NIH Suspension of Head Injury Project

Following is the text of a news release issued Friday, October 4, by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services:

HHS Secretary Margaret M. Heckler today announced that the National Institutes of Health has notified the University of Pennsylvania that funding to the Head Injury Clinical Research Center involving research on primates will remain under suspension.

The National Institutes of Health has not restored funding because a thorough review of the situation of the HICRC determined that the Pennsylvania researchers failed materially to comply with the conditions of their grant with respect to the care and use of non-human primates,” Secretary Heckler said.

On July 18, 1985, I instructed NIH to suspend the funding to the head injury laboratory when a preliminary report from an NIH investigative team determined the laboratory had violated standards established in the NIH Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals, and agreed to by the university.”

In a recent letter (see attached), Dr. James Wyngaarden, director of the National Institutes of Health, notified the University of Pennsylvania of several major actions that must be taken to determine its ability to maintain the high quality of research demanded by NIH.

"The University of Pennsylvania has itself independently taken action against the laboratory based in part on our investigation. Dr. Wyngaarden's letter instructs the university to conduct an institution-wide evaluation of NIH-funded research involving animals to ensure compliance with NIH animal welfare requirements. NIH will verify this evaluation through site visits involving outside consultants," Secretary Heckler said.

"Head injury is the leading cause of death and severe disability for individuals from age 1 to 40. Continued research in this area is critical if we are to better understand the effects of head injury and improve techniques to treat it. But our biomedical research, which requires the use of animals to develop the essential medical strategies and devices that are critical to the saving of human life and the well-being of people all over the world, must be done humanely.

"The University of Pennsylvania HICRC must meet that civilized test. The Department of Health and Human Services will tolerate nothing less than total compliance with NIH animal welfare requirements, which are designed to ensure that animals will only be used when scientifically necessary, and that when they are used they will be cared for in a humane manner."

On campus, Dean Edward Stemmmer of the School of Medicine said the requirement to file a new Animal Welfare Assurance is not unique to the Head Injury Project here, but will apply to all institutions beginning the first of the year:

"The NIH report "does not differ significantly from the University's own report (Almanac, September 3)," the Dean said, "and this attests to the validity of our committee. Where there is a difference of opinion, on control of anesthesia, it is acknowledged in the NIH report."

Women's Center: Ellie DiLapi

Elena M. DiLapi, who has been acting director of the Penn Women's Center since April, has been named director, Dr. James H. Bishop, vice provost for University life, announced Monday.

Ms. Di Lapi (left), a 1975 graduate of SUNY at Stony Brook who took her MSW from Penn in 1977, has been a counselor in Penn's Faculty-Staff Assistance Program and field supervisor and lecturer at Social Work, as well as a consultant on management systems and staff relations for several companies and organizations in the area. From 1974 to 1979 she was training coordinator of Planned Parenthood, and earlier was director of the Women's Health Concerns Program of Philadelphia. She was also a member of the Bicentennial Women's Center staff in 1976.

Ms. Di Lapi has published on sex education for teens and children, and has a forthcoming publication called Between a Rock and a Hard Place: When Race and Sexism Interact in Post Secondary Education. Among her honors have been the Alumni Recognition Award of SSW, the Distinguished Community Service Award at Stony Brook, and alumni awards at Nassau County Community College where she studied earlier.

A search committee headed by Placement Director Patricia Rose nominated Di Lapi to the post, which reports to the VPUL but serves faculty and staff as well as students. "People from all over campus came to us with unsolicited praise for her efforts over the past few months," Ms. Rose said. "I know I speak for everyone on the committee when I say we are all delighted she will be the director."
On Faculty Salaries and University Budgets

During the last few weeks I spent some time studying the budgets of the University for the fiscal years 1984, 1985 and 1986, and then, to some extent the trends on resource allocation within the University since 1973. The tables that I used were the ones that have been given to the trustees and a compilation produced by the Comptroller’s Office in 1983. What I found I believe is of direct interest to our faculty, and for this reason I decided to write the following paragraphs.

The Fiscal Year 1986 is a better year for faculty salaries. The total budget for faculty salaries from the unrestricted funds (teaching) was increased by 8.06%, something for which the faculty leadership fought very hard to accomplish. The President and the Provost have seen the dire need and responded accordingly, something for which they should receive the proper recognition. Still, however, the needs in many departments, and even schools, have not been met and therefore there is an immense need for FY 1987 to repeat the record of this year. The Faculty Senate leadership, including the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty is working hard on this problem and is in continuing communication with the administration.

However, there are several other significant items that need to be noticed. Although the teaching salary budget increased by 8.06%, the unrestricted funds budget increased by only 7.85% bringing the overall faculty salary budget increase to 7.98%. In contrast, the administrative (A-1) salaries budget increase for the University was an incredible 12.66% (which corresponds to 11% increase in unrestricted funds and 15.3% increase in restricted funds). Clearly, between FY 1985 and FY 1986 the administrative salaries budget increased by 59% more than the faculty salaries budget. Interestingly, even the support staff (A-3) salaries budget increased by 8.9%, or 11% more than the faculty salaries budget. In all cases the budget increases include both personnel increases and salary increases. Trying to find out where the A-1 salaries budget increased so much, one is bound to notice that the lion’s share of A-1 increases were in the Administrative Service Centers (Student Services, General Administration, General Institutional Expense, Operation & Maintenance, net space) which had an increase of 12.2% in the A-1 budget.

The faculty salaries are divided into two, the teaching salaries (unrestricted funds), and the research salaries (restricted funds). The research salary is always based on research projects secured by the faculty. In FY 1986 the research budget is $101 million covering $38 million in faculty salaries and $39 million in overhead. The teaching salary is $61.4 million. These $61.4 million represent 18.21% of total unrestricted University budget, 61.4/337.5 (excluding the hospital and clinical practice) and in FY 1986 it was down by half of one percent of what it was in FY 1985!

Interestingly enough the straight teaching salary budget of the faculty ($61.4 million) is so little that it can easily be equated in FY 1986 with simply the research overhead ($39 million), the special student fees ($17 million) and other miscellaneous general revenue ($6.8 million). If one adds the employee benefits (about 30% of salaries), then one would need to add a portion of the Commonwealth appropriations ($27.4 million) to cover all the faculty teaching expenses. In other words, the faculty pays for a major part of its teaching, and for all of its research. Student tuition ($165.6 million), gifts, donations, investment income, and everything else, can cover all kinds of expenses, but certainly are not needed, or used, to cover faculty salaries in this university!

The trends in the University since 1973 also show a disturbing direction. The ratio of total (teaching and research) faculty salaries budget to the entire salaries budget of the University was in FY 1973 52.7%, it declined to 47.7% by FY 1980, and declined again to 47.2% by FY 1986. This can be explained by noticing that the ratio of administrative salaries budget (A-1) to faculty salaries budget was only 25.9% in FY 1973, but rose to 47.7% in FY 1980, and to a record of 53.3% in FY 1986! These numbers represent a resource allocation pattern that is characterized by a continuously increasing administrative function in the University, in a period in which the educational function of the University has been held almost constant in size, and steadily reduced in comparison with the level of total University activities.

The table that follows includes the actual numbers of these comparisons and some additional aspects of the trends. From the entries it is clear that the growth of the administrative salaries budgets far outstripped all other salary budgets. The period 1973-80 is, of course, most notable for these increases, but the period 1980-86 is still following the same trends. On other items it is of great interest to notice the disproportionate increase of the budget of the Administrative Resource Centers for both periods 1973-80 and 1980-86. All four major expense items in this group increase far above faculty budgets and for the period 1980-86 far above the University budget, especially in comparison with the growth of the unrestricted University budgets. Notice also that the proportion of the total faculty salaries (restricted and unrestricted) budget to the total University budget, which in FY 1973 was 28.15%, has continued declining since then by almost one percent per year.

In my view the increase of faculty salaries should be a crucial objective this year. In addition, a fundamental review of the trends is needed. The Senate Committees on the Economic Status of the Faculty and on Administration will be doing this year some work along these lines, but it seems that much more effort will be needed from the administration. Both the Faculty Senate and the administration will be greatly aided by an open and sincere discussion on the trends the University follows. The views of the faculty on what are the preferred directions and on the appropriate role and size that the educational function should occupy in this university will be most important in any determination that will have to be made by the administration in the immediate future.

Anthony R. Tomazinis

Response: Provost Thomas Ehrlich notes that the above was received too late for his response in this issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selective University Expenditures Items</th>
<th>Budget Entries</th>
<th>% Add. Growth of Each Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fac. Sal. (Teach. &amp; Res.) (A-2)</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Administrative salaries (A-1)</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Total Salaries (A-1-2-3)</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>133.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Administrative Resource Ctrs.</td>
<td>25.6*</td>
<td>49.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Faculty Services</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. General Administration</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. General Exp.</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. General Exp.</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Libraries</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Total University Budget</td>
<td>167.0</td>
<td>266.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Unrestricted</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>106.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Restricted**</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Research Only</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* It does not include space allocations which in 1985 was 2.0 and in 1986 was 2.3
** Excluding hospital and clinical practice.
*** Restricted for 1973 and 1980 include only research while for 1985 and 1986 include also "other restricted."
SEC Action Taken October 2, 1985

The Senate Executive Committee during its regular meeting of October 2, 1985, discussed the recent speech on campus by Mr. Jamil Muhammad. After an extensive discussion, which at times was quite heated, emotional and full of anger, those present passed the following resolution on a vote 12:13, with the Chair breaking the final tie vote.

"The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate of the University of Pennsylvania depletes the lecture of Mr. Muhammad on September 24, 1985. We are committed to the principles of free speech on campus, and also consider it appropriate to criticize those who exercise the right of free speech in a manner which violates the most fundamental standards of this academic community. The reviling of individuals or groups on the basis of their religion or race is incompatible with the purposes of the University."

Speaking Out

Provocation and Responsibility

On September 25 The Daily Pennsylvanian reported a speech by Jamil Muhammad that other things contained an assertion that "Jews are chosen too—for the damn hellfire for telling all those lies they've been spreading." As described, that performance was a provocation, designed to generate hatred of one group of students against another.

That there are people on campus who incite hatred and fear is a serious problem; but the problem can be greatly exacerbated by the conduct of people in positions of responsibility. The next day Vice Provost Bishop was quoted as saying he hoped in the same spirit as last year "the speech and related concerns can be discussed." He also said, "Some of the dialogue of last year were very beneficial to members of the Jewish faith and those of Afro-American heritage."

If the Vice Provost was quoted accurately, he does not understand that a dialogue requires a minimum of rationality and mutual respect. But what is more disturbing is that there was no statement condemning that speech from an official whose responsibility is the welfare of all of our students.

—Henry Teune
Professor of Political Science

Why No Response?

On Yom Kippur, September 25, 1985, Jews and non-Jews were shocked to see statements reminiscent of Hitler reported on the front page of The Daily Pennsylvanian. If the invitation of the Nation of Islam Spokesman Jamil Muhammad to DuBois House was indeed "educationally appropriate" (to quote Lorenzo Holloway of the Black Student League) then why did we not read that quote Lorenzo Holloway of the Black Student League?

If the invitation of the Nation of Islam Spokesman Jamil Muhammad to DuBois House was indeed "educationally appropriate" (to quote Lorenzo Holloway of the Black Student League) then why did we not read that quote Lorenzo Holloway of the Black Student League?

—Ralph R. Smith, Assistant Professor Law

Departure for SEC

We observe with astonishment the Faculty Senate Executive Committee's resolution of October 2, 1985, deploring the speech made by Mr. Jamil Muhammad. This action is an extraordinary departure from SEC's usual inaction on matters of social oppression and discrimination on campus. We note that when a legitimate campus issue of racial harassment and degradation was in the forefront of campus life in the spring of 1985, SEC was stonily silent about the racism that was so apparent to perceptive observers. On numerous other occasions, speakers who were considered by some to be racist, sexist, or homophobic have been brought to campus. In these instances, SEC took no action, nor did it voice a single sentiment in protest or condemnation.

We can only conclude that this SEC resolution regarding this particular speaker reflects a degree of morally abject selectivity that is consistent with a history of institutional racism.

—Elias Burstein, Mary Amanda Wood Professor of Physics

Peer Harassment and the Law

In the September 25, 1985, The Daily Pennsylvanian report on the University's response to the sexual harassment survey, President Hackney is reported to have said, "According to the legal definition there can be no harassment between peers." And, "legally, harassment has to occur between someone in a position of authority and someone in a lesser position." By this view, female undergraduates harassed by male undergraduates, or female staff or faculty members, harassed by male colleagues have only a moral and ethical complaint but not a legal one. This statement of the law is inaccurate.

Under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, unwelcome sexual advances by co-workers is sex discrimination if submission to this treatment is made a condition of employment, a basis of employment decisions, or if it unreasonably interferes with work performance, or creates an "intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment." While an employer is liable for harassment by superiors regardless of its knowledge of the harassment, in the case of co-worker harassment the employer is liable when it "knows or should have known of the conduct unless it can show that it took immediate and appropriate corrective action." Therefore, the employment discrimination law recognizes that illegal sex harassment includes sexual overreaching by co-workers or colleagues.

The Title VII sexual harassment rules are grounded on the reality that the social context in which work is performed, including a context of systematic sexual harassment, can create a system of sexual privilege just as effectively as do overt rules that allocate jobs or benefits on the basis of sex.

The federal statute directly relevant to sexual harassment of students by other students is Title IX of the Civil Rights Act which prohibits sex-based discrimination in federally-funded education programs. While the courts have not yet definitely ruled on Title IX's applicability to co-student harassment, the underlying general equality concern are the same as in the employment area.

Responses: Space has been offered to members of the University who are mentioned in the letters above, and some have indicated that they may respond next week.—Ed.
Response on Harassment

I plead guilty to having made an incau-
tious statement and appreciate the brief on
behalf of accuracy filed by the law faculty. I
also very much appreciate the fact that Pro-
fessor Kerr called me to discuss the situa-
tion; that is a collegial act that deserves
notice and emulation.

As interesting as the question may be
about when the principles worked out for
the workplace might judicially be extended
to the academic context, and under what
circumstances co-student harassment might
constitute a violation of law, I believe the
most fundamental question is how members
of the University community can deal with
each other in humane and supportive ways.

There are clearly kinds of behavior that
must be defined, proscribed and punished,
but we should never lose sight of the fact
that our goal must be to provide a setting
in which all individuals can flourish and benefit
to the greatest extent possible from the mar-
velous opportunities that are available in the
University.

We should all be aware that our own
behavior, either as equals or as persons with
some form of authority, may impair a stu-
dent's academic experience and we should
avoid that kind of inappropriate behavior
whether or not it is officially proscribed.

We also must formally and informally
discourage all forms of sexual misconduct
and harassment. I hope that the current dis-
cussion of the sexual harassment survey will
increase the awareness on the campus of the
importance of this set of issues.

—Sheldon Hackney, President

Excerpts from NIH Findings on Head Injury Research Project

In a letter to Dean Edward Stemmle dated
September 23, 1985, Dr. James B. Wyngaarden,
director of U.S. Public Health Service, summarized
the NIH's report leading to the announcement of suspension (page 1, this issue).

Dr. Wyngaarden outlined and commented on the principle failings found in the Head Injury Clinical Research Project at Penn; conditions for reapplying for funding; and special conditions to be followed in the event of refunding.

Five Failings:

1. Management of anesthesia, analgesia, and sedation varied to an unacceptable degree.

2. Survival surgery was conducted in a facility that is not equipped for aseptic surgery; and procedures were carried out in the absence of aseptic techniques.

3. Experiments involving animals were not performed under the immediate supervision of a qualified biological or medical scientist; and assistants were either less than adequately or improperly trained to perform important procedures involving animals.

4. Staff members failed to maintain high standards of cleanliness, to wear appropriate laboratory clothing; and to refrain from eating, smoking or drinking during the conduct of laboratory experiments involving animals.

5. Adequate records of health status and care of animals were not available; and the staff veterinarian was not sufficiently involved in the choice of and/or use of anesthetics, analgesics and other pharmacologic agents.

Dr. Wyngaarden noted that Penn had accepted four of the five findings but disputed the fifth. “I recognize that the evidence available is not conclusive and that variations of opinion on the adequacy of anesthesia . . . exist,” he said. “Nevertheless, I conclude that the weight of evidence points to at least a few instances of inadequate pharmacologic management of the animals, especially when taken into account the adjudged inadequacies with respect to the training and supervision of laboratory personnel.”

NIH will not consider any request for refunding of the head injury project involving nonhuman primates, he went on, without . . .

Three Conditions:

1. The University shall file a new Animal Welfare Assurance and obtain approval from the OPRR in accordance with the recently revised Public Health Service (PHS) Policy. Prior to any consideration for the approval of the Assurance document, the OPRR shall conduct a site visit, with the assistance of expert consultants as appropriate, to assess whether or not the University's programs and facilities for the care and use of laboratory animals are consonant with the requirements of the PHS Policy and the University's Assurance.

2. The University shall provide evidence that, through its Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee, it has remedied all unacceptable practices involving research animals as described in the OPRR Evaluation Report. As part of the process of evaluating the evidence submitted by the University, the OPRR and the National Institute of Neurological and Communicative Disorders and Stroke (NINCDS), with the assistance of expert consultants as appropriate, shall be jointly responsible for the conduct of a full inspection of the Experimental Head Injury Laboratory. This inspection will include assessment of both the adequacy of implementation of the research protocol and the adequacy of compliance with the PHS Policy. The Directors of OPRR and NINCDS shall report their findings and recommendations to me.

3. The University shall provide to the OPRR evidence from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) that its charges against the University have been fully resolved.

Should NINCDS then elect to resume funding of head injury research involving nonhuman primates, special conditions would obtain for five years:

Four Special Conditions:

1. NINCDS scientific and technical merit site visits to the Laboratory shall include a veterinarian trained in laboratory animal science who shall, together with the other site visitors, determine and document that procedures and practices in the Laboratory meet the standards set forth in the Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals (Guide).

2. All videotapes of research in the Laboratory shall be provided to NINCDS on a quarterly basis. NINCDS shall evaluate the tapes for compliance with the standards of the Guide, and report the results of that evaluation to OPRR.

3. The University of Pennsylvania shall be formally notified that a USDA determination of violation of the Animal Welfare Act shall result in the automatic suspension of the institution's PHS Animal Welfare Assurance, or portions thereof, as determined by OPRR; and,

4. OPRR shall conduct unannounced inspections of the Laboratory to assess compliance with the PHS Policy.

The full text of the NIH Decision on the Grant-Supported Experimental Head Injury Laboratory at the University of Pennsylvania is scheduled for publication next week. —Ed.
The Research Fund: January 3, 1986, Deadline

The Research Fund, initiated in September 1984, is intended to selectively strengthen and stimulate research programs at the University of Pennsylvania. The Fund encourages application by younger faculty members and by other faculty who are exploring new research initiatives. The Fund supports proposals that are unique and excellent in quality and that have potential for making seminal contributions. Applications for awards in the range of approximately $10,000 to $50,000 are encouraged from individual faculty members, departments, centers, and institutes. Awards will be made on a competitive basis by the Research Fund Committee.

Research Fund support will focus on several areas of need. These include:

- Matching funds, vis-à-vis external grant sources;
- Seed money for exploratory research programs; equipment requests may be included;
- Support for interdisciplinary research initiatives;
- Faculty release-time.

Proposals should take the form of mini-grant applications up to 10 single-space pages in length. An original and 10 copies of the proposal should be submitted to the Vice Provost for Research, 106 College Hall, by January 3, 1986. The following format is suggested, although it is recognized that it may not be appropriate for every proposal.

I. Cover Page (must include):
   1. Names, Title, Department, School, signature of Department Chairperson and Dean.
   2. Title of proposal.

   **Please note that requests for student tuition and dissertation fees are not appropriate categories under this fund. Computer hardware and software requests should be directed to the funding mechanisms established by the Office of the Vice Provost for Computing. However, requests for hardware and software may be considered by the Fund in the event that alternative funds are not available.

   In response to Dr. Sherman Frankel's Speaking Out Letter of September 24, raising issues in research policy, Vice Provost for Research Barry Cooperman and ORA Director Anthony Merritt publish for the campus at large a memorandum sent September 17 to the deans, department chairs and principal investigators on grants now in hand at the University.

A Memorandum on 'Star Wars' Research

The current administration's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), more commonly known as "Star Wars," has generated intense debate about its technical practicality as well as its strategic effectiveness. Since a significant amount of SDI funding has been earmarked for support of basic research at universities, it is not inconceivable that Star Wars may have an equally controversial impact on Penn.

In March, the newly established SDI organization hosted a meeting to announce a budget of approximately $2 billion to be spent (subject to Congressional approval) over the next five years on R&D of interest to SDI. Of this, some $14 million in 1985 and $70 million in 1986 would be awarded to universities. The Innovative Science and Technology Office (IST) has been established under SDI to (a) pursue from scientific feasibility to the engineering proof-of-principle stage, highly innovative, high risk concepts that could have a revolutionary impact on SDI and (b) mount a mission oriented, basic research program that drives the cutting edge of the nation's science and engineering effort in a direction that supports existing SDI technical thrusts and points the way for future new initiatives. IST will enlist the assistance of all elements of the research community including universities to reach its objectives. Support will be available through individual grants as well as large research consortia.

While there may be opportunities for Penn faculty to become involved in relevant basic research projects supported by SDI, there are some very real concerns about the program to which we must be alert.

1. There is a high probability that SDI funded research could be subject to classification, if not at the outset, then sometime later in the course of the work. University policy prohibits the acceptance of contracts that are classified. Under current DOD procurement policy, we are able to terminate, without prejudice, projects which become classified during their performance. If, as have been advised, SDI/IST does not permit this latter course, the University would be unable to accept an award even though it was not initially classified.

2. As might be expected, the results of an SDI funded project may ultimately be utilized in national defense systems which are highly classified, and thus we must anticipate attempts by the government to impose publication restrictions on the research. A recent memorandum from the Director, IST, indicated that normally university projects supported by IST will be treated as "fundamental research" and will not carry any restrictions on publication. However, "where there is likelihood of disclosing operational capabilities and performance characteristics of planned or developing military systems, or technologies unique and critical to defense programs, the contract will stipulate that the responsibility for the release of information resulting from IST research belongs to the sponsoring office." A contract falling into this category would not be acceptable under University policy.

3. While SDI projects may not be classified, it is likely that principal investigators will need to obtain security clearances in order to gain access to relevant classified background data. It should be noted the University does not maintain a facility for security clearance and therefore cannot assist in the clearance process nor provide facilities to receive, store or safeguard classified information. Faculty members wishing to obtain a security clearance must make such arrangements through the sponsoring agency.

4. There will likely be pressure to restrict the participation of foreign nationals in SDI funded projects. If so, this could have a direct impact on graduate students and other personnel who might wish to work on such projects and might prevent acceptance of such support by the University.

While the University has policies in effect which address these issues, the potential for significant policy problems to occur during the submission, review and negotiation of SDI projects dictate careful scrutiny of those involved in the normal proposal/award approval process. Questions or concerns about this initiative and its potential impact on the University should be addressed to the Vice Provost for Research, the Chairman of the Committee on Research, or the Director, Sponsored Programs.

Anthony Merritt, Director, Office of Research Administration

To Comment on "Star Wars" Research Policy

The University Council Committee on Research expects to conduct general discussion on research policy with respect to the SDI research described above and in Dr. Sherman Frankel's letter to Speaking Out in Almanac September 24. Members of the University who wish to convey their views may send them to the 1985-86 chair of the Research Committee:

Dr. Trevor Penning
Department of Pharmacology
106 MED/G3

ALMANAC October 8, 1985
ZIP + 4: Why and How to Use It

Nationwide, the U.S. Postal Service is adding four-digit “sorting codes” to Zip codes of high-volume mailers and receivers of mail. The Service’s new automated equipment will read these new Zip+4 codes more rapidly. Further speed-up of delivery may come from a reduction in the glut of mass mail as big firms and mailing houses clean up their lists during the conversion to Zip+4: one reportedly reduced its list from 13 million to 7 million pieces.

Penn is one of the largest organizations that is adding the four digits, Penn Mail Service Manager David Sherman has announced. “We have a year’s transition period to get the codes onto our letterheads, directories and mailing lists in place of the familiar building codes we’ve been using,” said Mr. Sherman, “but that year will go by very quickly so we are starting now to convert.” Below, he explains . . .

How Zip + 4 Works

For outside mail, the Postal Service is simply adding four digits to our Zip code 19104. (U.S. mailcarriers deliver our outside mail direct to the central mailroom at the Franklin Building.) So, just as we all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>New Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Programs</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>37th &amp; Hamilton Wk</td>
<td>1st Fl</td>
<td>6001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Department</td>
<td>Steinberg/Dietrich Hall</td>
<td>3620 Locust Wk</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>6002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring</td>
<td>Franklin Bldg</td>
<td>3415 Walnut St</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>6003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>College Hall</td>
<td>Levy Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allergy &amp; Immunology</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>37th &amp; Hamilton Wk</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>6005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Relations/Conflicting Ed.</td>
<td>Dental School</td>
<td>4001 Spruce St</td>
<td>S 3</td>
<td>6006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatomy</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>37th &amp; Hamilton Wk</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>6007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatomy (Vet)</td>
<td>Veterinary School</td>
<td>M 506</td>
<td>6008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatomical Pathology</td>
<td>Veterinary School</td>
<td>37th &amp; Hamilton Wk</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>6009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Breeding</td>
<td>Veterinary School</td>
<td>37th &amp; Hamilton Wk</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>6010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>University Museum</td>
<td>325 South St</td>
<td>6011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatomy</td>
<td>David Rittenhouse Lab</td>
<td>209 S 33rd St</td>
<td>6012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial Records</td>
<td>Franklin Bldg</td>
<td>3425 Spruce St</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>6013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biddle Law Library</td>
<td>Law School</td>
<td>100 S 34th St</td>
<td>6014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry (Vet)</td>
<td>Veterinary School</td>
<td>3800 Spruce St</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>6015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry/Biophysics</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>37th &amp; Hamilton Wk</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>6016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioengineering</td>
<td>Tower Building</td>
<td>209 S 33rd St</td>
<td>6017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Graduate Studies</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>37th &amp; Hamilton Wk</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>6018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Library</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>3415 Walnut St</td>
<td>6 Fl</td>
<td>6019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursar</td>
<td>Franklin Bldg</td>
<td>3415 Walnut St</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>6020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Center</td>
<td>Vare Hall</td>
<td>3720 Spruce St</td>
<td>4 Fl</td>
<td>6021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Office</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>37th &amp; Hamilton Wk</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>6022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebrovascular Research Unit</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>37th &amp; Hamilton Wk</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>6023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplin’s Office</td>
<td>Quadrangle Dorms</td>
<td>3700 Spruce St</td>
<td>6024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>Towne Building</td>
<td>210 S 33rd St</td>
<td>311A</td>
<td>6025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Epidemiology Unit</td>
<td>Nursing Educ. Bldg</td>
<td>3850 Spruce St</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>6026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Scholars</td>
<td>Nursing Educ. Bldg</td>
<td>3850 Spruce St</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>6027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of General Studies</td>
<td>Logan Hall</td>
<td>249 S 33rd St</td>
<td>6028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Facility</td>
<td>Franklin Bldg</td>
<td>3425 Spruce St</td>
<td>3 Fl</td>
<td>6029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Information Science</td>
<td>Moore School</td>
<td>200 S 33rd St</td>
<td>6030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Office</td>
<td>College Hall</td>
<td>Levy Park</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>6031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Office SEAS</td>
<td>Towne Building</td>
<td>209 S 33rd St</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>6032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Sciences</td>
<td>Steinberg/Dietrich Hall</td>
<td>3620 Locust Wk</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>6033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental School Library</td>
<td>Dental School</td>
<td>37th &amp; Hamilton Wk</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>6034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dermatology</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>3415 Walnut St</td>
<td>6 Fl</td>
<td>6035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>37th &amp; Hamilton Wk</td>
<td>B-79</td>
<td>6036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Laboratory Animal Medicine</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>3415 Walnut St</td>
<td>6 Fl</td>
<td>6037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>McNeil Bldg</td>
<td>3800 Spruce St</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>6038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>Moore School</td>
<td>209 S 33rd St</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>6039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Franklin Bldg</td>
<td>3425 Walnut St</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>6040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endocrine Section</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>37th &amp; Hamilton Wk</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>6041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Program for Foreign Students</td>
<td>Bennett Hall</td>
<td>3340 Walnut St</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Department</td>
<td>Bennett Hall</td>
<td>3340 Walnut St</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Medicine Institute of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>37th &amp; Hamilton Wk</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Management</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>37th &amp; Hamilton Wk</td>
<td>B-8</td>
<td>6045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Planning</td>
<td>Franklin Bldg</td>
<td>3425 Walnut St</td>
<td>3 Fl</td>
<td>6046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Economics</td>
<td>Steinberg/Dietrich Hall</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>6047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Faculty</td>
<td>College Hall</td>
<td>Levy Park</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison Department of Surgical Research</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>37th &amp; Hamilton Wk</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>6049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History Department</td>
<td>College Hall</td>
<td>Levy Park</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>6050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Genetics</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>3415 Walnut St</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>6051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Franklin Bldg</td>
<td>3425 Walnut St</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>6052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Research Unit</td>
<td>Vare Hall</td>
<td>3725 Spruce St</td>
<td>3 Fl</td>
<td>6053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infectious Diseases Section</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>37th &amp; Hamilton Wk</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>6054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Neurological Science</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>3415 Walnut St</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>6055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Publications Office will automatically add the +4 to any printed pieces done there: stationery, cards, forms, brochures, catalogs and periodicals. But anyone responsible for printing done elsewhere (a professional journal edited here, stationary one maintains as an officer in an off-campus society) should remember to add the four digits.

The code assigned to each department will be moved into the personnel record of each present faculty and student member by data processing. Beginning November 1, the code will be printed on Personnel Action Forms at the end of line B-3. It is not necessary for business administrators to submit mail codes for current staff. Beginning November 1, however, business administrators should write the new mail code for new appointees in the position JUST TO THE RIGHT OF BOX 74 ON LINE B-3.

On campus, the importance of the four-digit code is to speed up delivery and to minimize rerouting of mail. The digits have not been assigned arbitrarily, but are arranged to help sort and bundle quickly the 80,000 pieces that come in and out of the central mailroom in a week.

### Building Mail Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Department/School</th>
<th>New Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3400 Walnut St</td>
<td>3400 Walnut St</td>
<td>Vice President Facilities Management</td>
<td>3400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3700 Market St</td>
<td>3700 Market St</td>
<td>West Campus Residence</td>
<td>3700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3701 Chestnut St</td>
<td>3701 Chestnut St</td>
<td>Wharton Administrative Services</td>
<td>3701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3732 Locust Wk</td>
<td>3732 Locust Wk</td>
<td>Wharton Entrepreneurial Center</td>
<td>3732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4015 Walnut St</td>
<td>4015 Walnut St</td>
<td>Wharton Evening School</td>
<td>4015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000 Market St</td>
<td>3000 Market St</td>
<td>Wharton Executive Education Div</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6100</td>
<td>6100</td>
<td>Wharton External Affairs</td>
<td>6100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6107</td>
<td>6107</td>
<td>Wharton Graduated Admissions</td>
<td>6107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6108</td>
<td>6108</td>
<td>Wharton Graduate Division</td>
<td>6108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6109</td>
<td>6109</td>
<td>Wharton Graduate Placement</td>
<td>6109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6110</td>
<td>6110</td>
<td>Wharton Administration</td>
<td>6110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To find your code . . . or someone else's:
- First check the departmental codes listed on the facing page. If the department is not listed there . . .
- Locate the building code on the list below.

In the forthcoming campus telephone directory, the green pages will contain the lists shown here, in lieu of the building code lists we now have; but the white and yellow pages will take longer to update.

In the meantime, these two pages are laid out to fit into the present directory: Just clip or photocopy them, trim off this introduction, and tape them into the green pages. Note that this list contains a few changes since the Penn Mail Service initially announced the new codes in The Penn Paper a few weeks ago.

If Penn Mail Service can assist you in any way with this conversion, please get in touch with me at Ext. 8-8655.

—David Sherman, Manager, Penn Mail Service
The Model of Integrity

David Goddard was provost during what was an exciting time for higher education. It was a time when Black consciousness was emerging, women's rights were coming to the fore, and the Vietnam war was coloring everything with corrosive conflict. There was, in particular, the question of secret research raised by the war—the Sperry and Summit contracts—very knotty issues for a consensual and collegial community. Yet, the Provost and the faculty worked out a solution that has remained our policy ever since—and wise policy it is, too.

It was also the time of the great sit-in, resolved with less disruption than at other universities—not because of student apathy, but because of genuine responsiveness on the part of the adult community. Those were tough times to be in a leadership position in a great university, but Dave Goddard was more than equal to the task. We was a huge success. We had it. He was tough but fair, and he was absolutely dedicated to the central values of the University, to academic freedom and the unfeathered exchange of ideas, values that are under constant pressure because they stand in the way of orthodoxies of all kinds. He wrote about academic freedom in clear and forceful language that remains an inspiration and a guide to all of us who follow in his footsteps at Penn or anywhere the search for knowledge is pursued with passion and at the highest level of quality.

His provostship was also a time of growing social concern, when urban universities—Penn among them—were caught in the cleft stick of needing to expand and being viewed as a threat by the local community. But David Goddard's contribution to expansion at the University was mainly in the building of programs whose "outward and visible sign" was and is an array of buildings: for the humanities, the social sciences, and the educational activities of the University Museum. The one for which he probably worked hardest was named in his honor and graces our south campus as one of Penn's most distinguished buildings.

He will be missed, but he will be remembered.

—from the tribute of Sheldon Hackney

The Revealing Scientist

If I were to attempt to epitomize David's character, I would start with the word fearless: second, honest; third, loyal; and fourth, dedicated. David's early career and contributions to science in later life were punctuated by these remarkable qualities that took him first through Berkeley, to Rockefeller Institute, Rochester, and on to Penn with the blossoming of his scientific and administrative career. Many anecdotes are told about his entry into unorthodox curricula in high school and at Berkeley but Dave's unorthodoxy was better shown in his approach to biological science—for there, not only was the approach unusual, but the innovation was tremendous. The scientific results were remarkable as testified by the 20 original papers as a result of his pre-World War II research. His versatility was significant; in neurospora studies he set the stage for the later work of Beadle and Tatum. A high point of his early career was reached during the two years he spent with Leonor Michaelis at the Rockefeller Institute in the early '30s. There he discovered that fibrous keratin structures such as hair could be straightened by reduction of their disulphide bonds, one of the first transformations of protein structure found. He further assimilated Michaelis's nascent thoughts on single electron steps in biology and put these ideas into the first, and even now the landmark, paper on the role of radicals in enzyme reactions; a paper with Jim LuValle which laid the foundations for what we now term "free radical reactions" in biology, so important now in interpreting the disastrous effects of hyperoxia on the one hand, and of reflow of blood into previously ischemic heart and brain tissues on the other hand. Another "first" for David was his isolation of pure cytochrome c from wheat germ and his observation that it substitutes for the mammalian enzyme as prepared from heart muscle oxidase. This was one of the great unifying observations of biological science: Cell respiration in plants operated in the same manner as in animals. And it was David's work that revealed commonalities of plant and animal nucleic acids. These discoveries led to world recognition of David's work and to numerous awards and recognition by learned societies. David was especially encouraging to students with new ideas and inspirations. And it was David's perception of novelty, and of quality that made him one of the great teachers and leaders in Biosciences and his strenuous efforts resulted in a modern Biology Department merging Botany Microbiology and Zoology.

David was a great teacher. He loved students, the students loved him, and his many doctoral and post doctoral students have populated top positions in biological sciences everywhere. His courses were magic to the undergraduate body. The triumvirate of David Goddard, Victor Heilbrun and Merkel Jacobs brought to students in biology, medicine and many other curricula the very best of biological science.

Seminars were one of Goddard's favorite forms of communication, and I well remember the seminars in the old biology building with creaky chairs and noisy floors. The seminar room had standing room only, crowded with eager students. In the front chair (tipping back sometimes), sat David with a beguiling smile. And when David's chair creaked, it sent chills of fright down the spine of the speakers because they knew he would soon launch a thunderbolt question of especial significance. His unique combination of qualities brought out the best in everyone who touched David Goddard.

—from the tribute of Britton Chance
The Special Blend

There are many tales of David Goddard that I have come to call "David Goddardisms" because they were unique to him and help explain his popularity.

One of the tales of David as Provost that I have enjoyed came from the then dean of our law school, Jefferson B. Fordham. Jeff was—and undoubtedly still is—tongue of embellishing a grain of truth with some lively imagination. Jeff would call it a "true apocryphal story". Early in Jeff's deanship he tells of entering David's office and arguing for a substantial increase in the Law School budget. Jeff's tale was that David blazed back at him with six-shooters and then threw him down the College Hall steps. The tale went on that Jeff crawled back and David threw him down the steps again. Then, bruised and sore, Jeff crawled back a third time, and this time David gave the Law School a substantial increase—as much or more than Jeff had hoped for—and they parted in a happy frame of mind. Only Jeff can tell what really happened, but it was David's congener—nature that inspired that kind of story. I will never forget one of the more burdensome experiences that David shared with Gaylord Harnwell and several of the trustees. It was in the mid-sixties when the University of California, Columbia and other universities had inflicted upon them insults, property damage and class disruption by groups of students. Our university had a student uprising, called a "sit-in." Thanks to the good judgment and advice of David Goddard and others, we came through six days and nights of non-stop negotiations without abusive charges, and with no property damage or class disruption. Our experience proved to be a shining example of how best to deal with such happenings.

Another story that typifies David Goddard occurred at a plenary session of the trustees. David had submitted a list of the members of the faculty he was recommending for tenure, and which required trustee approval. As he went through the list, one of the trustees expressed doubt about one candidate whose name had been featured in the news media. He asked David whether the candidate wasn't somewhat of an activist, and David promptly stood up and stated in a pleasant but firm matter, "I should remind the trustees that your provost was somewhat of an activist in his earlier days." The recommended list was approved unanimously.

I could go on with other tales...but they would be to the same effect: that David was a very special blend of brilliance, earthiness and good humor. He had a keen understanding of faculty, students, administration, trustees, research and all the other components of a great university. He dealt with these components with finesse and good cheer. His service to Penn will have a lasting good effect. I speak as a friend, and I am sure that I speak for all the trustees and all others who knew him in saying that we shall miss David Goddard, and that he will be remembered with affection, admiration, respect and gratitude.

—from the tribute of Robert Trescher

The Mentor

John A. Russell, Jr., who was vice provost for student affairs during the critical era of sit-ins and demonstrations, spoke informally and there is no verbatim text. He reminisced of the tenous beginnings, when David Goddard offered the job and Jack Russell accepted it. ("I was so very much the 'wrong' person—only 8 months on campus, the student was the worst of all a Methodist minister.") Mr. Russell spoke of David Goddard's meticulous fair play, his loyalty, his courage including the courage to change his mind and his gifts as mentor. By the end of a year I had changed completely, and I wrote that to him, perhaps fairly sentimentally: "God, what did you have to say that for?" he replied. Mr. Russell mostly left academia after leaving Penn.

—from the reading of Stanley Johnson
Continuing Faculty Hospitality to Students

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

The President along with Provost Thomas Ehrlich set up the Fund, which is now beginning its third year, with donated funds, and it was replenished at mid-year as informal gatherings multiplied.

Each faculty member is asked to limit himself or herself to one function per semester; invite no student more than once; and base reimbursement on figures set at $3 per student for receptions with light refreshments, $4 for brunches, and $5 for dinners.

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

Uses of the President's Fund for Student-Faculty Interaction

Following is an activity report on the President's Fund, with some statistics on its use over the past two years. The two full years of data allow for the following observations:

(a) Publicity is the most important factor determining the level of use. In the fall of 1983, we sent a mailing to all full-time faculty informing them of the Fund's existence; 158 faculty members took advantage of the fund during that semester. There was no special publicity in the spring, and use dropped to 88. For the fall of 1984 we relied on articles in Almanac, Penn Paper and the D.P.; the number of events rose to 109, still significantly lower than the first semester. Again this past spring there was no publicity, resulting in the lowest usage figure of all, 74.

(b) The concern (expressed by some involved in the establishment of the Fund) that it might not benefit undergraduate students proved to be unfounded. While the events for undergraduates tend to be slightly larger (reflecting the size of their classes), the pattern across four semesters is consistently near 50% graduate, 50% undergraduate.

(c) Despite fluctuations in the individual use figures, the diversity of departments and schools represented remains high. This factor seems to me particularly important, since it means the program is benefitting faculty and students across the entire campus. Certain departments are collectively more frequent users than others (language departments with small classes are one example), but none has a monopoly on the fund.

(d) The statistics on multiple users (i.e., faculty members who drew on the fund more than once during the four semesters) will, I think, alleviate some of the concern raised earlier about how widely the money is actually being spread. The figures show that of the 297 faculty users during the past two years, only 99 (or 33%) were multiple users, and of these, only 27 (or 9%) used the fund more than twice.

One interesting corollary is that multiple users are much more likely than one-time users to hold events at home rather than in restaurants or on campus. This fact explains the rise in the at-home percentage on the summary chart: as multiple users constitute a larger percentage of total users (fall and spring, 1984-85), the percentage of events at home also increases. Thus we have a trade-off in benefits: on the one hand, events at home are more conducive to strengthening relationships between faculty and students than events elsewhere; on the other, the more faculty who participate in the program, regardless of the location, the greater the value for all concerned. It seems to me, therefore, that we should not discourage multiple users until and unless their percentage begins to exceed 33%.

All of these factors are helpful in evaluating the use of the President's Fund over time, but none is as important as the two basic facts about the Fund: (a) it is a program with great (though ultimately nonquantifiable) benefits, and (b) it costs money, which can be measured. Having worked with the program since it began, I feel strongly about its value to the University community, think its benefits far outweigh its costs, and would like to see it expand to include more faculty and students.
Referring to the University Counseling Service

Many faculty and staff have been approached by, or wondered how to reach out to, students bothered by more than academic concerns. Often the faculty or staff person recognizes that this student needs to talk with a professional but does not know to whom to refer the student and how to help the student utilize the resource. Others know about the University Counseling Service (UCS) and wonder how the service can be helpful to staff, faculty, and students; how it is different from Student Health Psychiatry, and when is it appropriate to refer a student to either office.

**UCS and Student Health Psychiatry**

There is some overlap in the services provided by UCS and Student Health Psychiatry. However, the focus of the UCS is on developmental issues and life skills. These include family concerns, lover and friend relationships, sexual identity, racial issues, eating concerns, and stress. Psychiatry works with students who seem severely depressed, appear to be hallucinating, suicidal, paranoid, or complain of physical symptoms, or appear very agitated and confused.

**What are the Range of Concerns**

At the UCS psychologists or social workers are available to consult with you about a specific student, as well as a problem situation in a class or with a group of students with whom you are involved. There is no such thing as a small or trivial question. Questions we are often asked include:

- "A student told me he missed classes because his parents are divorcing and it's creating problems for him. What should I do?"
- "I am adviser to a club which seems to have a lot of difficulty maintaining membership and the officers fight amongst themselves. What can be done to end this?"
- "I coach a team and one of my athletes came in, very upset, to talk about her personal situation. She is having problems with her roommate, and balancing her studies with team practice, and is also concerned about letting her parents down. How can she get help?"

**Making a Referral**

When someone calls for information or help, a staff member is available and he/she will consult with the caller. If no one is immediately available then leave a message and someone will return your call as soon as possible. Occasionally, it is useful to discuss the best strategy for referring a student. It is helpful to plan how to approach a student, what are some good things to say so the student feels the helpers concern and caring.

Suggesting to a student that he/she may benefit from counseling can still be uncomfortable. If the student is discussing a situation with you, then he or she is already aware of the need for some help. It is all right—indeed, sometimes necessary—for you to say that the issue the student is dealing with is stressful and beyond your scope to be helpful. Suggest that the student might want on-going professional support and assistance. It is important to convey to a student this does not mean he/she is crazy but that they are dealing with a difficult situation. It's too much for one person to deal with alone and some extra help is needed. You might say that you've sent students to counseling before and it's proven to be very helpful. If you wish, give the student the name of someone at UCS who they can ask for specifically. Occasionally, students will call from a professor or staff person's office. We do request that students make their own appointments. Sometimes a student is willing to get help but insists on going off-campus. The UCS maintains a list of off-campus resources available to students.

Confidentiality requires that we give out no information about a student including whether or not a student has called or kept an appointment. If you want to talk to us, please ask the student to give us written permission to talk with you. We want to be helpful but also must protect the confidentiality of our clients.

**Making an Appointment**

When a student calls they can request a person of a particular sex, race, or sexual orientation. The student will be given an "intake appointment" with one of the staff. At this interview the student will clarify what brought him/her in, and how the counseling service can be most helpful. If there is no waiting list as is usually the case early in the semester, the student will be told to call back in about one week to learn who will be the assigned counselor and to get the initial appointment. This will be explained to the student who has the option of being referred off-campus or waiting until there is an opening on a staff member's schedule.

The staff of the UCS also makes themselves available to conduct workshops on a variety of topics for classes, residences and organizations. Some of the topics requested have included stress management, being gay or lesbian, black male and female relationships, abuse in families, and eating disorders.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to call. We are open between 9 a.m.-5 p.m. Sometimes we must use an answering machine to record messages. Someone will return your call as soon as possible.

Dr. Mary V. Cochran  
Dr. Leonard D. Miller  
Dr. Donelda A. Cook  
Dr. Steven D. Mullinix  
Dr. Ruth L. Hall  
Dr. Elaine S. Robinson  
Dr. Joan R. Lerner  
Robert Schoenberg, MSW
EXHIBITS

8 Sergio Castillo Works in Metal, Faculty Club, Monday-Friday, 9 a.m.-7 p.m., Opening reception, October 8, 4:30-6:30 p.m. Through November 8.

FILMS

8 The Painted Track, 5 p.m., 4th floor lounge, Williams Hall (Middle East Center); Folklore Film Series: Artist and Craftsman in the Middle East).

9 Videotape: Khalid Siddiqi at Middlebury; part of the Arabic Language Circle, 1 p.m., 8th floor lounge, Williams Hall (Middle East Center).

FITNESS/LEARNING

12 Fall Gardening Exposition 1985 at the Morris Arboretum: classes in Pruning, Houseplants, Herbs for the Kitchen, Garden, Potpourri and Planting Techniques; 2-4 p.m., $24 (includes lunch and all materials). Information: 247-5777.

14 Seeking Scientific Employment: Dr. Stephen Toy, life science consultant, E.I. Dupont de Nemours & Co.; 4:30-6 p.m., Benjamin Franklin Room, Houston Hall. Call Ext. 7430 to register (Career Planning and Placement Services).

Kaypro User Group Meeting, 3 p.m., Room 230 Houston Hall. Information: 222-3006.

15 The Locus Walk Al-Anon Group; first anniversary celebration, faculty, staff, students and the community are invited.

16 Administrative User Group, noon, Room 236 Houston Hall. Information: 898-7320.

MEETINGS

15 The Black Administrators, Faculty and Staff (BAFS) General Meeting, noon, Benjamin Franklin Room, Houston Hall.

SPECIAL EVENTS

12 President's Coffee Hour, a reception for parents hosted by President Hackney as part of Parents' Weekend; immediately following the Penn/Brown game (approx. 4 p.m.), Rotunda, University Museum. Please refer to the Parents Program, Ext. 8445.

TALKS

8 Exogenous Diacylglycerol Activates Adenylate Cyclase in Human Platelets, Dr. B. Ashby, Thrombos Research Center, Temple University; 12:30 p.m., Physiology Library, 4th floor, Richards Building (Respiratory Physiology Group & Department of Anesthesiology).

3-dimensional Structure of Antibodies, David Davies, chief, section of molecular structure, National Institutes of Health; noon, Room 404 Anatomy-Physiology Building (Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics).

On Ice at Class of '23

The Class of 1923 Ice Rink reopens this week with public skating hours Wednesdays 4 to 6, Fridays both lunchtime (12-2) and evenings (8:15-10:15); and weekends (Saturdays 1-3 and 8:15-10:15, Sundays 1-3 for now; evenings hours will be added in January). The Rink offers lessons each Thursday afternoon and Sunday morning, and has special rates with the Penn ID. There's also a pro shop now, and a heated, carpeted room for private parties in conjunction with skating events. For rates and registration information, call Ext. 1923.

9 Reflections of Teenage Pregnancy Prevention Programs. Dr. Michael A. Carrera, Hunter College; 11 a.m.-1 p.m., Room B-27, Graduate School of Education, (Graduate School of Education, Human Sexuality Program).

Current Work and Thoughts, Robert Venturi, partner of the architectural firm Venturi, Rauch and Scott Brown; 6:30 p.m., Samuel F. Houston Lecture Hall (formerly B-1), Meyerson Hall.

Talking Sense About Nicaragua: A First-Hand Account, Henry Wells, Rev. Ralph Moore and Lallie O'Brien (members of a fact-finding delegation which recently returned from Nicaragua); 7:30 p.m., Christian Association (Christian Association and CASA).

An Instance of "Wrong-Way" Technology Transfer: Timber-rais Bridges and Graphic Statistics, Thomas F. Peters; 4 p.m., Seminar Room, Smith Hall (History and Sociology of Science).

15 Adult Literacy in the Community Context. Dr. Carmen St. John Hunter, consultant and co-author of Adult Literacy in the United States; 12-1 p.m., Room C-34, Graduate School of Education, (The Literacy Research Center).


DEATHS

Stanley Cierkosz, a custodian in the Annenberg Center, died July 13 at the age of 66. Mr. Cierkosz began at the University in December 1970 and continued until he went on short-term disability in February 1985 and retired in May. His wife, Mrs. Margaret Cierkosz, also a former custodian at Penn, survives.

Mae Augusta Cooke, a longtime member of the Dining Service staff, died August 26 at the age of 85. Between 1953 and her retirement in 1973, Mrs. Cooke served as head waitress, then hostess and cashier, in the Houston Hall dining room. There are no known survivors.

Robert H. Elmore, organist, composer and former chair of the Music Department, died September 22 at the age of 72. A 1937 alumnus of the University, Mr. Elmore won the Nitsche Prize three consecutive years; won the first Thornton Oakley Prize in the creative arts; and later received two honorary degrees for his contributions to church music in the U.S. His opera, It Began at Breakfast, was the first American opera ever televised.

Mr. Elmore joined the teaching staff as an instructor in 1939 and was an assistant professor from 1946 to 1950. He was at one time official organist of the Philadelphia Orchestra and music director of the Tenth Presbyterian Church. He survived by his sister, Rachel Elmore.

Dr. Margaret Williams, a pediatrician who was on the medical faculty here from 1954 to 1970, died August 24 at the age of 62. After taking her medical degree at Penn in 1949, Dr. Williams interned at HUP and completed her pediatric training at CHOP. From 1951-52 she was assistant chief of residence at CHOP and in 1954-55 a fellow in nutritional research.

Dr. Williams was founder/director of the Margaret Williams Developmental Evaluation Center for assessment of preschool children’s difficulties. She was also co-founder and director of the Upstate New York Medical Center’s regional perinatal center, and former director of the neonatal intensive care nursery at Course Irving Memorial Hospital. She was the Post-Standard’s “Woman of Achievement” in medicine, 1976, and the following year was honored by the Onondaga County Medical Society for her contributions to community health.

Surviving are her husband, Dr. William J. Williams; two daughters, a son, a sister and a grandchild. Contributions may be made to the Margaret L. Williams Fund for Medical History, Upstate Medical Center Foundation, 155 Elizabeth Blackwell St., Syracuse, N.Y. 13210.
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