Invitation to a Party for the Whole Penn Family

By now, we hope, everyone at the University has had a chance to review the registration package for Penn's 250th Anniversary Celebration and to register for various activities during Peak Week. The variety of programs, faculty exchanges and entertainment festivities offered during the week of May 13th is remarkable. We are truly offering something for everyone and we want formally to invite all of you—faculty, staff and students—to participate in any and all aspects of this memorable event. Join us as we celebrate Penn's 250 years of educational leadership and excellence.

Thanks to the tremendous response to our call for volunteers, we have been able to finalize the logistical arrangements of Peak Week. More than 300 faculty, staff and students have volunteered to help in providing information, staffing special events, and administering the program.

The Peak Week program includes over 100 provocative exchanges on subjects that range from the educational to the practical, including "How to Manage Your Money," "Poor, Powerless, and Pregnant: The New Family in America," and "Risks and Returns of Real Estate Investment." Other exchanges include updates on AIDS research, infertility and reproduction, and treatment of heart attacks. More thoughtful topics include "Steinberg on Picasso" and "The Intersection of Law and Art."

Although seating is limited for the colloquia, The 21st Century: World Without Walls?, and will be determined on a first come, first serve basis, the program will be produced as a mini-series to be aired on public television in mid-June. Ted Koppel, the anchor of ABC's Nightline, will moderate the colloquia and Koppel Communications, Inc. will produce the mini-series.

In addition to the colloquia, exchanges and the three plenary sessions at the core of the Peak Week program, there are numerous performances, exhibitions and festivities focused around the 250th celebration. We encourage you to review the entertainment options and consider participating in several. For example, the architectural walking tour and the campus art tour will generate new ways of looking at our campus.

We hope all of you will also join in the big festivities—PennULTIMATE, Ben's Bandstand Bash, and Penn MayFare.

Operational guidelines and procedures have been established for employees and supervisors during Peak Week (Almanac January 16, 1990). Although the University will be open for business that week, the pace will slow to allow staff involvement. If you need a registration package, please stop by the Houston Hall information desk.

Because the 250th is a "family party," we hope that all of us, faculty, staff and students, will attend the many events and festivities and join together as the University celebrates its beginnings as the nation's first university. For those of you who are new to the University, we promise that you will leave Peak Week with a deeper understanding of Penn's role in the formation of higher education in America.

Sheldon Hackney, President
Michael Aiken, Provost
Marna C. Whittington, Senior Vice President

Honorary Degrees: Eleven at Commencement

Ten leaders in their fields, including six from academia, will join Commencement Speaker Barbara Bush in receiving honorary degrees at the University of Pennsylvania's 234th Commencement on Monday, May 14—an occasion when President Sheldon Hackney has promised to explain why, if Penn is celebrating its 250th Anniversary, the Commencement is the 234th.

In the ceremony that begins at 10 a.m. on Franklin Field, three of the scholars being honored are scientists associated with the University. With them and the U.S. First Lady are two Soviet honorees, the head of Edinburgh, the leading expert on chimpanzees in their habitat, the president of Planned Parenthood, the father of the Walkman, and the nation's best known family man.

The Penn scientists: Dr. Baruch S. Blumberg, the Nobel Prize winner who during anthropological/medical field investigations identified the virus responsible for hepatitis-B, is now master of Balliol College at Oxford, but continues as professor of medicine and anthropology and is a senior advisor at Fox Chase Cancer Center.

Dr. Raymond Davis, described as the "father of neutrino research," joined Penn as research professor of astronomy and astrophysics in 1985 upon his retirement as a senior chemist at Brookhaven National Laboratory, and is currently investigating energy generation at the sun's center.

Dr. C. Everett Koop, the longtime pediatrics professor and Surgeon-in-Chief at the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, as Surgeon General of the United States was acclaimed for his influential Report on AIDS, his opposition to smoking and his handling of the "Baby Doe" case among other contributions. Other honorary degree recipients: Israel Moiseievich Gel'fand of Moscow University, one of the world's leading mathematicians, has been highly influential in forging the contemporary unified view of algebra, geometry and analysis, and has made a significant contribution to interaction with mathematical physics.

Others from the U.S.S.R. comes Tatyan a Za slavskya, an economist who has been an advisor to Mikhail Gorbachev. One of the first to use public opinion polls in the U.S.S.R., Ms. Zaslavskya directs the All-Union Center for Public Opinion Research on Soviet and Economic Problems.

Dr. Jane Goodall, who will also give the School of Veterinary Medicine's commencement
Report to the April 18 Meeting: The Year’s Issues and Actions

I thank the Chair-elect, Dr. Almarin Phillips, and the Past Chair, Dr. David P. Balamuth, for the many ways in which they have helped to ensure the smooth running of the Office of the Faculty Senate, the Senate Executive Committee and the many Standing Committees of the Faculty Senate, and Ms. Karen Gaines for her cooperation in ensuring that Almanac, the University’s journal of record, had material relevant to the Faculty Senate in each of its numbers since our last Annual Meeting. The Senate Executive Committee has had representatives from every one of the constituencies throughout the University and a complete slate of at-large members. The attendance at meetings of the committee has been improved, and I thank its members, and also particularly the Chairs and membership of the various Senate Committees, for their dedication and performance during my term of office.

There will be direct reports later in this meeting from Professors Madeleine Joullie, Louise Shoemaker, Solomon Pollack, and Morris Mendelson about the activities of their Senate Committees, so I will not summarize them here. Other activities of the Senate Executive Committee that have been or will be published in Almanac include the following:

We made changes in the Draft Policy on Misconduct in Research, in which we reviewed and approved the President’s Task Force Report on Archival Policy, we passed a motion: “The Senate Executive Committee strongly urges the administration to make available to all retiring faculty the option of taking CREF as cash in a lump sum upon retirement.” This has now become University policy.

We discussed a wide range of issues with the Provost concerning the 250th Anniversary Celebration, academic integrity, security, and, of course, problems of faculty salary, benefits, and the growth of the Administration.

We discussed the Campus Center with Stephen Gale and VPUL Kim Morrison, the Diversity Education Program, the Task Force on University Life with its Chair, Professor Drew Faust, and other members, we passed the following motion on United Way: “The Senate Executive Committee requests that the President open the United Way Program to include other Federated Charities who wish to participate in the coming year.”

We adopted the following motion: “The Senate Executive Committee condemns the criminal vandalism and theft committed against Dr. Adrian Morrison’s office, and also condemns the vicious personal harassment to which Dr. Morrison has been subjected. We affirm our unequivocal support of Dr. Morrison’s right to engage in research on animal subjects, in conformity with the University and Federal standards regarding use of laboratory animals. We also affirm our unequivocal support of his right to express his views publicly without being subjected to reprisals.”

The Senate Executive Committee, after hearing a report from Vice Provost Paul Mosher, adopted the following motion: “Whereas the libraries are the one research and educational resource that serves all faculty and students, and whereas the libraries at Penn have been declining on any of several measures for three decades, and whereas the current faculty and administration have the obligation to pass on to future generations a world-class research collection, the Senate Executive Committee resolves that the share of the libraries in the current billion-dollar campaign should be raised to no less than 2.5% of the total and that, for the same reasons, the annual budgetary allocations be increased significantly.”

We completed our reviews of the document “Planning for the Twenty-first Century: Final Reports of the Ten Working Groups” and we accepted the report of the Ad hoc Committee to Review University Council that was published in Almanac March 20, 1990. This very important committee, chaired by Professor Marten Estey, was created because of the three questions that were voted on in a mail ballot sent to Faculty Senate members on May 9, 1989. The report proposed a variety of changes in University Council, some of which have already taken place. All the recommendations are presently going through the process of becoming by-law changes in University Council, and will be voted on at its next meeting on May 9.

One of the questions in the mail ballot was “The members of the Senate Executive Committee shall withdraw from the University Council at the end of the 1989-1990 academic year unless the Senate Executive Committee determines, by a formal vote to be taken no earlier than the March meeting, that continued participation in the University Council serves the interests of the faculty.” After discussion, SEC voted “that continued participation in the University Council serves the interests of the faculty.” SEC also adopted unanimously the motion “that the Senate Executive Committee shall monitor the progress of the implementation of the revised Council By-laws for 1990-91 and vote no earlier than March 1991 and no later than the end of the academic year 1990-91 whether to continue its participation in University Council.”

Besides all these activities of the Senate Executive Committee, the past, present and future Chairs of Senate have met with the President and the Provost at least twice a month to discuss all matters relevant to the University that any of us wished to raise. This continuing consultation, and the numerous informal contacts that they generated, are extremely valuable, and, I believe, have been most helpful to all concerned and to the University large. They provide a mechanism by which any member of the faculty, through the Chairs of Senate, can quickly bring anything to the attention of the President and Provost for discussion and, if necessary, action.

In addition to the above, I have expressed my views on a variety of matters in Almanac in the section called “From the Chair” on 17 occasions since our last meeting.

In conclusion, I wish to tell you of an unexpected event, unique in the history of the University. A past Secretary of the Faculty Senate, Professor Lawson Soulsby, who received an Honorary Degree of Doctor of Science from the University in 1984, has just been made a Life Peer by Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, and will become Baron Soulsby. He will continue to serve in the meantime as Head of the University of Cambridge School of Veterinary Medicine, but will soon sit in the House of Lords, a classical example of being kicked upstairs. I have sent him a letter of congratulation.

Robert E. Davies

Honorary Degrees from page 1

As president of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Faye Wattleton heads the country’s oldest family planning organization and the largest private, nonprofit health provider with 186 affiliates serving 3 million clients a year. It also contributes to an international program that reaches 120 countries.

Akio Morita, chairman and founder of the Sony Corporation, will deliver the graduation address to Wharton’s MBA class. Founding Sony shortly after World War II, Mr. Morita invented or oversaw the invention of many consumer electronic products, including the Walkman and compact disc players. His firm was the first Japanese company ever listed on the New York Stock Exchange.

Bill Cosby, star of “The Cosby Show,” is a Philadelphia who graduated from Temple, and after becoming an Emmy and Grammy award-winning entertainer remained visibly dedicated to the promotion of higher education. He earned his Ph.D. in education from the UM and is the author of several books including Fatherhood, a widely read analysis of parenting; Bill Cosby’s Personal Guide to Power Tennis and The Wit and Wisdom of Fat Albert.
Senate April 18 Meeting: Affirmative Action Resolutions Passed, 40-4

At the Faculty Senate's annual full membership meeting Wednesday, after the Chair gave the report at left, President Sheldon Hackney delivered a short talk in which he noted that the Campaign for Penn is running ahead of schedule, with $438 million in gifts and pledges at the end of March; the target is to be at $500 million (the $1 billion goal) by October. Provost Michael Aiken said that 77 of the envisioned 150 chairs have been raised, and that the majority of chairs filled so far have gone to distinguished present faculty, with impacts on outside appointments still to come.

Action: The meeting's only action item was a vote on affirmative action issues raised in the Report of the Committee on the Faculty (Almanac April 10)—ended in passage of a four-part resolution that includes provisions for Senate monitoring of progress toward increased presence of women on the faculty, and for confidential exit interviews with women and minorities who leave the faculty. (The full text of the resolution as passed appears in a gray box on page 4 of April 10. The resolution passed was a substitute motion for the Committee Report's six resolutions, which appear on page 3 of the same issue.) Dr. Peggy Sanday indicated that she would present a further amendment of the same issue.) Dr. Peggy Sunday introduced discussion of problems the committee faced in monitoring the distribution of the percentage of salary reserved for merit.

Other Reports: An interim report of the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility by Dr. Louise Shoemaker, and Dr. Solomon Pollack's preliminary overview of a Committee on Administration effort to study the growth of administrative costs, were distributed at the meeting and are available to members on request to the Senate Office. The respective committee chairs suggested that publication await final reports.

Sen. Chair Robert E. Davies announced as an unusual occurrence that all members of the Committee on Administration have asked to be reappointed next year to complete the work begun, which involves securing detailed data to account for rising administrative costs that are indicated as overall totals in annual public budget reports of the administration.

Redaction: On behalf of the campus AAUP chapter, Dr. Marten Estey presented a text on the administrative decision to redact documents in the Tung case now being investigated by the EEOC (see Speaking Out, below) and asked President Hackney to comment. After the President spoke briefly along the lines of his message in this issue's Speaking Out (pp. 4-5), Dr. Peter Freyd charged that the President shifted from "I" to "we" in characterizing the decision to engage in litigation, suggesting a distinction be made between "the administration" and "the University" on a faculty issue. Dr. Morris Mendelson challenged Dr. Hackney's characterization of the national AAUP'samicus brief during the Supreme Court phase of the EEOC matter as representing the same position as the University's; Dr. Hackney held that both Penn and the national AAUP urged "action, not words.

Planning: When Dr. Bernard Shapiro criticized the final reports of the Ten Working Groups as lacking broad input, Dr. Hackney deferred to Provost Aiken for his prepared report. Dr. Aiken described the consultation process, including reviews by the Academic Planning and Budget Committee, and noted that a final Five Year Plan is to be drafted over the summer and distributed to many including SEC in the fall, with a view to adoption in December.

A quorum of 100 members attended the annual meeting, according to a card count following the meeting. At meeting's end, outgoing Past Chair David Balamuth proposed the final resolution:

Before we leave, I think we should take a moment to recognize the dedication which our Chair, Dr. Davies, has shown this year in the performance of his job. His performance has been truly astonishing. He always stood ready to make that extra phone call, to attend an extra meeting, or to do anything else that helped him represent all of us as well as he possibly could. We are all in his debt.

Speaking Out

The AAUP statement below was delivered at the Faculty Senate meeting on April 18. Two letters on the same subject (pp.3-4) arrived prior to the meeting. Dr. Hackney's response to all three begins on page 4.

AAUP on Redaction

Members of the University of Pennsylvania Chapter of the American Association of University Professors met to become informed and to discuss the issue of redaction as it relates to tenure review and promotion materials forwarded to the EEOC in situations involving allegations of discrimination. After careful consideration, it was the consensus of those members present and of invited faculty guests that redaction of documents to remove identifying information from letters of reference submitted to EEOC is not in the best interests of the faculty involved. Submission of complete information would not be a violation of general assurances of confidentiality to writers of those letters nor a threat to the tenure review and promotion process.

The Board of Directors along with this faculty group concurred that it was inappropriate for the Administration of the University to pursue lengthy and elaborate legal mechanisms on an important academic matter without consulting a representative group of faculty, such as the Faculty Senate.

Elsa L. Ramsden, President, Pennsylvania Chapter AAUP

Redaction and the EEOC

We write as faculty and staff who share the conviction that legality and fundamental fairness require that Penn's hiring, tenure and promotion efforts be conducted in a deliberative manner, characterized by processes which ensure accountability, review and oversight. Because of this conviction we applaud the Supreme Court's decision in University of Pennsylvania v. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. And we deplore the University's apparent determination to circumvent that decision. We write to urge you [President Hackney] to speak clearly, forcefully and forthrightly on this matter.

Three months ago, the United States Supreme Court rejected the novel argument advanced by Penn to justify its refusal to submit peer review files needed by EEOC to evaluate a discrimination complaint. That the Justices recognized Penn's argument as pernicious and disingenuous is made clear by the language of the opinion itself:

"We are all in his debt.

If there is a smoking gun to be found that demonstrates discrimination in tenure decision, it is likely to be tucked away in peer review files.

Having advanced an argument so lacking in merit as to elicit unanimous rejection from a generally fractious court not known for its sensitivity to civil rights, the University's administration has now been willing to circumvent that decision by submitting "redacted" documents to the EEOC. In other words, as with the South in the wake of Brown v. Board of Education, Penn is prepared to wage its own war of resistance, interposition and nullification. That position is objectionable, embarrassing and inconsistent with the mission, role and interests of this University.

As we understand it, the administration has removed names and other identifying information from material submitted to the EEOC. The submission of redacted documents, in our view, is a nonviable alternative. (It should be noted at the outset that Penn's own internal grievance procedures currently require this same information be provided to the panel). We advance for your consideration the following five points.

1. The message is inconsistent with the mission. As an institution of higher education entrusted with many young women and men who will soon be policy makers in their own right, it is particularly inappropriate for the University to countenance circumvention of the clear intent of the law. The tortured logic in support of redaction is transparent, its message is inescapable.

There are more than enough examples of public and corporate officials who hide information for "legitimate" reasons. Penn need not model this behavior.

Moreover, a university such as Penn, concerned about the integrity of its own processes, can ill afford to legitimize such
Redaction and the Tung Case

We are writing in regard to the University's decision to turn over redacted tenure review files of Rosalie Tung to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Congress, in passing Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, determined that employment discrimination based on race, gender, religion, or national origin will not be tolerated in our society. We understand that the University has a legitimate concern in protecting the confidentiality of the tenure peer-review system. Yet the Supreme Court has held that the University's concern must yield to societal interest implicated by Rosalie Tung’s case.

Wharton professor Rosalie Tung was denied tenure in 1985. She filed charges alleging racial and sexual discrimination with the EEOC, citing Title VII. For the past five years, the EEOC has been trying to investigate her claims but has had to go to court to obtain the tenure review files. The Supreme Court unanimously required the University to turn over Rosalie Tung’s files to the EEOC. We are greatly distressed that the administration chose to respond to the Supreme Court's ruling by removing names and identifying features from the requested files. We recommend that the University submit all the pertinent files in their complete and unredacted form. The EEOC has already stated that redacted documents are largely useless.

The administration has followed the letter of the decision but circumvented the spirit by redacting the files. Serious charges of discrimination have been alleged, and the University cannot be expected in finding the truth of the matter at hand. The University should seek, as soon as possible, to substantiate or to dispel the claims, and take appropriate action pending the ultimate findings.

Why has the administration been so determined to avoid compliance with the requests of the federal government? Is it trying to protect someone? Is it hoping that the whole affair will be forgotten? Does the administration prefer further litigation than to risk negative publicity from a candid reconstruction of Rosalie Tung's tenure decision? The University’s actions, for the past five years, have prompted and continue to invite this type of speculation.

We are concerned with the University’s conduct in redacting Rosalie Tung’s tenure review file, the actions of individuals during her peer review, the University’s decision to contest information requests by the United States government, and the significant amount of money the University is willing to spend to protect its confidentiality. We have obtained and reviewed an accurate picture of what really transpired at Rosalie Tung’s tenure review.

Response from the President

I am well aware that there are divided opinions in our community concerning this University's position. Many believe that the trade-off between the criterion of openness and that of confidentiality in tenure cases, and I welcome your advice on this matter.

Let me say, however, that the University's position before the Supreme Court was supported by most of the private universities in this country. It was consistent with the position taken by the AAUP—an organization well known for defending the rights of faculty. Many of our faculty support Penn's position. Many people do not think that we are acting foolishly or "doidly" on this important matter of principle.

The universities that join us in thinking confidentiality of tenure review letters is of high priority believe that it is extremely important, both for the protection of faculty and for affirmative action, to rely on a considerable extent upon evaluations by leading scholars at other institutions in deciding tenure cases. If one fears that a particular department is paying insufficient attention to the quality and/or diversity of its faculty, one needs to have advice from the outside. Unfortunately, there is reason to...
The following was addressed to the faculty of the Oriental Studies Department and sent to the President, Provost, Dean of SAS and others as well as to Almanac. The Department’s chair reserves the right to respond in a future issue.

We suggest that one way to describe the broad area that your department covers is to use a geographical name such as North African and Asian Studies.

As Asian American students, we have a stake in this matter. The continued use of the name, Oriental Studies, offends us and contributes to our feeling of outside status and disregard at this university. Striving to create a university which values cultural diversity means taking seriously the concerns of students of color. We await your decision on our request.

— Ellen Sohn, for the Asian American Student Alliance

Correction on Rita Klimova

Information in Almanac on speakers at the 250th plenary is welcome. However, we regret an unfortunate error in connection with the Czechoslovak ambassador, Mrs. R. Klimova. Contrary to the April 17 statement, ambassador Klimova returned to Czechoslovakia only after her country was freed from Nazi Germany by Russian and U.S. Forces in 1945, and not after the Munich Pact in 1938, which in fact invited Germany to occupy Czechoslovakia.

— Arnost Kleinzeller, Emeritus Professor of Physiology, and Lotte Kleinzeller

Dismay over Role Model

I am dismayed at the choice of Barbara Bush as Commencement speaker. No offense to Mrs. Bush, who seems to be a nice lady, and as President, her women graduates go better than most. A Commencement speaker, however, should be a role model for our graduates, not somebody’s wife, nice as she may be. How can we send our women graduates off into the world with a mission, and our men graduates with demands based on the model the University seemingly proposes for women in the 1990’s and who embodies the principles:

— make your life a supporting role for your husband’s career;
— do not speak out on controversial issues that may affect him;
— do volunteer work at no pay rather than pursue a career.

— Rosane Rocher, Professor of South Asian Studies

A Vision of Penn

“A University should not be a house but a village,” said Thomas Jefferson of his model campus, the University of Virginia in Charlottesville, one of the oldest and best-designed universities in this nation.

When it comes to age, our University steps forward with pride as we come to celebrate our two hundred and fiftieth anniversary this summer. Tested against the Jeffersonian ideals of a university community, however, the verdict is a fragmented aesthetic and community environment which weakens Penn's image as a first-rate school. To understand this, come along on two tours of the University, one with Kite and Key and one with us.

Sons and daughters of wealthy trustees, Muffy and Biff’s grandchildren, and the brightest of the potential class of 1994 and
their parents are assembled in the back of College Hall ready for their first campus tour. Their decision between colleges will be in the brief campus visit that corroborates the school's reputation. Impressions them is no problem, for Mary Penn from Kite and Key will be their tour guide. Walking down Spruce Street, she points to the elegant Houston Hall on the left, exhibiting the nation's first student union, and on the right she indicates its first medical school. She turns the corner at the magnificent University Museum, looking every bit one of the world's top anthropological museums. Franklin Field is next, and she explains the Penn's largest track meet. She takes them up Bush Smith Walk, pointing out the ornate Towne Building, the cradle of the world's first computer. Expounding on Penn's tradition of firsts, she walks down Locust Walk. We comment that the plastic facade of the new 1920 Commons resulted in the old building. Suddenly, one prospect lurches forward, attempting to recover a material that could be stapled onto filling her father's initial scheme, had to resort allslashed by the University that the offspring of the modern movement: "Students and Faculty acutely aware that the Kite and Key tour highlights what the new Campus Center being built in the past fifty years — so have applications for community co-existed in harmony."

Speaking Out welcomes short, timely letters on University issues. The normal Tuesday noon deadline is extended to Thursday noon for time-dependent comments, but advance notice of intention to submit is always appreciated — Ed.
Concerning the Controversy Between The Red and Blue and the Student Activities

The Complaint of The Red and Blue

In an undated memorandum submitted to the Committee on Open Expression in November 1989 and in a revised undated memorandum submitted in January 1990, Christopher Matson, publisher of The Red and Blue, charges that a violation of the University's Guidelines on Open Expression has occurred in connection with the refusal of the Student Activities Council (SAC) to re-recognize The Red and Blue in the Fall of 1989 primarily on the grounds that the following statements made about the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Alliance (a member of SAC) in the October 1989 issue of the publication were highly objectionable:

1. "The Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Alliance received $2,656 from the Student Activities Council. Need we say more."
2. "In the true spirit of the Diversity Program, the Lesbians and Gays at Penn have changed their name to the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Alliance. While we are completely behind such democratic gestures, we would like to know when the heterosexual community will be so included. By the way, do you think we could get a discount on pink paper for The Red and Blue?"

Specifically, the complaint charges that:

"Through the invocation of the Harassment Policy, the request to examine future issues of The Red and Blue, and the voting procedures of the Council, the continued publication of The Red and Blue has been seriously jeopardized."

The complaint argues further that:

1. "The allegations and the subsequent controversy have resulted in the loss of all advertising revenue."
2. "The methods undertaken by the aforementioned (the SAC Steering Committee) represent a threat to the office allocation granted to The Red and Blue. The office allocation is provided by the Houston Hall Board. The Student Activities Council holds a position on the Board."
3. "The allegations have resulted in a loss of credibility and a voice in campus affairs. In particular, The Red and Blue cannot participate in the allocation of over $300,000 in student fees by SAC to various student activities on campus."

Initially, the complaint was lodged against SAC as a whole, while the revised version is directed at individual members of the SAC Steering Committee. The complaint requests the Committee on Open Expression to reconsider the denial of the members of the SAC Steering Committee from their positions.

The Response of the SAC Steering Committee

In an undated response to The Red and Blue complaint, the SAC Steering Committee denies having invoked the Harassment Policy to justify its negative recommendation; denies any intent to monitor the content of The Red and Blue; and rejects the charge that the voting procedures of the Council are in any way improper. The Steering Committee takes the position that the question of The Red and Blue's recognition by SAC is not an open expression issue.

With respect to charges #1 and #2 listed above, SAC Steering argues that:

1. "The publication is free to print and distribute within the University community. "Lack of SAC recognition does not deprive the organization of its right to function."
2. "The Red and Blue can still reserve rooms in University buildings and has the right to maintain a student-group designated office."

In response to charge #3, SAC Steering agrees that lack of SAC recognition:

"deprives the publication of the ability to vote in the Student Activities Council."

SAC Steering explains its negative recommendation, as follows:

"We believe that SAC should not extend membership to groups which directly attack other member groups because of who the members themselves are. Criticizing the ideas or beliefs of a group is acceptable within the forum of SAC; attacking people, for who they are is not.

Elaborating on this view, SAC Steering observes that SAC is "a body which only admits groups which can benefit the community as a whole by contributing to the process of communication and cooperation between student activities. " According to the SAC Steering Committee, a review of issues of The Red and Blue and an interview with the publication's editors raised concerns about "The Red and Blue's commitment to the community it wished to join." In addition, the Steering Committee had "other doubts about the publication's fulfillment of its stated purpose to have 'alternative viewpoints, both conservative and otherwise.'"

The Purview of the Committee on Open Expression

The Red and Blue complaint raises several issues outside the jurisdiction of the Committee on Open Expression. Sections IV-B-3 and 7 of the Guidelines on Open Expression confer on the Committee the responsibility to: (a) give advisory opinions interpreting the guidelines as a guide to future action; and (b) investigating incidents involving the application of the Guidelines, but not for the purpose of initiating, consideration or disposition of disciplinary proceedings arising from the incidents. Clearly, factual questions, such as whether the Harassment Policy was or was not invoked and whether SAC Steering does or does not intend to monitor future issues of The Red and Blue, are beyond the purview of this committee. Nor are the voting procedures of SAC a matter which the committee can consider. Nor can the committee recommend disciplinary action. We confine ourselves to the question of whether the reasons given for the recommendations of the SAC Steering Committee against recognition of The Red and Blue are in consonance with the Guidelines on Open Expression, and we do so within the context of the three charges set forth in The Red and Blue complaint.

Advisory Opinion

In considering the complaint, the committee had to address three questions:

1. Is the controversy of a type which falls within the Guidelines on Open Expression?
2. Is SAC the type of University organization whose membership criteria are subject to the Guidelines?
3. If the answers to the first two questions are affirmative, was there a violation of the Guidelines?

We consider each of these in order.

1. Does the controversy fall within the Guidelines? Section I-A of the Open Expression Guidelines states that: "The University of Pennsylvanian community of scholars, affirms, supports and cherishes the concepts of freedom of thought, inquiry, speech, and lawful assembly. The freedom to experiment to present and examine alternative data and theories; the freedom to hear, express, and debate various views; and the freedom to voice criticism of existing practices and values that are fundamental rights that must be upheld and practiced by the University in a free society." All sections of the Guidelines except I-A deal with matters having to do with lawful assembly and demonstrations. Section I-A, however, clearly embraces freedom of speech as one of its concerns. The Committee concludes that an issue relating to the content of a publication is one of free speech and therefore within the purview of the Guidelines.

The Committee also concludes that the situation is not affected by the fact that the statements and views of The Red and Blue were published. If these statements or views had instead been spoken or otherwise conveyed in a public way, the situation under the Guidelines would have been the same. The Red and Blue is a group whose purpose is to publish its statements or views in the form of a newspaper.

SAC is a member organization for University student groups, all of whom have views but not all of whom have published the articles that are their purpose. All SAC organizations have an equal right to express their views in public; the fact that The Red and Blue chooses to publish a newspaper is not material to the protection of its views under the Guidelines.

2. Is SAC covered by the Guidelines? The Committee concludes that, because of the authority granted to it by the University to allocate University funds among competing student organizations, SAC is an arm of the University subject to the same constraints relative to open expression as the University Administration itself.

3. Was there a violation of the Guidelines with respect to any of the three charges brought by The Red and Blue?

a. Impairment of freedom to publish: The Committee concludes that failure of SAC Steering to recommend re-recognition, regardless of the reasons for doing so, does not prevent The Red and Blue from dissemi-
Open Expression continued from page 5
nating its views. In the context of the issue of publication viability alone, SAC Steering is correct in stating that "Lack of SAC recognition does not deprive the organization [The Red and Blue] of its right to function."

b. The yes. The proposal of office of space: Apart from any other consideration, the Committee finds this charge too speculative to review.

c. Denial of a voice in SAC: SAC Steering agrees with this portion of The Red and Blue complaint, but argues that The Red and Blue in its October 1989 issue demonstrated a lack of "commitment to the community it wishes to serve."

We thus are faced with a conflict between two values (their attendant policies—open expression at the University and the right of a University organization such as SAC, which is an arm of the University and not simply an independent body associated with the University, to deny membership to groups whose positions it finds objectionable and in possible conflict with the organization's guiding spirit of collegiality. The Committee on Open Expression respects both of these conflicting positions. In our judgment, however, the Open Expression Guidelines take precedence over the Preamble of the Student Activities Council Constitution. SAC Steering therefore erred in the extent that it based its recommendation against re-recognition of The Red and Blue at least in part on the statements in the October 1989 issue of the publication.

COUNCIL
Summary of Meeting April 11, 1990
The president read a statement about Locust Walk which was published in The Daily Pennsylvanian Thursday, April 12, 1990 (p.5 and is) in Almanac April 17, 1990. A copy of this statement was attached to [the summary as mailed to members].

The provost reported the conclusion of the SEAS and Wharton's Dean Search and the intention to appoint a Search Committee to recommend a dean for the Graduate School of Fine Arts (Dean Copeland's term ends on 6/30/91) see letters in 4/10/90 Almanac.

The provost announced that Professor Carol Smith Rosenberg (History) and Professor Jeffrey Cotten (Music) had been selected for Guggenheim Awards and Professor Houston Baker is to receive the award of the Governors Award for Excellence in the Humanities.

The provost alerted the University community to look in the April 17 issue of Almanac for the 1990-1991 salary guidelines.

The provost reported that the proposed revisions of the University Student Judicial System Charter and the Academic Integrity Code should be ready soon for open discussion.

Professor Davies made his last report to Council as the chair of Steering. He reported that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee had voted that the Faculty remain involved in University Affairs until the fall and that the progress of the implementation of the Ad Hoc Committee report be monitored.

Professor Davies also expressed thanks to the University Council committee and urged the continued support of the upcoming year-end reports. Professor Davies and many other members of Council applauded the president's statement on Locust Walk.

Mr. Saadi-Elmandjra formally introduced Ms. Susan Garfinkel, his successor as chair of GAPSA. Ms. Garfinkel was applauded. He also expressed appreciation for the attempt to improve counseling services for graduate students and the approval of the concept that the same percent of the General Fee will be made available for graduate student activities funding as is available for undergraduate student activities funding. He urged letter writing support for HB3267 that would permit Lebanese students to remain in the United States until the political situation in Lebanon stabilizes.

Ms. Duchess Harris was applauded as the new Chair of the UA. She expressed the hope that we could develop a community where racism, sexism and heterosexism were less controlling. Ms. Harris also expressed enthusiasm about the president's statement on Locust Walk. She also expressed interest in the Honor Code implementation and the development and implementation of the plan for the "Vision of Penn's Future." Finally Ms. Harris invited everyone to the 4/22/90 Conference on Student Government.

Professor Estey introduced the "Report of the Senate Ad Hoc Committee to Review University Council" which was published in the March 20 Almanac and distributed to University Council in the pre-meeting packet. Discussion centered on the recommendation that section IV, subsection 5 of the University Council By-Laws state that "Anyone (proposedly "any guest") who, in the opinion of the presiding officer, does not preserve the decorum of the meeting shall be asked to leave." (Messrs. Glasker, Singer, Phaahla and A. T. Miller, Ms. Garfinkel and Professors Cohen, Gross, Lior, Robert Davies, Helen Davies and Harris commented on the questions.) After discussion Professor Hildebrand, the moderator, agreed that when a vote on the proposed by-law amendments was taken a separate vote could be taken on section IV, subsection 5.

The remainder of by-law proposed amendments concerned the addition of the underlined clause to subsection V, subsection 3, "The Council, by affirmative vote of a majority of the full membership, may decide to act on a matter not on the agenda for action: otherwise no action, including a straw vote may be taken." (Mr. Glasker, Prof. Gross, and Mr. Goldstein commented on this wording. Mr. A. T. Miller commented "I still feel the word 'neutral' should appear with moderator, with this clarification: The moderator shall neither solicit opinions from the floor, nor shall the moderator have the power to introduce, comment on second or amend motions in Council." Professor Robert Davies and Professor Harris responded that the word moderator meant all characteristics stated by Mr. Miller.)

The discussion on the proposed revisions of the Open Expression Guidelines centered on the proposed addition to paragraph I subsection D which states "In case of conflict between the principles of the Guidelines on Open Expression and other University policies, the principles of the Guidelines shall take precedence." (Ms. Hunt, Mr. Glasker, Prof. Kors, Ms. Ingleby, Ms. Garfinkel and Mr. Phaahla expressed views on this question.) Messrs. was the question about whether if a person was told they were violating or would violate the guidelines if they continued and then that person desisted, then is the person in violation (Section III b 5c). (Mr. Pringle, Prof. Cohen, Prof. Gross, Ms. Garfinkel and Prof. Lior spoke about this question and evidence.)

The provost reaffirmed that as soon as the proposed recommendation from the committee to consider the revision to the Student Judicial System Charter and the Code of Academic Integrity are received an oversight committee will consider all three reports in order to ensure consistency.

The continued discussion of the First Amendment and the University of Pennsylvania Harassment Policies considered the process by which the policies might be re-evaluated. (Mr. Pringle, Prof. Robert Davies, the provost, Mr. Glasker, Prof. Gross, Prof. Singer, Prof. Kors, Mr. Saadi-Elmandjra, Ms. Elizabeth Hunt, Mr. A. T. Miller, Mr. Phaahla and the president all participated in the discussion.) After discussion Prof. Robert Davies moved and many seconded a resolution "that the University of Pennsylvania Harassment Policies be re-evaluated." The motion passed 27 in favor, 4 against and 7 abstentions.

—Duncan Van Dusen, Secretary
Managing the Endowment: FY 1989

Scott C. Lederman, CFA, Treasurer
Lucy S. G. Momjian, CFA, Associate Treasurer for Investments

The University's endowment continued its successful 10-year period ended June 30, 1989, Penn's endowment ranked first in performance among all other college and university endowment funds. This article summarizes the results achieved.

University investments are the responsibility of the Investment Board which John B. Neff, a University Trustee, has chaired since 1980. Investment policies established by the Board are implemented on a day-to-day basis by the Office of Investments, which reports to Scott C. Lederman, CFA, Treasurer.

The University's endowment had a market value of $761 million as of June 30, 1989. Approximately 91% of the endowment (after adjustments for additions on July 1, 1989) is invested in the Associated Investment Fund (AIF), a pooled investment fund. As of June 30, 1989, the AIF had a total market value of $683,276,000 and consisted of 1,439,526 participating shares. Due to investment restrictions that prohibit pooling into the AIF, the remainder of the University's endowment is invested in over 140 Separately Invested Funds. Given the magnitude of the AIF, its performance is used to represent that of the University's total endowment.

Performance Results

The AIF is managed for total return, as investment returns are sought from both current income and principal appreciation. For Fiscal Year 1989, ended June 30, 1989, the AIF achieved a total return of 16.19 percent. On a per share basis, funds invested in the AIF on July 1, 1988, when each share was worth $434.13, increased in value by $40.52 or 9.33 percent. On a per share basis, funds invested in the AIF on July 1, 1988, share value.

For performance comparison, total returns typically are stated in terms of cumulative compounded returns. This approach assumes that all principal and income returns are reinvested or compounded, usually on a calendar quarter basis, over the given measurement period. The above AIF total return figure for FY 1989 stated as a cumulative return compounded quarterly was 16.7 percent. By comparison, the Standard and Poor's 500 (S&P 500) common stock index and Dow Jones industrial average increased 20.4 percent and 18.6 percent, respectively, on a total return basis during the same 12-month period. Meanwhile, the Shearson Lehman Government Corporate bond index and the Salomon Brothers broad index reflected total returns of 12.3 percent and 12.2 percent, respectively.

Longer measurement periods provide a more meaningful context in which to evaluate investment performance. The chart below shows the AIF's excellent total return performance relative to various market indices. Also included is a composite index which shows what the AIF return would have been had the AIF been invested in the S&P 500 and the Shearson Lehman Government corporate bond index on a weighted basis equivalent to its actual stock and bond allocation over the various periods.

Comparison with the actual performance of other endowment funds will allow not only a protection against present and future inflation, but also compensation for the effects of inflation experienced during the 1970's and early 1980's. Under the Spending Rule Policy, a decision is made each year to spend in the following fiscal year a certain rate or percent, called the Spending Rate, of the endowment's market value. A three-year moving average of the June 30 AIF share market values is used for the market value base to smooth the sometimes volatile year-to-year investment returns. To accommodate budgetary planning, this average is set back one year.

The Spending Rate is the key to successful application of this policy. Historical investment return studies suggest a Spending Rate should be no higher than 5.0% to 5.5%; the latest NACUBO study indicates that the average Spending Rate for participating institutions is, in fact, 4.8%. However, to avoid dislocations in existing University programs when the Spending Rule was instituted in Fiscal 1981, a 6.7% Spending Rate was used. It was a stated goal, at that time, to lower the rate in each succeeding year. For this year, Fiscal 1990, the Spending Rate is 5.5%.

The Spending Rate usually would be less than total return and under present market conditions, would likely be less than earnings from income. Any return, in our case, current income earned above the amount available for spending, as calculated under the Spending Rule, is reinvested in endowment principal. Previously, our practice had been to spend all current endowment income. By focusing attention on the trade-off between current spending and future growth, the Spending Rule has enabled us to exercise control over endowment spending and to improve long range planning.

In Fiscal Year 1989, $10.5 million, representing 25% of total AIF income, was reinvested in the AIF. Since establishment of the Spending Rule, over $79.0 million has been reinvested, which at a market value of approximately $1.08 billion, represents over 15% of the AIF's market value as of June 30, 1989. The graph below, which reflects endowment purchasing power, plots the AIF share values both with and without the effect of the Spending Rule against two indices of inflation, the Consumer Price Index and the Higher Education Price Index. As indicated by the graph, the Spending Rule has aided in the preservation of the purchasing power of the AIF, although clearly we have yet to compensate fully for the effects of inflation in the 1970's and 1980's.

Total Return Performance Comparison
Various Periods Ended 6/30/89

Annualized Returns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AIF Share</th>
<th>Composite Index</th>
<th>S&amp;P 500</th>
<th>Dow Jones Indust'l Average</th>
<th>Shearson Lehman Gov't Corporate</th>
<th>Salomon Bros. Broad Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Years</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Years</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA = Not Available

NACUBO Comparative Performance Study
Fiscal 1989 Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Funds</th>
<th>Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIF Ranking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>54/278</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Years</td>
<td>7/243</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Years</td>
<td>2/227</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Years</td>
<td>1/179</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two Guggenheims

Winners of the John Simon Guggenheim Award for 1990-91 are Dr. Jeffrey Cotton, a composer and recent alumnus who is now a lecturer in music, and Dr. Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, professor of history. Dr. Smith-Rosenberg will work on a book tentatively titled Bodies Politic during the coming year, and Dr. Cotton plans to compose a chamber opera set during the building of the Berlin Wall.

Honorary Degree

Former Provost Eliot Stellar, University Professor of Physiological Psychology in Anatomy, received an honorary doctorate this month from Emory University, which cited him for his pioneering research in the nascent interdisciplinary science of physiological psychology, his statemanship in the national academies, and his gift for developing institutions. He was recognized for special contributions to Emory where, after serving on the visiting committee for the arts and sciences, he advised on expansion in the life sciences that is coming to fruition as “an important step toward a future you helped us to imagine.”

Inventor’s Award

Dr. Jeffrey Cohen, associate professor of physics, received the 1990 Best Invention Award of the Franklin Institute for his invention of the high-efficiency solar collector—meaning, at 150 degrees, it is 90% efficient compared to the flat plate collector’s 10%. Dr. Cohen began work on the device in 1962 as a hands-on hobby to relax from his theoretical work at the University. It is now in the manufacturing stage, soon to be brought to market.

Festschrift

The Journal of the American Oriental Society continues to have a special issue (Volume 109, No. 2, 1989) dedicated to the work of Dr. Ernest Bender, professor emeritus of Indo-Aryan language and literature in South Asia Regional Studies. In the volume edited by Professors Theodore Ricardi, Jr., of Columbia and Stanley H. Insel of Yale, scholars from the U.S. and abroad delineate Dr. Bender’s contributions to Indological Studies. The Society also named Dr. Bender the Journal’s editor emeritus—the first to be so named since the Society was formed in 1942.

Publication Prizes


Dr. Karen Buhler-Wilkinson, associate professor of nursing, received the Lavinia L. Dock Award of the American Association for the History of Nursing, for her book Nursing and the Public’s Health, an examination of public health nursing since the 1880s. She is also at work on another, with Audrey Davis of the Smithsonian, called Nurses Still Make House Calls: A Hundred Years of Visiting Nurses in America.

Dr. Morris A. Cohen, professor of decision sciences at Wharton, won the Lauder/TIMS Award for Best Advances in the Theory and Practice of International Management, for his paper on Resource Development Analysis of Global Manufacturing and Distribution New Ventures.

Gold (Again!)

For the second year in a row, WXPN-FM’s “Kid’s Corner” took the gold award in children’s programming at the Corporation for Public Broadcasting’s annual conference. For the daily (7-8 p.m. weeknights) call-in show for youngsters 6 to 14, host Kathy O’Connell brings guests who rap with callers about art, music, archaeology and science—and about family dynamics, their feelings, and realities of life such as AIDS, child abuse, racism, sexism and substance abuse. Regulars include a “Science Guy,” Mike Weilbacher; a family psychologist, Mary Eisman, and computer/technology expert Peter Cook and Scott Manning. Proposals are under consideration for regional or national syndication of the show.

To the Peerage

Dr. E.J. Lawson Soulsby, a member of the Veterinary School’s faculty for 14 years and now head of the Cambridge Veterinary School in his native England, was created a Life Peer by Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II on April 4. The former Penn professor of parasitology and chair of pathology received an honorary degree here in 1984 during the Wharton Centennial celebration. His exact title is not yet known, but is likely to be Baron Soulsby of Swaffham Prior in the County of Cambridgeshire. He will sit as a Conservative in the House of Lords.

Williams/Paul Awards

The Association of Women Faculty and Administrators presented its 1990 Leonore Rowe Williams Award to Dr. Rosalie Tung, a former Wharton faculty member who is now Distinguished Professor at the University of Wisconsin. Dr. Tung was cited for “outstanding contributions to her profession, her University, and her community, and for her special efforts to promote equal opportunities for women and minority populations.”

The award was given April 17 at a Faculty Club breakfast, where the Association also gave seven students the Alice Paul Award for outstanding leadership, scholarship and contributions to the community: College Seniors Suzanne Maloney, Elizabeth Dominik and Elena Maria Mortemore; SAS graduate students Abby Schrader and Ann Cullibie; and Law School students Ann Bartow and Storm Jamison. The Williams Award was created by bequest of a former member, whose name is also on the Williams Building with that of her late husband. The Alice Paul Awards, provided by membership contributions, are named for the
DEATHS

Dr. Julius Winston, associate professor emeritus of medicine died March 25 at the age of 88. Dr. Winston worked part-time "on-leave" with the West Philadelphia Improvement Corps (WEPIC) from his job as a landscaper at the University. During the past year, by special arrangement, Mr. Taicher was able to work part-time with the WEPIC program at the John F. Kennedy High School. He held a bachelor's degree in human services from Villanova and was due to receive his master's degree from Penn in May.

He is survived by his fiancé, Diane Thomas, his parents, Herb and Dorothy Taicher, his brothers David and Adam, and his grandmother, Mildred Taicher.

A memorial service will be held for Mr. Taicher Friday, April 27, at 4 p.m. at Hillel. Donations may be sent to WEPIC, 3906 Spruce St., Philadelphia, PA 19104.
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### The University of Pennsylvania Police Department

This report contains tallies of part 1 crimes, a listing of part 1 crimes against persons, and summaries of part 1 crimes in the five busiest sectors on campus where two or more incidents were reported between April 16, 1990 and April 22, 1990.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time Reported</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Offense/Weapon</th>
<th>Arrest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/19/90</td>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>200 Block 36th</td>
<td>Bike wheel taken from rack</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/19/90</td>
<td>6:43 PM</td>
<td>Van Pelt Library</td>
<td>Wallet taken from knapsack</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/16/90</td>
<td>6:26 PM</td>
<td>Van Pelt Library</td>
<td>Unattended book taken</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/17/90</td>
<td>6:43 PM</td>
<td>Van Pelt Library</td>
<td>Wallet taken from knapsack</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/16/90</td>
<td>10:21 AM</td>
<td>Logan Hall</td>
<td>Unsecured bike wheel taken</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/19/90</td>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>200 Block 36th</td>
<td>Bike wheel taken from rack</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Safety Tip:** Use bicycle racks, which are strategically located on campus, and secure your bike with recommended chains and locks. Report any suspicious people you may see loitering around bike racks to The University Police immediately.

### 18th Police District Crimes Against Persons

Schuylkill River to 49th Street, Market Street to Woodland Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time Reported</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Offense/Weapon</th>
<th>Arrest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/09/90</td>
<td>1:28 AM</td>
<td>1425 S. Hanson</td>
<td>Aggravated Assault/gun</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/09/90</td>
<td>1:50 PM</td>
<td>4201 Chestnut</td>
<td>Aggravated Assault/knife</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/09/90</td>
<td>2:10 PM</td>
<td>1215 S. 49</td>
<td>Aggravated Assault/knife</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/09/90</td>
<td>2:20 PM</td>
<td>4600 Lukow</td>
<td>Robbery/strong-arm</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/90</td>
<td>12:00 AM</td>
<td>4525 Linmore</td>
<td>Aggravated Assault/fists</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/11/90</td>
<td>9:27 AM</td>
<td>3400 Sansom</td>
<td>Robbery/gun</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/11/90</td>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td>3800 Sansom</td>
<td>Robbery/strong-arm</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/12/90</td>
<td>1:27 AM</td>
<td>3925 Walnut</td>
<td>Robbery/strong-arm</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/12/90</td>
<td>1:50 PM</td>
<td>4600 Pine</td>
<td>Robbery/screwdriver</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/12/90</td>
<td>5:18 PM</td>
<td>4600 Walnut</td>
<td>Robbery/gun</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/14/90</td>
<td>3:25 AM</td>
<td>4513 Kingsessing</td>
<td>Robbery/knife</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/15/90</td>
<td>3:53 AM</td>
<td>4600 Woodland</td>
<td>Rape/in van</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 30th Anniversary of the FirstAbbott Award

The Layman Award, Nominated for a 1988 Tony Award, "A Walk in the Woods," starring Sam Gray (far left) and Terry Lyman, Nominated for a 1989 Tony Award, "A Walk in the Woods" is based on the historical account of American negotiator Paul H. Nitze and Soviet diplomat Yuri A. Kvitinsky, who in 1982 met daily in an outlying forest of Geneva to discuss arms negotiations. Critics say it deals humorously and poignantly with the quest for peace.

### APRIL AT PENN

**FILMS**

- **27 Neighborhood Film Video Project:** A Soiree with Jessie Jane Lewis; tickets: $5 for adults and $1 for students, International House members, and senior citizens (International House).
- **28 Don't Let Them Shoot the Kite:** Tunc Basaran, Turkey, 1989; 7:30 p.m. Tickets: $5 for adults, $4 for students (International House).

**MUSIC**

- **30 Arbel Choirale:** Philadelphia's Young Adult Jewish Choir; $7, $5 for students, 7:30 p.m., Hillel (Jewish Campus Activities Board).

**TALKS**

- **26 Head-hunting and Gene Tweaking in Insect Flight Muscle:** Crossbridge and Sarcomere Ultrastructure; Mary Reedy, Michael Reedy, Duke University; 4 p.m., Library 4th floor, Richards Building (Department of Physiology, Pennsylvania Muscle Institute).
- **Interactions between Dopamine and Gaba in the CNS:** Karen Gale, Georgetown University; 4 p.m., Seminar Room, 100-101, John Morgan Building (Psychiatry and Pharmacology).
- **Speed, Size and the Cost of Running:** A New Look at What Muscles Do; C.R. Taylor; 2-3 p.m., Room 109, Leidy Labs (Departments of Physiology and Biology).

- **27 The Fusion Site of Influenza Hemagglutinin Expressing Fibroblasts Requires More Than One Hemagglutinin Triemer:** Harma Ellens, SKF Laboratories; 12:15 p.m., Seminar Room 1, John Morgan Building (Environmental Medicine).
- **New Methods in Molecular Biology Applied to the Neurosciences:** topics: PCR: How to Clone Any Receptor without Really Trying; M. White; pharmacology; Bacterial Expression Systems: A New Route for Antibody Production; R. Pittman, pharmacology; RNA Amplification: How to Clone from Discrete Brain Regions; J. Eberwine, pharmacology, 2-3:30 p.m. Lecture Room B, John Morgan Building (Department of Pharmacology, Philadelphia Chapter/Society for Neuroscience).

**Cloning around with Neuropeptide Receptors:** Michael White, pharmacology and pediatrics; noon, Seminar Room, Suite 100-101, John Morgan Building (Department of Pharmacology).