Nine Term Chairs at Wharton

Dean Thomas Gerrity has announced nine term chair appointments for The Wharton School—eight of them to new arrivals under the Young Faculty Development Program.

The ninth is the Coopers and Lybrand Term Professor of Accounting, Dr. Robert W. Holthausen, who joined Wharton in 1989 as professor of accounting and finance. After taking his Ph.D. from Rochester in 1980, Dr. Holthausen was at the University of Chicago as assistant professor and associate professor. He is associate editor of The Accounting Review and has been on the board of the Journal of Accounting Research since 1982. His research interests include the effects of information on prices and volume, corporate restructuring and valuation, accounting choice and organizational structure, and market microstructure.

The eight term chairholders in the Young Faculty program are:

Dr. Marlene E. Burkhardt, Anheuser-Busch Term Assistant Professor of Management. Dr. Burkhardt took her Ph.D. in organizational behavior and organizational theory in June from Penn State, where she received the Dean's Doctoral Fellow Award in 1986 and was a doctoral consortium participant at the Academy of Management National Meeting in Washington, D.C. in 1989. Her research includes the interplay of power, technology and structure; social network analysis, and the institutionalization of organizational change.

Sandra L. Chamberlain, Arthur Andersen & Co. Lecturer in Accounting. A Ph.D. candidate at Chicago, Ms. Chamberlain held Chicago's GSB Fellowship from 1984-89 and was both a research assistant and teaching assistant there. Her research areas include earnings management, accounting methods choice, and changes in corporate structure; her dissertation is on the effect of mergers on the operating performance of acquired banks.

Bruce Grundy, Donald B. Stott Lecturer in Finance. Joining the faculty after four years as assistant professor of finance at Stanford, Mr. Grundy is a Ph.D. candidate at Chicago working on a dissertation on “Dividends: Tax Equilibria and Signaling Equilibria.” He is also associate editor of the Review of Financial Studies. His interests include option pricing, dividend policy, capital structure and trading volume.

Dr. Barbara E. Kahn, Stephen M. Peck Term Associate Professor of Marketing. Dr. Kahn, who took her Ph.D. at Columbia, spent a year at Wharton, 1988-89, as visiting assistant professor of marketing. She comes back to the faculty from UCLA’s Anderson Graduate (continued next page)
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School of Management, where she won the Chancellor's Faculty Career Development Award for 1988. She is on the editorial boards of The Journal of Marketing Research and Marketing Letters. Her research in progress is on consumer choice and variety seeking, brand loyalty, decisions under uncertainty/ambiguity, and price promotion.

John Paul MacDuffie, Roger Stone Lecturer in Management. A Ph.D. candidate and research associate at MIT's Sloan School of Management, Mr. MacDuffie has also been a Haman Fellow at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government. Earlier this year he received the International Research Award from the American Society for Training and Development. Mr. MacDuffie's research interests include organizational and technological change, international comparative human resource strategies, flexible production systems, and manufacturing policy and performance.

Dr. Robert J. Meyer, Anheuser-Busch Term Associate Professor of Marketing. A former visiting associate professor at Wharton (1988-89), Dr. Meyer took his Ph.D. at Iowa and in 1982 joined UCLA's Anderson School, where he chaired the Marketing Academic Unit. A member of the editorial boards of the Journal of Consumer Research, Journal of Retailing, and Marketing Letters, he focuses his research on consumer decision-making, sales response modeling, decision-making under uncertainty, and dynamic decision-making.

Dr. Sharon Tennyson, Mathew R. Komreich Term Assistant Professor of Insurance. Dr. Tennyson is a former lecturer at Roosevelt University and at Northwestern University, where she took her Ph.D. in June. She was a University Scholar at Northwestern in 1988-89. Her research areas are the economics of insurance, organization of insurance markets and government policy.

Dr. Ping Zhang, Anheuser-Busch Term Assistant Professor of Statistics. Dr. Zhang took his Ph.D. in June at Berkeley, where he was a research assistant and instructor in statistics. His current research explores cross-validation methods, model selection and nonparametric regression.

Library's Late-Late Computer Lab at Rosengarten Reserve: Open to All

The Library's new Adolph G. Rosengarten Computer Laboratory will be dedicated tomorrow evening, October 17.

But it is already open for business. All students, faculty and staff are invited to "stop by and try out" the new lab, said Dr. Paul Mosher. Located on the ground floor of the Van Pelt-Dietrich Library Center, adjacent to the Rosengarten Reserve. Room, the Lab is equipped with 20 Macintosh and 10 IBM PCs, and scratch and laser printers; it provides access to a number of standard word processing and spreadsheet programs—and to the Penn Library Information Network, including the online catalog, Franklin, and PennNet. Fall hours for the Lab match Rosengarten Reserve's new, longer hours:

- Monday-Thursday 8:30 a.m. - 7:00 a.m.
- Friday 8:30 a.m. - 10 p.m.
- Saturday 10 - 2:00 a.m.
- Sunday noon - 7:00 a.m.

A student consultant is on duty until 10 p.m. Sundays through Thursdays, and until 8 p.m. Saturdays.

At Council on October 10, a question from the floor revealed an omission in Almanac's September 25 listing of membership of the new Committee to Diversify Locust Walk. The full list appears below.

Update: Committee to Diversify Locust Walk

Co-chairs:
Dr. Kim M. Morrison, VPUL
Dr. David Pope, Engineering

Members:
Dr. Gloria Chismus, chair, Trustees Committee on Student Life
Dr. Drew Faust, chair, University Life Committee
Dr. Robert Lucid, chair, Council of Masters
Dr. Almarin Phillips, chair, Faculty Senate
Dr. Adelaide Deluva, chair, Council Safety/Security Committee
Dr. Lawrence Eisenberg, chair, Council Facilities Committee
Doris Cochran-Fikes, director, Alumni Relations
Nicholas Constans, assistant to the President
Elena di Lapi, director, Penn Women's Center
Duchess Harris, chair, Undergraduate Assembly (UA)
Susan Garfinkle, chair, Graduate and Professional Students Assembly (GAPSA)
Anita J. Hseuh, president, Panhellenic Council
Bret Kinsella, president, Interfraternity Council (IFC)
Melanie Shain, Greek Alumni Council
Erica Strohl, Students Together Against Aquaintance Rape (STARR)
Kathryn A. Williams, president, Black Inter-Greek Council (BIGC)
Nalini Samuel, United Minorities Council (UMC)
Robin Wood, co-chair, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Alliance.

Advisory/Support Members:
Kemel Dawkins, director of project management, Facilities
Christopher Mason, associate treasurer
Christopher de Van Velde, director, real estate
Tricia Phaup, director, Fraternity/Sorority Affairs
Steven G. Poskanzer, associate general counsel

FROM COLLEGE HALL

Tenure Decisions and Gender

Each year the Office of the Provost publishes data showing how women and men are faring in the internal tenure process. The most recent reports can be found in Almanac October 25, 1988, pg. 2, and October 17, 1989, pg. 2.

The following data do not concern individuals hired with tenure from outside the University nor faculty members reviewed internally before the fifth or sixth year of an assistant professor's appointment or before the third or fourth year of an untenured associate professor's appointment. These reports concern so-called "timely" internal reviews—cases held during the fifth or sixth year for assistant professors and those held during the third or fourth year for untenured associate professors. Appropriate modifications are made for health school faculty on the ten-year tenure track. The study currently covers the period from 1980-81 through 1989-90.

These tables indicate those achieving timely tenure by (TT). Cases yielding negative results are indicated by (D) if the decision was made at the departmental level, by (S) if at the school level and by (U) if at the University level. The symbol (O), other, refers to persons who received the appropriate data for a timely review, but for whom no review took place because of resignation, transfer to the clinician-educator track, death or request for no review. Numbers are adjusted for faculty members reviewed twice; this means that the sum of the data from 1980-89 and those from 1989-90 need not add to the cumulative data for 1980-81 through 1989-90.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes of Timely Tenure Reviews 1989-90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Faculty Members (Proportions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Attained (TT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women 56(52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men 22(60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 78(36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Not Attained (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women 13(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men 47(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 60(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Not Attained (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women 6(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men 20(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 26(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Not Attained (U)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women 5(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men 12(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 17(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Not Attained (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women 5(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men 12(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 17(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report presents data but does not attempt interpretation.

— Richard C. Clelland, Deputy Provost
— Anne Mangel, Assistant to the Provost for Provost Staff Conference Matters
Dear Colleague:

We did it again! Last year the University’s faculty and staff substantially exceeded our goal of $275,000 in giving during Penn’s 1989-90 workplace charitable contribution campaign and set a new record. If you were among the many Penn people who gave a total of $290,000, please accept my thanks. Your generosity continues to help people in every corner of the Delaware Valley.

As need grows, we continue to review the shape of our campaign to enable the most dollars to serve the greatest number of people whose lives can be improved in our communities. Our campaign this year is entitled, “Penn’s Way/United Way,” to signify that Penn’s employees support a wide variety of services and self-help programs for the communities in which we live and work. As we did in last year’s campaign, we have included information, in addition to The United Way’s “Guide to Caring,” about four other fundraising organizations in our area: The Black United Fund of Pennsylvania, The Bread and Roses Community Fund, the United Negro College Fund and Womens Way. These Organizations, like The United Way, exist to raise money for service agencies and charitable programs in the Delaware Valley.

We can, as before, make an unrestricted gift to all United Way agencies and services by direct donation to The United Way. Through The United Way’s “Targeted Care” and “Specific Care” selections, we can contribute to categories of United Way’s affiliate agencies and to individual donor option agencies for whom The United Way administers workplace campaigns. These agencies are listed in the “Guide to Caring.”

In addition, those of us who want to provide help to agencies and programs that are funded by other fundraising organizations that serve the Delaware Valley can write in one or more of their names on the Donor Choice Forms. As the result of important changes we have made for this year’s campaign, our contributions to The Black United Fund of Pennsylvania, The Bread and Roses Community Fund, The United Negro College Fund and Womens Way will be directed to those organizations without deduction of administrative charges. Like The United Way, those organizations listed above are participating in our campaign by providing literature describing the agencies and programs they fund, by assisting in solicitor training and by participating in the events planned to support our campaign.

Please join me in exercising your personal choice by making a gift that will count very much in support of the people of the Delaware Valley.

Sincerely,

Sheldon Hackney
A Few Remarks on Honorary Degrees, from the Chair of the Committee

Nominations should be sent before November 1, not to me or the Council Committee on Honorary Degrees but to:

Duncan Van Dusen
121 College Hall/6382

The Council Committee only makes recommendations to the Trustees and its recommendations are limited to academic areas, that is, scholars and artists (in the broad sense: scientists are scholars and writers are artists). We do pass along other nominations we receive but it is not clear to me that I should advise anyone to be content with that pass-along. I certainly do not advise against making nominations directly to the Trustees (bear in mind, however, that for at least fifteen years those receiving honorary degrees for scholarly work have all been recommended by the Council Committee).

The rules of confidentiality have an unfortunate side effect. The committee members are not entitled to give interim reports to the nominators. In the usual case, the success of a nomination will not be known until the Trustees announce the list and even then the reasons why a name is missing (which is, of course, the usual case) can not be told. We can not tell you whether it was action of the Council Committee or the Trustees or the candidate that was decisive. The most troublesome part of this is in the last case: the candidate who turns us down. Certain people are repeatedly nominated and their absence on the list repeatedly is a cause of resentment. I know no solution to this problem. If one perceives a systematic bias in the University's selections it seems improper for the Council Committee to ask for the benefit of the doubt. On the other hand we can not go public with a list of nominees who have declined the honor.

I have noticed that successful recommendations usually answer two critical questions: why should the nominee—of all people—be honored by Penn; why should Penn—of all places—do the honoring. The first question is an obvious one but it is surprising how often the committee receives just the name and no other information. An effective letter of nomination comes with supporting material beginning with a vita (photocopied, usually, from something like Who's Who). The second question, why should this university offer a degree, has two versions depending on the renown of the candidate: in the case of an ordinary candidate the question is why should we extend the honor and in the case of a famous candidate why should the honor be accepted? In the first case the best answer is to argue that the honor will, in fact, be ours. In the second case we need some reason to believe that the candidate will accept.

It is idle for the Committee to recommend an honorary degree to a scholar with colleagues at Penn without letters of endorsement from some of those scholarly colleagues. It is almost as idle for anyone to recommend a degree for a celebrity with a tight schedule, particularly a performing artist or head of state and, in the opposite direction, to recommend a celebrity known for ignoring schedules. Successful nominations usually come with reasons why the nominee should accept and, in fact, show up on commencement day. The best reason is a good "Penn connection," that is, a serious relationship with some part of the University.

—Peter Freyd, Chair, Council Committee on Honorary Degrees

One Harassment Policy

As an employee at Penn, it seems to me that harassment—whether racial, sexual, religious, or whatever—is obviously inappropriate in an educational institution.

However, to devise a policy on Racial Harassment and a policy on Sexual Harassment and a policy on some other form of harassment seems to be reinventing the wheel. I believe that the University needs a single policy that provides guidelines to prevent or punish confrontations based on any and all forms of prejudice, with the exception of sports rivalries, of course.

Unfortunately, harassment—and any policy that might be devised against it—simply focuses on the negative aspect of the situation. Perhaps instead of telling people what not to do and whom not to do it to, we should develop a policy on Politeness—not only to other people but also to other species and to our environment.

—K.R. Mullin, Supervisor of Medical Records, V.I.U.P
After consultation with University Council in December 1988, President Sheldon Hackney appointed a committee of University faculty, students, staff and alumni to undertake a broad examination of campus life. The Committee was charged (Almanac December 13, 1988) with identifying ways of creating and maintaining a campus atmosphere conducive to the free and vigorous exchange of ideas—not only in the classroom, but throughout the living and working environment on campus. The Committee's report, below, is intended for University Council discussion. The President invites the views of all members of the University community, to be sent to him at 100 College Hall/6303.

Report of the President's Committee on University Life

Institutions of higher learning across the United States are troubled by what they see as the "declining quality of campus life," by proliferating incidents of racial and sexual harassment, bigotry and incivility, by a disappearance of the community that seems, at least in retrospect, to have characterized American universities of an earlier era. Individual colleges, including many of Penn's peer institutions within the Ivy League, have commissioned studies on one or more aspects of the problem, and the prestigious Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has recently completed a study of campus life. The charge that Sheldon Hackney issued to our Committee on University Life in the last week of 1988's Fall semester thus expressed concerns relevant far beyond the Penn campus, issues that arise at least in part from the changing situation of higher education within the United States and from transformations in American society at large.

In the 1990s, we find ourselves in a society of growing racial polarization and of increasing economic inequality. Penn's urban setting reinforces these realities in particularly forceful ways. And Penn, like most other major universities, is itself a different sort of place than it was a generation ago: it has become a far more heterogeneous community internationally, racially, ideologically than the school most of our alumni/ae attended. Yet many of its citizens, here for a few years of their lives, or a few hours of each working day, come from sites far less diverse than those the University offers and are shaped by the far more homogeneous experiences and values of those settings. Many, if not most, of the members of the Penn community are unaccustomed to the diversity of University life. Yet in committing itself to the promotion of diversity, Penn, like most other institutions, assumed through much of the 60s, 70s and 80s that good intentions would resolve, if not obliterate, emerging conflicts; that the values of intellectual and cultural tolerance associated with academic life would prevail. It is hardly surprising that many individuals, overwhelmed and often threatened by the scale and unfamiliarity of campus society, have retreated to groups that reproduce their own backgrounds or special interests. Left to find community on their own, students, faculty and staff have often coped by creating their own islands of psychological safety and, more often than not, homogeneity. Thus, rather than genuinely diverse community life, Penn's tends more towards a fragmentation and separation that does little to mitigate the sense of unfamiliarity, insecurity and, often, marginality that many of its members feel.

A commitment to recruiting diverse students, faculty and staff is therefore just a beginning; the University, and each of its faculty, staff and student citizens, must be actively committed to building community, establishing situations and occasions for celebrating diversity by making it central to all aspects of campus life, and negotiating the difficulties that will inevitably arise from this. The greatest of Penn's educational endeavors: the effort to create and maintain a genuinely heterogeneous community of justice, equality and creativity. Our committee was much impressed by the way a Brown University report on minority life framed this distinction, arguing that the concept of diversity "...in which individuals from various groups are merely present" is significantly different from pluralism, in which individuals and groups maintain their separate identities, yet come together in a community enriched by both its members' differences and their similarities. We should not be surprised that building pluralism is not easy; in its difficulty lies its very importance.

A university commitment to social and cultural pluralism arises naturally from long cherished intellectual values that have traditionally placed the encouragement of pluralistic thought at the center of higher education's pursuit of knowledge. What has come to be known as "academic freedom" has for decades been vigorously advanced by university citizens of widely varied political allegiances and has become institutionalized through such structures as tenure and other university protections for open expression. Yet the increasing social diversity of American campuses, a phenomenon that is in one sense the inevitable counterpart of universities' commitment to intellectual tolerance and pluralism, has ironically been accompanied by growing challenges to freedom of speech and expression on campus.

Our committee regards these issues of intellectual, social and cultural pluralism as inseparable. The University must work to ensure the right of individuals to express their intellectual, ideological, cultural, social, and sexual differences, for it is this variety of experience that will provide the foundation for the richest possible educational environment for all members of the campus community. But we must recognize that individuals' need for a sense of familiarity and safety within this complicated and often conflictual social and intellectual world often militates against the nurturance of the understanding necessary for a genuine celebration of either intellectual or cultural pluralism. In defending or asserting their own particular identities or choices, individuals may all too easily overlook their responsibilities as members of the larger, shared community that serves as the ultimate defender of our differences. In emphasizing what we do share, as well as how our differences enrich the texture of our common experience; in continually articulating the standards of civility fundamental to daily life, the University's faculty, student and administrative leadership must provide the campus at large with a realistic understanding of its problems as well as a vision of its extraordinary possibilities for encouraging intellectual and personal growth.

What We Share: Our Commitment to Learning

Penn's identity as an institution and as a community is founded in its commitment to the discovery and dissemination of knowledge. How we structure the learning and teaching process and how we define its contents are central to the ways we define the University community. The powers of decision in regard to many of these matters rest with clearly designated parts of the University. The Faculty, for example, has entire authority over the curriculum. We nevertheless believe that our committee must comment upon the significance of the existing curriculum for the issues of community life with which we are concerned, even though we recognize that some of us are from constituencies that have no direct power to act in these matters.

In recent years, significant changes have been made in the curriculum, with the institutionalization of African American and Women's Studies Programs, as well as with the introduction of dozens of individual new courses relating to the issues of pluralism with which we are concerned. Nevertheless, these courses in many instances seem to remain mere appendages to a curriculum still focused on the achievements of white men of European origins. We would request that each Faculty within the University study its curriculum, asking if it is consistent with the principles of pluralism, and if not, how it might be brought closer to such an ideal. We urge consideration of how existing courses might be...
broadened, as well as identification of new courses that should be introduced. Such curricular questions might well be included in charges given to outside teams evaluating University Departments and Schools. The Provost should support efforts for change, and resulting needs for additional faculty training, with a program of incentives and support.

How we learn and teach at Penn seems to the Committee as significant as the theme of this report. It is one of the functions of Penn as a research institution in the years since World War II and the growing importance and availability of extra-institutional grants and other research funding has worked to remove faculty attention, and in many cases, their actual bodies, from the classroom. Many faculty are teaching less, and attributing less importance to teaching as an avenue to achieving tenure, which necessarily puts them in conflict with the sensibilities of research and publication and legitimate and important; but they should be balanced by greater rewards for commitment to teaching and collegiality. We recognize the many efforts, from teaching awards to the requirement that student evaluation forms be submitted to tenure committees, that the University is making to combat these pressures. Nevertheless, we feel that while the impact of these trends on the intellectual experience of students has been noted, the effect upon levels of faculty-student interaction, and thus on community life has perhaps been insufficiently acknowledged. We are likewise concerned with the proportion of the undergraduate experience that is spent in large lecture courses, which often encourage feelings of social as well as intellectual fragmentation, alienation and marginality in students. Part of building shared community necessity take place in the location where student ties are outgrowths of these curricular interactions, and thus any plan for encouraging enhanced faculty-student interaction must begin by working to put them in closer contact within the classroom. We enthusiastically support the multiple efforts being made by undergraduate schools to ensure that this interaction begins in the freshman year, through programs such as Freshman House and the Praxis Center.

The quality of Penn's physical space also plays a role in inhibiting faculty-student interaction. There are insufficient numbers of classrooms appropriate to seminar classes, and students often find themselves in spaces that are relics of a bygone era—with desks fixed to the floor and faculty on raised platforms, suggesting that students should not look at one another or move from their seats, while faculty should not lower themselves to student level. Good teaching, faculty accessibility, and free interchange have to take place in spite of these physical environments. The physical spaces of Penn affect all our perceptions of each other, and of our community, in ways we may not even consciously recognize. An effort to make Penn's buildings and landscapes embody our articulated principles of pluralistic community seems of great importance, even though we fully recognize that the University must operate within constraints provided by existing structures and resources.

How We Interact

I. Students Together

A significant number of students at Penn do not view the campus as pluralistic, as a place where their differences or race, gender, nationality, religion or sexual orientation are affirmed or even respected. Every section of this report is in some sense directed to transforming the forces...
creating such a perception. In diversity awareness training, in a variety of College and Freshman House Programs, in numerous efforts at sites all over campus, members of the Penn community are working to the same end. We cannot possibly mention or commend by name each of these efforts, nor can we ourselves propose a systematic and complete program for promoting the kind of resourcefulness, creativity, and initiatives among Penn students. Nevertheless, we would like to note a few issues that seemed to us of significance in our discussions with a wide variety of Penn citizens.

Despite the similarities of their concerns, there was little evidence that the diverse subgroups on campus were reaching out to one another for support of the efforts of others to their unique cultures, outlooks and experiences. Most groups did indicate that such interactions were desirable, and they could point to the positive effects of the few programs that bring the various groups together, e.g. the STAAR (Students Together Against Acquaintance Rape) program. However, they reported that their resources were currently being consumed in the interest of supporting one another. Student groups and all persuasions must begin to reach out to others. However, none of the groups we interviewed felt that it had the resources to develop the programs that might enhance interaction. We would like to see the establishment of a joint committee of these student organizations to explore the possibilities for interaction and the kinds of resources that might be useful in supporting it. We propose that the Vice Provost for University Life offer special incentives to encourage joint programs. The real problem is an income problem, created by such groups that would be open to, and effectively publicized to, the general University community. In addition, the office of the Vice Provost for University Life should evaluate each of its student support services to determine the extent to which each promotes interaction among the various student constituencies. A Council Committee on Pluralism should be established to gather data on problems arising among the various constituencies in the student body and to advise the VPUL on ways of promoting pluralism within the student body.

The Greenfield Intercultural Center has a key role to play in the development of pluralism on campus, for it has the mandate to focus on the interaction among various groups. It must also be given the resources to do this job. Our Committee would advise a re-examination of the potential of the Center with an eye to a significant increase in its budget and program. The Director of the Center should be an ex-officio member of the Council Committee proposed above and should be guided by the advice of that Committee. In addition, the Director should report to the University Council on an annual basis about the Center’s progress in promoting interaction among the student groups on campus.

The question of how best to promote pluralism through living arrangements should be more vigorously pursued. Other campuses across the country are using research strategies to examine the efficacy of different living arrangements in promoting interaction and tolerance among students representing varying religious, ethnic, and sexual orientation groups. We heard in the course of our deliberations for the relocation of the fraternal housing and its financial feasibility should be investigated again by such groups that would be open to, and effectively publicized to, the general University community. In addition, the office of the Vice Provost for University Life should evaluate each of its student support services to determine the extent to which each promotes interaction among the various student constituencies. A Council Committee on Pluralism should be established to gather data on problems arising among the various constituencies in the student body and to advise the VPUL on ways of promoting pluralism within the student body.

The question of how best to promote pluralism through living arrangements should be more vigorously pursued. Other campuses across the country are using research strategies to examine the efficacy of different living arrangements in promoting interaction and tolerance among students representing varying religious, ethnic, and sexual orientation groups. We heard in the course of our deliberations for the relocation of the fraternal housing and its financial feasibility should be investigated again by such groups that would be open to, and effectively publicized to, the general University community. In addition, the office of the Vice Provost for University Life should evaluate each of its student support services to determine the extent to which each promotes interaction among the various student constituencies. A Council Committee on Pluralism should be established to gather data on problems arising among the various constituencies in the student body and to advise the VPUL on ways of promoting pluralism within the student body.

The Greenfield Intercultural Center has a key role to play in the development of pluralism on campus, for it has the mandate to focus on the interaction among various groups. It must also be given the resources to do this job. Our Committee would advise a re-examination of the potential of the Center with an eye to a significant increase in its budget and program. The Director of the Center should be an ex-officio member of the Council Committee proposed above and should be guided by the advice of that Committee. In addition, the Director should report to the University Council on an annual basis about the Center’s progress in promoting interaction among the student groups on campus.
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The question of how best to promote pluralism through living arrangements should be more vigorously pursued. Other campuses across the country are using research strategies to examine the efficacy of different living arrangements in promoting interaction and tolerance among students representing varying religious, ethnic, and sexual orientation groups. We heard in the course of our deliberations for the relocation of the fraternal housing and its financial feasibility should be investigated again by such groups that would be open to, and effectively publicized to, the general University community. In addition, the office of the Vice Provost for University Life should evaluate each of its student support services to determine the extent to which each promotes interaction among the various student constituencies. A Council Committee on Pluralism should be established to gather data on problems arising among the various constituencies in the student body and to advise the VPUL on ways of promoting pluralism within the student body.

The Greenfield Intercultural Center has a key role to play in the development of pluralism on campus, for it has the mandate to focus on the interaction among various groups. It must also be given the resources to do this job. Our Committee would advise a re-examination of the potential of the Center with an eye to a significant increase in its budget and program. The Director of the Center should be an ex-officio member of the Council Committee proposed above and should be guided by the advice of that Committee. In addition, the Director should report to the University Council on an annual basis about the Center’s progress in promoting interaction among the student groups on campus.
ing the variety of ways in which this definition of staff role might be implemented and enhanced.

A-1 and A-3 staff alike, moreover, should be allocated a significant voice in defining the quality of their interaction with faculty and students by being included in committees examining personnel policies dealing with issues of employee harassment and in Judicial Inquiry Office cases involving incivility behavior by students.

A Community within a Larger Community

The University of Pennsylvania is a privileged institution within American society. It is supported in large measure through public subsidies provided both by outright grants and by tax free status; it benefits as well from the gifts of many private individuals who believe that the University contributes in significant ways to the quality of American life.

These privileges entail responsibilities and define the University as an institution with a mission of service, not just to its own citizens but to the Philadelphia community in which it is located as well as to a wider sphere. In an era in which tuition payments are so high and in which faculty salaries have slipped in comparison to salaries of other workers with equivalent levels of education, the objective forces encouraging a sense of entitlement rather than an ethic of service are considerable. University policies and rhetoric must endeavor to counteract such perceptions and tendencies, by insisting upon the larger responsibilities of the University and by publicizing the many ways its citizens are struggling to meet them.

Our committee was struck in its interviews with members of the Penn community by the numbers of ways in which Penn reaches out to its surrounding neighborhood and, at the same time, by how little publicity or coordination many of these activities receive. A number of University groups deal directly with Philadelphia, for example, were entirely unaware of closely related efforts by other University organizations. The President has recently established a position for an individual to interconnect these various initiatives. We believe that such leadership is essential, both to the effectiveness of the programs themselves, and to the enhancement of the University community's understanding of the nature and dimension of Penn's involvement with its immediate neighborhood.

Penn's responsibilities beyond its own borders are most easily defined when they can be related to its teaching and learning mission. Careful management of University real estate decisions regarding the surrounding area can contribute to the enrichment of University life by providing living, working and recreational sites where faculty, students and staff will want to interact. We were impressed by the qualitative considerations that influence many decisions made by the Real Estate office, but would recommend a more systematized and proactive institutionalization of such decision making, as well as a more explicit statement of the goals that guide Real Estate actions. Regularized communication between the Real Estate office and University citizens might well enhance both University understanding of Real Estate policies and Real Estate understanding of University policies.

Continuation and expansion of the use of University resources to encourage faculty and staff to live close to the University will benefit both Penn and the surrounding area. Imaginative efforts to promote student/faculty/staff residences close to campus would also work to extend the University community beyond classroom, lab and library. The recent attempts by Penn and other institutions in the surrounding neighborhood to coordinate efforts with the Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency to provide below-market rate mortgages for University employees represents one such effort.

The University and the community can also profit from expanding University involvement in encouraging the vitality and diversity of the West Philadelphia business community. The University should support and in some cases pioneer measures that will use its resources selectively to encourage the growth of those enterprises that support the particular needs of an academic community, such as new and used bookstores and meeting/eating establishments. Both the University and local communities benefit from such vitality.

The involvement of students and faculty in learning opportunities and programs in West Philadelphia and in the city more generally is an avenue of University-community relations well suited to both University goals and community needs. The WEPIC Program emerged directly from a Penn History course and has become a public service effort involving faculty, staff and students to provide below-market rate mortgages for University employees.

Of such programs depends not just on the volunteers, but on the environment of training and support in which they operate. The University has wisely affirmed in its recent actions its assumption of considerable responsibility for maintaining this environment.

Our interviews with University citizens revealed a wide range of members of the Penn community involved in an extraordinary number of community service activities, involving from closely tied to classroom work to the contribution by employees of Buildings and Grounds of their skills to West Philadelphia residents in need of home improvement services. These efforts seem to us potential situations for joint faculty/student/staff efforts, and different forms of responsibility for enhancing interaction among University groups, as well as between University groups and the larger community. We would urge the Center for Community Involvement, as well as individual volunteer programs throughout the University, to consider these internal University goals as they design programs and services.

Our Committee found that Penn citizens are increasingly concerned about issues of security in their consideration of the University's relationship to the city in which it is located. These concerns included direct anxiety about vulnerability to crime both on-campus and off, and a widely expressed fear that security issues would distort Penn's perceptions of its surroundings as to foster isolation and hostility. The University must do all it can to ensure the physical safety of its citizens, both in University-owned spaces and in the community immediately surrounding the campus. We applaud Penn's efforts in promoting safety, including increased security staff, and the Philadelphia Police off-campus, escort services, improved lighting, security education programs and so forth. But the University also must work to combat the second consequence of the growing sense of vulnerability to crime. Now, more than ever, Penn must work to keep campus/community boundaries permeable, for Penn and West Philadelphia are interdependent, and cannot be separated or isolated from each other.

In all these programs of community outreach and involvement, Penn must carefully consider the desires and interests of community residents. It was our sense that joint planning and action are indeed central to most of the University's activities, as is indicated by the very name of the West Philadelphia Partnership. Such principles must be continually reaffirmed as faculty, staff and students design new educational or service efforts in the years to come.

Towards a University for the Twenty-First Century

As Penn enters a new decade, it finds itself an institution in transition. Its commitment to opening its community to individuals of much more varied backgrounds, identities and ideologies has both enriched and disrupted its community life. Not surprisingly, its adjustment to these new realities is as yet incomplete, and the tensions accompanying the changes troubling to us all. In our view, the most rapidly and effectively to diminish these anxieties is to develop a genuine pluralism, one that acknowledges and embraces the fullest implications of the diversity we have introduced into Penn life, to make that diversity central to our self-definition both socially and intellectually through the adoption of the model of pluralism as our guiding principle. To live peacefully and sensitively together, to realize most fully our scholarly goals, we must feel as equal partners in the living/learning enterprise of University life. When diversity moves from the margins to the center, then we may begin to create pluralism in the building of genuine pluralism, we see the task for the nineties.
ority members—and if they are, they only mimic majority stereotypes; why integrate yourself into a burning building?, as James Baldwin always pointed out. Greek houses are full-time living arrangements, not clubs that meet occasionally. Undergraduate life should broaden, not limit, a student’s horizons, and should introduce him/her to the widest variety of people, ideas and cultures.

I am a faculty brat; I have a bachelor’s and master’s degree and some credits toward a Ph.D. from various institutions of higher learning. I have worked for such institutions or businesses leased from them most of my adult life. I feel qualified to judge the effects of the Greek system on campus life; I have never seen this to be positive.

Fraternities and sororities are like religious habits, by now meaningless relics of a past age—a brutish and ignorant time (even the late 19th century of the early fraternity system), constricted by violence, robust, and redemptive. I know that is not what we want for our or any other campus in these equally trying times.

The Greek system has been a vehicle of oppression in U.S. campus life for over 100 years. I urge all University community members of goodwill and especially those truly interested in “diversification” of Penn to join together and evict all fraternities and sororities from the University permanently. Such a course of action will place Penn decisively in the forefront of progressive social and educational practice, and demonstrate unequivocally our support of civil rights.

At this point, a chorus of well-meaning critics will tell me that this is impossible. The power of the Greek alumni and the administration and trustees (many of them Greeks themselves) is too great, they will say. But I think this is only an excuse for inaction. Times have changed; the “younger guard” of alumni is more enlightened; fewer of them every year are Greeks; and all of them are more open-minded than their predecessors; they will carry this outlook with them into “old guardism”; it is the obligation of all serious students to support progressive change to encourage and accelerate this development where possible. I think we have a good chance to remove the Greek system from campus today.

I am reminded here of a story (possibly apocryphal, certainly illustrative) concerning a Faculty Senate meeting of perhaps two decades ago. The Senate, in the last five minutes of the last meeting of the academic year, voted to abolish the “gym class” requirement for undergraduates. The chairman of the athletic department, pale and thin, his demeanor destroyed in one vote, staggered to the podium. “Gentlemen,” he implored.

(Women faculty, scarce now, were far fewer then.) “I beg of you. Don’t be hasty; think about what you are doing, please.” Whereupon another faculty member, now a distinguished emeritus, rose and said something like: “Don’t know about you chaps; I’ve been thinking about this good and hard for the past 25 years.”

So let us ask ourselves whether over the years on this campus that many in our community have thought seriously about removing fraternities and sororities from Penn. Now is the time for such action. Let us all make this a more open, really diversified community, hospitable to all—faculty, students, administrative staff—where everyone can grow and learn in an atmosphere of free and equal exchange.

—Frances G. Hoenigswald

Invoicier Clerk, Biddle Law Library

Ed. Note: No one fraternity or group was targeted for a response to the letter above, but views on either side of the questions raised will be welcome.—K.C.G.

More on ‘Oriental’ vs. ‘Asian’

We are responding to the [Speaking Out letter] entitled “Ex Oriente Lux” (Almanac 5/22) by Professors Victor Mair and Peter Gaeffke, who oppose a proposal to change the name of Penn’s Oriental Studies Department to the Department of Asian and North African Studies. In their letter, Professors Mair and Gaeffke justify the use of the term “oriental” in the title of Penn’s Oriental Studies Department. The professors spend a good deal of their article arguing that the use of the term oriental is acceptable because oriental (derived from the Latin orienis—“rising,” “east”) is essentially the same as the meaning of Nippon or Nippon (i.e. Japan), root/origin of the sun” and “yazza (cf. also Hebrew ‘went out; rose of the sun’). Furthermore, the letter by Professors Mair and Gaeffke also makes the claim that their department does not “study African cultures.”

Unfortunately, Professors Mair and Gaeffke have missed the point. The whole issue at hand is not what is semantically correct from a Eurocentric perspective of the world, but rather the issue is simply the right of peoples to properly identify themselves. It is time for a Department of Asian and North African Studies here at Penn.

—Sean W. Lew, COL ’91
—Hue Tran, COL ’92

More and More on Parking Jam

Three Solutions to the Existing Traffic Jam at the Garages

1. Enforce the parking restriction in the bus stop area on 34th Street—there are always three cars blocking the right lane.
2. New Lines painted on 34th Street—clearly showing three lanes, the left for left turn only.
3. All drivers should understand the left-turn-on-red rule...it is legal to make a left from a one-way street onto a one-way street. If every driver exiting the garage who wished to head down Chestnut chose the left exit and then the turn left only lane, traffic would move more quickly.

—Denis Spizoco, Director
Northeast Region, Campaign for Penn

* which applies if there is no sign prohibiting it according to Lt. Joseph Weaver of the University Police.—Ed.

Speaking Out welcomes reader contributions. Short, timely letters on University issues can be accepted Thursday noon for the following Tuesday’s issue, subject to right-of-reply guidelines. Advance notice of intention to submit is appreciated.

Nominations are once again being solicited for the Lindback Awards presented annually to eight members of the University of Pennsylvania faculty in recognition of their distinguished contributions to teaching. They are open to teachers of undergraduates and graduate students in both the professional schools and the arts and sciences.

Non-Health Areas

For Lindback Awards in the non-health areas a separate Committee on Distinguished Teaching, appointed by the Vice Provost for University Life on behalf of the Provost, is charged with presenting the Provost's Staff Conference with eight candidates from which the four non-health area winners are chosen.

The Committee is drawn from the non-health schools and is composed of five Lindback Award recipients, three graduate and professional students, and two undergraduates. The Chairperson is one of the faculty members and is appointed by the Vice Provost.

Nominations should be submitted to the Committee on Distinguished Teaching, 200 Houston Hall/6306, to the attention of Terry Conn. They should be in the form of a letter, citing those qualities that make the nominee an outstanding teacher. It is particularly important to include the nominee’s full name, department and rank; and your name, address and phone number. Additional supporting evidence, in the form of statistical surveys, curriculum vitae, lists of courses taught, etc., will also be helpful to the Committee in its selection process. Nominations open Monday, October 22, and will close on Friday, November 30.

Health Areas

For Lindback Awards in health areas, an internal nominating process is carried out in each school, using procedures developed in that school. The respective school committees shall submit their nominations to the Vice Provost for University Life in February. These will be reviewed by a Committee on Distinguished Teaching in the Health Areas, appointed by the Provost on the recommendations of the Deans, who will then develop a rank-ordered list of the candidates for submission to the Provost’s Staff Conference. The dossiers of those nominated must include a current curriculum vitae, teaching evaluations with instruction for interpreting them; letters of comments and/or support from students, faculty colleagues, deans, directors or department chairs.

Criteria and Guidelines for Lindback Awards

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

2. Distinguished teaching means different things in different fields. While the distinguished teacher should be versatile, as much at home in large graduate and in small undergraduate classes as in small, she may have skills of special importance to his/her area of specialization. Skilled direction of dissertation students, effective supervision of student researchers, ability to organize a large course of many sections, skill in leading seminars, special talent with large classes, ability to handle discussions or to structure lectures—these are all relevant attributes, although it is unlikely that anyone will excel in all of them.

3. Distinguished teaching is recognized and recorded in many ways; evaluation must also take several forms. It is not enough to look solely at letters of recommendation from students. It is not enough to consider “objective” evaluations of particular classes in tabulated form; a faculty member’s influence extends beyond the classroom and beyond individual classes. Nor is it enough to look only at a candidate’s most recent semester of teaching or opinions expressed immediately after a course is over; the influence of the best teachers lasts while that of others may be great at first but lessen over time. It is not enough merely to gauge student adulation, for its basis is superficial; but neither should such feelings be discounted as unworthy of investigation. Rather, all of these factors and more, should enter into the identification and assessment of distinguished teaching.

4. The Lindback Awards have a symbolic importance that transcends the recognition of individual merit. They should be used to advance effective teaching by serving as reminders to all wide a spectrum of the University community as possible of the expectations of the University for the quality of its mission.

5. Distinguished teaching occurs in all parts of the University and therefore faculty members from all schools are eligible for consideration. An excellent teacher who does not receive an award in a given year may be re-nominated in some future year and receive the award then.

6. The Lindback Awards may be awarded to faculty members who have many years of service remaining, or they may recognize many years of distinguished service already expended. No faculty member may be considered for the Lindback Award in a year in which the member is considered for tenure. All nominees should be members of the standing faculty. The teaching activities for which the awards are granted must be components of the degree programs of the University of Pennsylvania.

7. The awards should recognize excellence in either undergraduate or graduate/professional teaching or both.

8. The recipient of a Lindback Award should be a teacher/scholar. While a long bibliography is not necessarily the mark of a fine mind, nor the lack of one a sign of mediocrity, it is legitimate to look for an active relationship between a candidate’s teaching and the current state of scholarship in his/her field.
The University Council’s first fall meeting, held October 10, will be summarized next week by the Council Secretary. Below are two texts presented at the meeting.

**GAPSA Resolution on the Locust Walk Committee**

Following is the text of a resolution adopted October 4 by the Graduate and Professional Students Assembly and presented at Council October 10.

As graduate and professional students, we like other groups within the larger Penn community, are troubled by the current lack of diversity among residents of Locust Walk, and by the effect that this has on all of us who use the Walk on a daily basis. We therefore welcome the recent establishment of a Locust Walk Committee to examine the physical, social and psychological character of the space.

Yet we find unacceptable Dr. Sheldon Hackney’s representation to the committee that fraternities currently housed on Locust Walk should not be displaced in any diversification plan. By attempting to remove this issue from the committee’s deliberations, he has severely limited that committee’s ability to function productively. A large segment of the University community feels that fraternities are problematic, and a school-wide forum to discuss these problems must exist.

Further, we are disturbed by the composition of the committee--four administrators, seven faculty members, and six undergraduates are presently complemented by a single graduate student. Five of these members are representatives of the Greek system. Should this seven faculty members, and six undergraduates are presently complemented by a single graduate student. Five of these members are representatives of the Greek system. Should this committee ever come to a vote, graduate and professional student interests could never be fairly represented.

Therefore be it resolved:

We ask President Sheldon Hackney to grant the committee free reign to discuss and recommend on whatever matters it finds appropriate, and specifically on the displacement or restructuring of fraternities on campus.

We ask the Locust Walk Committee to fully consider the matter of fraternity presence despite its limiting charge.

We ask Dr. Sheldon Hackney to add two graduate-professional student committee members, to be chosen by GAPSA, so that the spectrum of our views can be fairly represented. We will then appoint one professional student and one international student to the committee.

The following proposed amendments to Council Bylaws were presented, as a preliminary to action at the November meeting:

**Proposed Bylaw Amendment: Presiding Officer of Council**

[Reference is to the Bylaws as available for inspection at the Office of the Secretary, 121 College Hall. Insertions are underlined and deletions are in brackets.]

p.4, III. Positions. 1. Presiding Officer. The President of the University is the presiding officer of the Council. Each year, with the advice of the Steering Committee and the consent of the Council, the President shall [may each year] appoint a Moderator of the Council, who shall thereby become a non-voting member of the Council. [If a Moderator is appointed] The Moderator shall act as presiding officer at meetings of the Council. [In lieu of appointing a Moderator, the President may act as presiding officer of the Council.] The President, or in the absence of the President, the Provost, shall open each meeting and shall normally turn the conduct of the meeting over to the Moderator.

[If the President has appointed a Moderator, the Chair of the Steering Committee shall serve as presiding officer in the absence of the Moderator. If the President has not appointed a Moderator, the Provost shall act as presiding officer in the absence of the President, or when the President, on specific occasions, wishes not to serve as presiding officer; the Chair of the Steering Committee shall preside if both the President and Provost are absent or wish not to preside.]

The bylaw, as amended above, would read as follows:

III. Positions. 1. Presiding Officer. The President of the University is the presiding officer of the Council. Each year, with the advice of the Steering Committee and the consent of the Council, the President shall appoint a Moderator of the Council, who shall become a non-voting member of the Council. The President, or in the absence of the President, the Provost, shall open each meeting and shall normally turn the conduct of the meeting over to the Moderator.

**Proposed Revision to Council Bylaws: Persons Attending**

IV. 5. Persons entitled to attend. Meetings of the Council shall be open to members of the Council and to the Chairs of Council committees and subcommittees as observers and to non-Council members of the Senate Executive Committee, the GAPSA Executive Committee, and the UA Steering Committee.

**OSHA-Mandated Seminar**

A seminar, “Occupational Exposure to Bloodborne Pathogens,” mandated by OSHA and CDC recommendations, will be presented by the Office of Environmental Health and Safety on Tuesday, October 23, 10:15-11:45 a.m. in the John Morgan Building, Class of ’62 Lecture Hall.

It will be repeated on Thursday, November 7, in the John Morgan Building’s Lecture Hall B, again from 10:15-11:45 a.m.

The program is designed to help protect personnel from occupational exposure to bloodborne pathogens such as the Hepatitis B Virus and the Human Immunodeficiency Virus. Information pertaining to the safe handling of infectious agents will be presented.

Information on free Hepatitis B vaccination for all eligible personnel (faculty, research technicians, research specialists, research assistants, support staff) will be available. For information/registration: Denise at Ext. 8-4545.

**Update**

**OCTOBER AT PENN**

Correction: Koyaanisqatsi/Live, a mixed media event with the Philip Glass Ensemble will be held October 23 and 24 at 8 p.m. in Irvine Auditorium. The location listed in the October calendar was incorrect.

**CONFERENCES**

18 Visions of Society: Perspectives for the Social Sciences; a component of the 250th celebration; topics include The Efficient and Equitable Economy, and The Integrity of Cultures; keynote address 7:30 p.m. Also October 19 and 20, 9:30 a.m.-4 p.m., Bodek Lounge, Houston Hall. Information: Ext. 8-7695 (Program for Assessing and Revitalizing the Social Sciences).

22 Cellular and Molecular Approaches to Human Disease; symposium to celebrate the 25th anniversary of the School of Medicine; topics include DNA and RNA, The Current State of Gene Therapy, and The Molecular Dystrophy Gene; 8:30 a.m.-5:35 p.m., Dunlop Auditorium, Medical Education Building. Information: 662-6653 (Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine).

**FITNESS AND LEARNING**

**Alcohol Awareness Week Workshops**

22 Shame and Addiction: film that looks at how alcoholism hurts continue to haunt us as adults; Lockwood Rush, coordinator, Streeker Substance Abuse Program; noon, Ben Franklin Room, Houston Hall. (F/SAP)

23 When the Stress Is Too Much: Getting Rid of Our Destructive Ways of Coping; understand the sources of your stress and new healthy ways of coping; Bettie Begleiter, F/SAP counselor; noon, Smith Penniman Room, Houston Hall. (F/SAP)

Update continued next page
CrimeStats at Penn: This week's Almanac contains a four-page center pullout with information on safety and security at Penn. Its fourth page, a three-year summary of incidents on campus, includes an list of what constitutes "part 1" crimes referred to here each week.

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 crime in the five busiest sectors on campus where two or more incidents were reported between October 8, 1990 and October 14, 1990.

Totals: Crimes Against Persons-2, Thefts-22, Burglaries-1, Thefts of Auto-1, Attempted Thefts of Auto-0.

Date Time Location Incident

10/08/90 9:42 PM 3800 Blk Spruce Neck chain taken

10/13/90 2:02 AM Houston Hall Person assaulted w/bottle/abuse

34th to 36th; Spruce to Locust

10/08/90 7:10 AM College Hall Wall photos taken

10/08/90 9:57 AM Duhring Wing VCR taken/no forced entry

10/08/90 10:57 AM Wilo Gym Hall Secured bike taken from rack

10/13/90 2:02 AM Houston Hall See entry above under crimes against persons

34th to 38th; Civic Center to Hamilton

10/08/90 9:07 AM Nursing Ed Bldg Clock and keys taken from desk

10/08/90 1:22 PM Nursing Ed Bldg Locks pried/no entry

10/10/90 4:17 PM Nursing Ed Bldg Unauthorized wallet and contents taken

10/11/90 8:16 PM Guardian Drive Auto taken

39th to 40th; Spruce to Locust

10/09/90 1:16 PM Van Pelt House Envelope taken from reception area

10/09/90 5:25 PM 3900 Blk Locust Men's bike taken

36th to 57th; Locust to Walnut

10/09/90 8:02 PM Phi Gamma Delta CD player, bookbag taken from room

10/10/90 9:40 AM Phi Sigma Kappa Unauthorized wallet & contents taken

33rd to 34th; Spruce to Walnut

10/08/90 12:33 PM Towne Bldg 2 apprehensions/3 bikes recovered

10/08/90 3:58 PM Moore School Bike wheel taken

Safety Tip: Tell the "powers that be" about broken lights, overgrown shrubbery near walkways, telephones that don't work, doors with broken locks. Don't assume that someone else will do it.

18th District Crimes Against Persons

Schuykill River to 49th Street, Market Street to Woodland Avenue 12:01 AM October 1, 1990, to 11:59 PM October 7, 1990.

Totals: Incidents-21, Arrests-4

Date Time Location Incident/Weapon Arrest

10/01/90 5:10 AM 4523 Pine Rape/knife Yes

10/01/90 12:00 AM 4748 Pine Aggravated Assault/knife No

10/02/90 12:10 AM 4600 Walnut Aggravated Assault/knife No

10/02/90 2:00 AM 4700 Chestnut Robbery/pipe No

10/02/90 11:53 AM 4111 Locust Robbery/forge-arm No

10/03/90 12:05 AM 4601 Larchwood Robbery/forge-arm No

10/03/90 10:55 AM 4500 Baltimore Robbery/forge-arm No

10/04/90 6:45 AM 4748 Pine Agg ravaged Assault/teeth No

10/04/90 4:52 PM 1000 S 48 Robbery/forge-arm No

10/04/90 6:25 PM 47 1200 Purse Snatch/forge-arm No

10/05/90 10:30 PM 4801 Walnut Robbery/gun No

10/06/90 2:20 AM 4000 Pine Robbery/gun No

10/06/90 4:30 AM 4021 Pine Robbery/gun No

10/07/90 10:39 AM 4423 Pine Aggravated Assault/knife Yes

10/07/90 10:45 AM 4601 Chester Robbery/forge-arm No

10/08/90 11:04 AM 4500 Baltimore Robbery/gun No

10/07/90 12:15 AM 4300 Spruce Robbery/gun No

10/07/90 2:33 AM 4700 Chestnut Robbery/shootgun No

10/07/90 3:30 PM 357 S Melvile Rape/forge-arm Yes

10/07/90 8:44 PM 4500 Walnut Robbery/gun No

10/07/90 8:50 PM 307 S 41 Robbery/forge-arm Yes

Update

continued from page 11

23 Caregivers Support Group: ongoing support group for individuals caring for an elderly relative; noon, Room 301, Houston Hall (Child Care Resource Network).

TALKS

17 History of the Atlantic Coast of Honduras: Recent Research Results, and Future Research Directions; Rodolfo Pastor, history, El Colegio de Mexico; noon, Bishop White Room, Houston Hall (Latin American Cultures Program).

Evolution and Natural History of Gingko biloba; Peter Del Tredici, editor of Arnoldia; 3 p.m. and 8 p.m., Widener Education Center. Reservations are required at 247-5777 (Morris Arboretum).

19 Sensory Transduction in the Chemoreceptor Cells of the Carotid Body: The Acidic Stimuli; C. González, University of Valladolid, Spain; noon to 1:15 p.m., Physiology Library, Richards Building (Department of Physiology/Graduate Group in Cell Biology).

The Role of Arachidonate Mediators, Oxygen Radicals and eAMP in Lung Injury; Gail H. Gurtner, New York Medical College; 12:15 p.m., Seminar Room, John Morgan Building (Institute for Environmental Medicine).

Dinosaur Symposium-Five Years in the Fossil Fields of the Gobi; Dale Russell, Canadian Museum of Natural History and Dinosaurs; Dragons of the Mind; Peter Dodson, geology; 8 p.m., Room 200, College Hall (Philomathian Society).

22 The Sanctity of Life; Ronald Dworkin, jurisprudence, Oxford University and law, New York University; 4 p.m., Rainey Auditorium, University Museum (SAS Leon Lecture Series/Department of Philosophy).

Covering Political Campaigns; Andrea Mitchell, NBC News chief correspondent; 9:30 p.m., Zellerbach Theatre, Annenberg Center (Conscience).

23 The Transforming Functions of the Human Papilloma Virus; Peter Howley, Laboratory of Tumor Biology, National Institutes of Health; 4 p.m., Wistar Auditorium (Wistar Institute).

Deadlines

The deadline for the November at Penn pullout calendar is today, October 16. The deadline for the Update is Monday, a week before the issue goes to press. Submissions must be in writing (by mail, FAX or e-mail; see addresses below).