in which people are treated with dignity and respect. The Office of Affirmative Action would be actively involved in this screening process.

4. That an individual suitable to both the School of Medicine and the DLAM staff will monitor the interpersonal activities within the Division of Laboratory Animal Medicine until June 1, 1986. The candidates under consideration are: Dr. Jacqueline E. Wade, Administrative Director, Afro-American Studies and Dr. Helen O. Dickens, Associate Dean, Minority Affairs, Medical School.

5. That supervisory authority and responsibility in the Division of Laboratory Animal Medicine shall be explained to the members of the collective bargaining unit, particularly with respect to the role of Veterinary Technicians.

6. That participation in the training programs sponsored by the American Association for Laboratory Animal Science shall be encouraged. The completion of this training program shall be recognized with regards to promotion. The cost of participating in this training program shall be borne by the Division of Laboratory Animal Medicine.

7. That all disciplinary memora and or letters in the files of members of the collective bargaining unit in the departmental office of DLAM with a date of April 15, 1984, forward to April 15, 1985, shall be removed from the said member's files.

8. That all members of the collective bargaining unit currently in the classification of Animal Caretaker shall be upgraded, effective April 15, 1985, into the classification of Animal Laboratory Technician. This upgrading is done under the following understandings:
   a. That all members in the classification of Animal Laboratory Technician shall perform all of the duties associated with the classification of Animal Caretaker.
   b. That any Animal Caretaker who is upgraded to Animal Laboratory Technician and in their first year of employment, shall be paid in accordance with the terms and conditions of Article IV, RATES OF PAY, applicable to newly hired Animal Laboratory Technicians, as set forth in the Collective Bargaining Agreement dated June 1, 1984.
   c. That this upgrade does not affect any other term or condition set forth in the Collective Bargaining Agreement dated June 1, 1984, or any Understandings applicable thereto.
   d. That because of this upgrade of Animal Caretakers to Animal Laboratory Technician, the Union, Local 473, International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers, agrees to and herewith withdraws the grievance of Michael Smith concerning the denial of promotion from Animal Caretaker to Animal Laboratory Technician.
   e. That there shall be no retaliatory action against the members of the collective bargaining unit for their participation in the matter associated with this Memorandum of Understanding and/or any individual that supported the members in this matter.

Statement of Resolution

The parties acknowledge and agree, by their signatures below, that any and all of the allegations raised by the members of the collective bargaining unit have been investigated, discussed and resolved, consistent with the spirit of compromise and good faith, and with a view towards assisting in a new beginning in the relationships between the parties involved.

Signatures
For the University: George W. Budd
For the Staff of DLAM:  
Will Copeland  Jean Wilson
Enress Glover  Lisa Contino
John Gulledge  Michael Smith
John Quzack  Stanley Robinson
Will Robinson  Eileen Berry
For the School of Medicine: Dr. Harry J. Halley
For Local 473: Will Copeland, Chief Steward
Dated on this 16th day of April 1985

ALMANAC April 23, 1985
Spring Security Reminders

With the coming of spring and the shedding of winter wools comes a generally carefree feeling. But you need to make sure that does not turn into a careless attitude toward your safety and the security of your belongings. Remember: Thieves have the intent to steal but they need the opportunity.

1. Don't leave a bookbag or pocketbook unattended.
2. Don't leave rooms unlocked.
3. Don't leave valuables in plain sight or where they can be easily reached.
4. Be observant when you are just out at the copying machine or playing a video game, studying, or reading while sitting under a tree, know your surroundings and attend to your possessions.

On campus, anyone who sees suspicious behavior of any kind is urged to go immediately to a BlueLight Emergency Telephone and report it. No dialing is necessary. The line connects directly to Public Safety headquarters, and the dispatcher will send help immediately. Try to furnish the "who, what, where" details.

Though the evening is longer coming, it does get darker eventually. Don't be out alone at night. If it's a matter of getting home on-campus or to a University City location, take the PennBus (schedules available at Houston Hall and Room P-107 of the Franklin Building) or call Escort Service at 898-R-I-D-E (Ext. 4733).

—Ruth Wells
Department of Public Safety

FOR COMMENT

Rules Governing Final Examinations

1) No student may be required to take more than two final examinations on any one day during the period in which final examinations are scheduled.
2) No instructor may hold a final examination except during the official periods; the first week of the spring and fall semesters. Students must obtain permission from their dean's office to take a postponed exam. Instructors in all courses must be ready to offer a make-up examination to all students who were excused from the final examination.
3) Postponed examinations may be held only during the official periods; the first week of the spring and fall semesters. Students must obtain permission from their dean's office to take a postponed exam. Instructors in all courses must be ready to offer a make-up examination to all students who were excused from the final examination.
4) No instructor may change the time or date of a final exam without permission from the appropriate dean.
5) No instructor may increase the time allowed for a final exam beyond the scheduled two hours without permission from the appropriate dean.
6) No classes (covering new material) may be held during the reading period. Review sessions may be held.
7) All students must be allowed to see their final examination. Access to graded finals should be ensured for a period of one semester after the exam has been given.

In all matters relating to final exams, students with questions should first consult with their Dean's office. We encourage professors to be as flexible as possible in accommodating students with conflicting exam schedules.

—Thomas Ehrlich, Provost

Proposed Alcohol Policy

Introduction

The University of Pennsylvania seeks to encourage and sustain an academic environment that respects individual freedom and promotes the health, safety and welfare of all members of its community. In keeping with these objectives, the University has established the following policy governing the possession, sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages on the University campus, and conforming to the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (See attached summary of the Pennsylvania Liquor Code). Consistent with its educational mission, the University sponsors programs that promote awareness of the physical and psychological, social and behavioral effects of alcohol consumption. The University also assists its members in finding alternatives to alcoholic beverages for promoting social interaction and stress reduction, and it provides services and resources for community members who experience alcohol-related difficulties. Together, Penn's alcohol policy and programs are intended to encourage its members to make responsible decisions about the use of alcoholic beverages, and to promote safe, legal, and healthy patterns of social interaction.

Policy

1. The University permits lawful keeping and consumption, in moderation, of alcoholic beverages on its property by persons of legal drinking age (21 years or above).
2. The use of alcohol by members of the University community and external groups on University-owned property at University-sponsored events is governed by the following provisions:
   a. University funds may not be used to purchase alcoholic beverages that will be served to persons under the legal drinking age.
   b. Individuals or groups sponsoring University events should take reasonable measures to ensure that alcohol is not sold, served, or made available to persons who are under the legal drinking age, or to persons who are obviously inebriated.
   c. Publicity for University social events directed primarily toward students should not include advertising the availability of alcohol at these events.
3. Persons in charge of various University facilities should, in consultation with students and others, develop and implement guidelines and procedures consistent with this policy, for the use of alcoholic beverages in specific facilities.
4. While the University recognizes that alcohol plays a role in some social activities, it deplores its misuse and abuse. Alcohol consumption will not be considered an excuse for misconduct, but rather an aggravating factor to the misconduct in question.

Vice Provost James Bishop invites comment, to 112 College Hall/ICO, before the May 1 final meeting of University Council.

Resources

University Services

Any member of the University community experiencing alcohol-related problems or anyone concerned about another having such difficulty is strongly encouraged to consult any of the resources listed below. (Asterisk indicates strictly confidential services.)

A. For students:
   * University Counseling Service
     3611 Locust Walk/CA
     898-7021
   * Student Health Service
     1 Maloney, HUP
     662-2865
   * Student Health Psychiatry
     1 Maloney, HUP
     662-2860
   * BACCHUS Office of Student Life
     110 Houston Hall
     898-6533

B. For faculty/staff:
   * Faculty/Staff Assistance Program
     1220 Blockley/S1
     898-7910

Off-Campus Resources

The following organizations may also provide assistance to members of the University community or their families:

Alcoholics Anonymous
Central Office and Information Center
311 South Juniper Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
545-4023

Al-Anon Family Groups
4021 Walnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104
222-5244

Alcohol Concerns Committee

The Alcohol Concerns Committee provides information about alcohol-related issues, educational programming, and supportive resources. Direct inquiries should be addressed to the Committee at the Office of Student Life, 110 Houston Hall, Ext. 6533 or 6081.

Summary of Relevant Provisions of the Pennsylvania Liquor Code

The Pennsylvania Liquor Code controls the possession and sale of alcoholic beverages within the Commonwealth. According to the Code:

1. It is a summary offense for a person under twenty-one years of age to consume, possess, or transport any alcohol, liquor, or malt or brewed beverages.
2. It is unlawful to sell or give liquor or malt or brewed beverages to any minor (under twenty-one).
3. It is unlawful to transfer or to procure unlawfully a Liquor Control Board card.
4. It is a crime to misrepresent one's age knowingly and falsely to obtain intoxicating liquors or to represent that another is of legal age for such purpose.
5. It is also unlawful to lend, rent, or give a minor to purchase liquor.
6. Sales without a license or purchase from an unlicensed source of liquor or malt or brewed beverages are prohibited.
7. It is also unlawful to possess or transport liquor or alcohol within the Commonwealth unless it has been purchased from a state store or in accordance with L.C.B. regulations.
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U.S. Savings Bonds: A Campus Drive

Penn is holding a two-month U.S. Savings Bond Drive, which started April 1 and ends May 31 under the auspices of the Treasurer's Office. In response to the U.S. Bonds switch to a variable, market-based interest rate structure in November 1982, a spokesman for the Treasurer's Office said, major industries such as Penn are now actively recommending them to employees and holding drives such as this one. Mailings to individual employees emphasize the payroll deduction system, the small-investor appeal of the $25 start (for a $50 bond), and the fact that there is no pre-set ceiling (current rate is 10.94%) so series EE bonds can rise as high as others. But, as pointed out, there is a guaranteed minimum rate. Regardless of prevailing U.S. Treasury Securities yields, the EEs yield 7.5% if held five years. (Cashed sooner, they yield from 5.5% after one year to 7.5% after four-and-a-half. For accessibility of savings, the bonds can be cashed as soon as six months following purchase through most banks.)

"Before November 1982," said the spokesman, "the old bonds were stuck with a most non-competitive interest rate of 8.5% at a time when consumers could earn as much as 15% on certain deposits at their local banks. The new series EEs are pegged to 85% of the average yield of five-year U.S. Treasury Securities, if held five years. And, the 7.5% guaranteed minimum is a real safeguard should market rates drop sharply."

The packet now being mailed gives faculty and staff more information, plus a card to fill out for activating payroll deductions. For questions on the payroll procedures, contact Payroll Director Val Gossman at Ext. 1443. Additional details on the bonds themselves are available at the Federal Reserve of Philadelphia, Savings Bond Section, at 2301 Market St. Mondays through Fridays from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.

Comparing the Performance of Public and Private Family Planning Agencies in Colombia; Laura Roper, Ph.D. candidate in political science; 4 p.m., Anspach Lounge, Stiteler Hall (Political Science-International Relations Faculty-Graduate Student Colloquium Series).

27 Discussion with Choreographer Bella Lewitzky and Multi-Media Artist/Composer Donald Knapp; 1 p.m., Zeilerich Theatre, Annenberg Center Information: 924-3222 (Dance Affiliates, Annenberg Center, Philadelphia Dance Alliance).

SPECIAL EVENTS


TALKS

25 The Structure of Sanskrit Mystical Poetry; Dr. Barbara Stoler Miller, professor of oriental studies, Barnard College, Columbia University; 2 p.m., Room 305, Houston Hall (Seminar on Non-western Literature). The Impact of DRGs: Professionals’ Response; Dr. William Rial, immediate past president, American Medical Association; 4:30 p.m., auditorium, Colonial Penn Center (Leond Davis Institute Research and Policy Colloquium Series). Golden Nugget’s CEO Steve Wynn Discusses his Career in the Hotel and Casino Industry; 4:30 p.m., Room B-1, Meyerson Hall (Wharton Entrepreneurial Club). Writing the First Play: panel of distinguished playwrights and representatives from the Foundation of the Dramatists Guild including: Mary Rodgers, Terrance McNally, Ted Tally, Wendy Wasserstein, David E. LeVine, 5 p.m., Harold Prince Theatre, Annenberg Center, $3. Information: 222-5000 (Philadelphia Festival Theatre for New Plays). Basic Research in a Competitive Industry; Dr. William Brinkman, vice president for research, Sandia National Laboratories; 4:30 p.m., 1203 Steinberg Hall-Dietrich Hall (Department of Public Policy and Management). Drug and Neurotransmitter Receptors in the Brain; Dr. Solomon H. Snyder, distinguished professor of neurology, pharmacology, and psychiatry, National Institute of Mental Health; 5 p.m., Lecture Room 10, Leidy Labs (David Mahoney Institute of Neurological Sciences). The Concept of Anthropological Economics and its Applications; Professor Philippe J. Bernard, Ecole Polytechnique, France; 11 a.m., Room 285, McNeil Building. Spatial Averaging in Elevation Estimation of Multiple Consensus Surfaces; Dr. Stanislaw Kesler, associate professor, department of electrical and computer engineering, Drexel University; 11 a.m., Room 216, Moore School (Valle Forge Research Center Seminar, Electrical Engineering Dept.).

FITNESS/LEARNING

Career Planning & Placement

30 How to Make Penn Work for You: Tuesday Group for Women Administrators; 1 p.m., Benjamin Franklin Room, Houston Hall.

F/S Assistance Program

24 Stepping into a Step Family; Social worker Laura Schneider will discuss issues and resources for blended families; noon, 1227 Blockley Hall.

Microcomputer Services

25 Apple II Family User Group Meeting; 4 p.m., Room 305, Houston Hall. Information: 662-1070.
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