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proposals to close five units were made separately, in a Dean’s letter which appeared here last week. [See responses, pp. 4-6 of this issue.]

On Closings: In response to numerous inquiries, Almanac requested and received information from the Office of the Secretary and the Office of the Provost on establishing and closing departments and graduate groups:

1. Trustees Statute 9.5 sets out the procedure for creating a department: “Upon recommendation of the President, the Trustees may authorize the establishment of academic departments within a Faculty.” The rest of the Statute deals with chairmanships.

2. On September 16, 1991, Provost Michael Aiken sent to the Academic Deans a memorandum, Establishment or Discontinuation of a Department, which says that “Such an action requires a formal vote of the Trustees, either in the full Board or in the Executive Committee. . . .

“Trustee action is taken upon recommendation of the President and Provost following an earlier recommendation to these officers by the Dean of the school in question.

Although the organization of a school into departments is an administrative decision, the Dean should make his or her recommendation only after a careful study, a dialogue with involved faculty, and a thorough discussion in a meeting of the standing faculty of the school [*].

This procedure has been followed in recent years in either establishing or terminating departments in the School of Dental Medicine, the School of Engineering and Applied Science, and the Wharton School."

3. Procedures on the establishing and closing graduate groups are given Of Record in Almanac September 29, 1981.

Discussion on the recent proposals is scheduled for the SAS Faculty Meeting October 12.

‘Ancient Nubia’ Held Over

The University Museum’s Ancient Nubia: Egypt’s Rival in Africa, scheduled to close October 3, has been held over to November 7.

Five-Year Plans...Departmental Closings

All twelve schools published five-year plans in Almanac between 1986 and 1988, and all are expected to publish their latest ones here in the near future. But none are formally released until they have been reviewed by the Provost and the Academic Planning and Budget Committee, a Provost’s Office spokesperson said Monday.

The School of Arts and Sciences’ Strategic Plan, Priorities for the Twenty-First Century: 1993-2000, is scheduled for formal review shortly. Dean Rosemary Stevens said she will release an executive summary for publication in Almanac next week.

In addition to detailing missions and goals, the plan discusses budgetary constraints and projections, but does not single out specific departments or graduate groups for elimination or merger.

Proposals to close five units were made separately, in a Dean’s letter which appeared here last week. [See responses, pp. 4-6 of this issue.]
Searching for a President:
An Open Letter to the Search Committee

This is a crucial time for higher education, throughout the country and here at Penn, as we face significant challenges. The future of the University is dependent upon the way we address these challenges. Our response must be shaped by a strong leader. What then are the most important qualities for which we must search in the next president?

• The president must be a respected academic. The University is in the knowledge business and its chief executive must understand that balanced budgets are not goals in themselves and that the true success of the University is measured by advances in knowledge and the quality of education we provide for our students.

• The president must have a vision of the future. The academy is not a structure set in concrete. It affects and is affected by changing paradigms of learning and structures of knowledge. We are the guardians of past knowledge but at the same time we need to take imaginative steps to keep us at the forefront of knowledge.

• The president must have a record of innovation. As we face the challenges of the future we need to be led by a president who is not content to tinker at the margins. There are serious structural problems at Penn that will require strong and innovative leadership to solve.

• The president must be a skilled manager. We are in a period of constrained resources; yet we need new resources to take the bold steps required of us. This will require cost containment, reallocation of existing resources as well as finding imaginative new sources of revenue.

• The president must be a conciliator. As we face the challenges of the future we need to work together toward their solution. The president must be able to bring diverse views together to form a consensus.

• The president must have a commitment to the institution. The president’s number one priority must be Penn. We have all seen high administrators who have feared to take decisive and perhaps controversial actions for fear that those actions could interfere with their next job hunt. We can not tolerate such an approach.

Because he sought to encourage reflection and not polarization, Professor Arnold obviously chose not even to mention one of the more troublesome facets of this case—the fact that the faculty member who filed the complaint alleging a violation of the Open Expression Guidelines was a member of the Committee on Open Expression and participated actively in the deliberations of the Committee on this incident without disclosing that he already had filed a complaint or recusing himself from the process.

Reasonable people might disagree on the appropriateness of a faculty member exploiting a student dispute to advance his own ideological agenda. There can be no disagreement, however, that guarantees of fairness and the appearance of fairness are essential to the integrity of our disciplinary processes. Those guarantees are savaged when faculty members willingly assume the roles of judge, jury and lynch mob.

The president must have a record of innovation. As we face the challenges of the future we need to be led by a president who is not content to tinker at the margins. There are serious structural problems at Penn that will require strong and innovative leadership to solve.

Many of us in the room know that you feel better about ourselves when we do things that serve others. Good citizens working together build strong communities. And strong, vital communities—in all our neighborhoods—are the punch that it deserves. I have a very dear friend whom many of you must know too, Judge Lou Pollak, who used to be dean of Penn’s Law School. As the punch that it deserves. I have a very dear friend whom many of you must know too, Judge Lou Pollak, who used to be dean of Penn’s Law School. As

We wish you well as you search for the president. The task is great and our future depends upon your success.
Adding the Tenure System

Once again, tenure in our universities and colleges has been under attack as an anachronistic and outdated concept which provides a haven for incompetent and mediocre men and women. This attitude is now being fueled by a slow-moving economy, rising university costs, and a new “downsizing” pattern appearing in the nation.

We believe these criticisms are based on mistaken perceptions. Yet they suggest we examine ways to improve the tenure system.

The tenure system should be valued for its function in attracting superior minds and talents to university faculties. This is becoming increasingly difficult, but its success is all-important to the survival of our outstanding colleges and universities. Award of tenure is an achievement which all young faculty members aspire to attain and highly value. It provides local and national recognition as an award for outstanding accomplishment in research and teaching. In other words, the possibility of achieving tenure is a strong recruiting device, both in terms of professional award and an increase in salary. But there is another facet of tenure that is of comparable importance to the dedicated scholar: Lacking a tenure system makes the continued employment of a faculty member dependent on the possible biases of a chairperson or a university administrator which can lead to a wasteful intrusion to and a diversion of a faculty member’s main function: attention to long-term research and thoughtful, conscientious teaching.

Tenure has historically another valuable asset, namely to encourage faculty to speak out on important issues, both professionally and politically, and to protect them from harassment and persecution. In times of conflict, (such as the McCarthy era after the start of the Cold War or the period of the Vietnam war), it is especially important that faculty, who are the teachers of our young students, be free from reprisal. In fact, tenure ensures the freedom of speech of an important and influential sector of men and women with clear and significant influence on the development of the minds of our students. The qualifications for appointment to tenure should be high and vigorously applied; they should be based on superior scholarship.

A frequent criticism of tenure is that it is a sinecure and as such can be abused by those who lose their drive toward excellence in research and teaching. There is a mistaken perception that, because the normal teaching load may be as low as three class hours per week when the national work average is about 37 hours, the faculty is taking advantage of the system. In actuality, the majority of faculty work many more hours than 37 per week in order to do the research which is carried out in the laboratory or the library. First class scholarship is demanding and, for most professors, achievement in this area is the major reason they have entered academia. In short, professors work long hours because of this strong commitment. One of the rewards may be a promotion to tenure.

How do we deal with those who stop doing research some years after receiving tenure, in a sense changing the conditions under which the tenure decision was made? Without a system that sets clear expectations on job performance, without periodic assessments of performance, and without clear rewards related to performance, we risk a degradation of university quality easily recognized from within and without. This is leading to a perception of the university that is similar to the pervasive view that government agencies are bureaucratic and inefficient.

We believe there is a need to introduce a periodic assessment of tenured faculty. Such an assessment would not reverse tenure decisions. Its goal would be to provide both the faculty member and the department a periodic but well defined view of performance and to couple this assessment to faculty responsibilities. It would provide the basis for rewarding professors who are dynamic and active. Those who have become nonproductive could be stimulated to contribute once more to the intellectual enterprise of the university, either by a revival of their research program or the allocation of additional teaching or departmental duties, (e.g., an Associate Chair for Undergraduate Affairs).

Such assessment could be conducted every 5-10 years by the department head, along with a committee of peers who can judge the quality of the research and teaching and the professor’s overall contribution to the department, school, and university. That review might contain some of the same features as a tenure review in that it would utilize information such as publications, awards, invited talks, student evaluations, and academic service. Citation indices might be useful in assessing the quality of the work and of the journals in which the work appears. These materials could be collected by the faculty member to ease the burden on the evaluation committee. Of course different reviews, or even the period between reviews, would vary from discipline to discipline and need only follow some broad university guidelines.

In order for such a review to be successful, the University would have to establish mechanisms for evaluating the results of these confidential reviews. Such evaluation would be monitored by the respective Deans to ensure that the sense of the recommendations is being carried out at the Department level. We hope that this proposal to enhance the goals of the tenure system will lead to its consideration and amplification at all levels of our body politic, in the Administration, among the Deans, within the University Senate, and among the faculty.

The result of a fair and rigorous review would be to increase the respect for the tenure system and to acknowledge its virtue in protecting the political freedom of educators and of encouraging devotion to research and teaching which are the prime missions of a university. It would provide uniform information that would be the basis of an enlightened reward system.

— Sherman Frankel, Professor of Physics, and James Sprague, Professor of Neuroscience

Correction: Research Foundation

In the Research Foundation Guidelines published September 21, a line was omitted in Type B, Section I.9. The notation “If you were funded by the Research Foundation in the last three years, please submit a brief progress report with publications and grants proposed or received (no more than one-page)” applies to both Type A and Type B proposals.—Ed.

Penn's Way '94: School and Center Coordinators

Annenberg Center:
  Stephen Goff and Eileen Rauscher-Gray
Annenberg School:
  Phyllis Kaniss
Athletics:
  Debra Newman
Business Services:
  Banoo Karanjia
Dental Medicine:
  Michele Taylor
Development and University Relations:
  Janice McGrath
Engineering:
  Ave Zamichieli
Executive Vice President:
  Bonnie Ragsdale
Graduate Education:
  Elizabeth Deane
Graduate Fine Arts:
  Mati Rosenstein
Hospitality Services:
  William Haines
Human Resources:
  Fina Maniaci
Info Systems and Computing:
  Thomas Fry
Law School:
  Rae DiBlasi
Libraries:
  John Keane
Medicine:
  Duncan Van Dusen
Morris Arboretum:
  Margie Robins
Museum:
  Diane Hamrish and Lisa Prettyman
Nursing:
  Marianne Roncoli
President:
  Janet Dwyer
Provost:
  Manuel Doxer
Public Safety:
  Judith Wojciechowski
SAS:
  Jean Marie Kneelley
Social Work:
  Rosemary Klumpp
University Life:
  Nancy McCue
Veterinary Medicine:
  Chrisann Sorgentoni
VP, Facilities Management:
  Virginia Scherfel
VP, Finance:
  D-L Wormley
Wharton:
  Carole Hawkins
Wistar:
  Mary Hoffman

The authors of the following invite the opinions of colleagues.

— Sherman Frankel, Professor of Physics, and James Sprague, Professor of Neuroscience
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Responses to the SAS Dean’s Proposals to Close or Merge Departments

Religious Studies Graduate Group

The interdisciplinary Religious Studies Graduate Group [RSGG], composed of a wide array of talented faculty from across the entire School, met on Wednesday, September 29 to discuss the recommendation to close the Department of Religious Studies. The RSGG has authorized me as Graduate Chair to communicate the following four points:

1. The RSGG deplores the decision to close the Department of Religious Studies.
2. The RSGG, as a separate entity from the Department, most of whose members hold primary appointments in other departments, particularly deplores failure to consult with either the Department or the Graduate Group.
3. After discussion, members of the RSGG are unable to see any merit whatsoever in the arbitrary decision to freeze graduate admissions for the coming year. We are concerned that this precipitous move would cause irreversible damage to graduate study of religion at Penn, which takes place across departmental lines. We recommend reconsideration of that decision in consultation with the RSGG.
4. The RSGG reaffirms its commitment to excellence in this area, and stands ready to work together with the SAS administration to enhance the graduate study of religion at Penn.

— Stephen N. Dunning, Chair, Religious Studies Graduate Group

Religious Studies Department

On behalf of my colleagues, I wish to respond to the proposal of the SAS administration to close the Department of Religious Studies. I think it is necessary to begin by carefully distinguishing between the undergraduate study of religion at Penn and the existing interdepartmental Religious Studies Graduate Group [RSGG]. The RSGG is already made up of virtually all faculty in the School who have shown interest in the study of religion as an academic discipline. The contribution of the Department to the graduate program includes coordination and administration, which could be handled in other ways, and the focus for important core courses dealing with religion as a phenomenon, which would be very difficult to replace otherwise. Commonly, half of the course work taken by our graduate students originates in other departments.

RSGG members with appointments outside the Department play active roles in the training of every graduate student in the program through courses, final examinations, and throughout the dissertation process. In some cases the extra-departmental members of the RSGG serve as chairs of dissertation committees. We are perplexed, therefore, at the suggestion that the graduate program does not adequately reflect “the strength of interest in religious studies across the School.” That the graduate program does not attempt to encompass all possible specializations within the broad field of Religious Studies represents a consistent policy of the RSGG. We admit gradu-
in these fields will be improved by destroying these departments, and the claim that such improvements will be attained is false.

4. The dean's own statement shows that her claims are false.

About the only believable part of the dean's statement is her assertion that she intends to "eschew investments where we do not have a good prospect of achieving distinction" and "cease making investments in areas no longer at the forefront of our endeavors." This shows what she really thinks of these departments and these fields. It also shows what the goal is. It is not to strengthen these areas; it is to withdraw resources from them and eliminate them as fields of study. In a world where religious conflict has become the major danger to world peace, we do not need to study religions. In a nation torn by dissention and self-doubt, we do not need to study our own civilization. In a world where regionalism is becoming of increasing importance, we do not need regional studies. While the study of MACHOs is making the headlines, we do not need to study astronomy.

5. This action calls into question Penn's status as an Ivy League school.

This action is a confession that Penn cannot (more accurately, will not) attempt to match other schools which we have usually considered to be our reference group. Every Ivy League school has a religious studies department; we will not. Yale and Brown have American Civilization Departments; we will not. All of them have astronomy departments; we will not. The real question is not whether we are at the bottom of the Ivy League; the question is whether we qualify as Ivy League at all.

6. The model of a university that informs these decisions is the Aiken model—eliminate the small departments, build up the big ones.

That this has been the objective of the administration in recent years is too well known to need argument here. The point is that it is the wrong strategy. What has made Penn interesting as a place for students and many of its faculty has been the range of opportunities for study it has provided, particularly those offered by small departments. These have been among the best departments in the University, and they are departments which have excelled in undergraduate teaching. It is raised as a fault of Regional Science that other universities have not established such departments. A more insightful dean might have realized that having such a department is something that Penn can offer that other universities do not. What these actions do is to serve notice on all small departments at Penn that their days are numbered.

7. These actions devalue the degrees which have been awarded to the graduates of these departments.

Already the students are asking whether they ought to transfer elsewhere. After all, if Penn does not value these departments, who will? This action is a betrayal of the commitments that Penn made to its students when they came here to study in these fields. It is also a betrayal of the commitment Penn made to the faculty who came here to work in these fields. And it is a betrayal of the mission of this University.

The Penn community would do well to consider these actions with considerable care, for they show the shape of things to come. One should ask, is this the future we want—a future in which departments are destroyed at a stroke of the dean's pen, without faculty consultation or approval, in which bureaucratic convenience is more important than academic excellence, in which the ignorance and prejudice of administrators determine what faculty may do. I think not!

— Murray Murphey, Chair, Department of American Civilization

Regional Science Department

We, the members of the Regional Science Department, would like to take this opportunity to express our reaction to Dean Rosemary Stevens' recent recommendations with respect to our Department and its programs. To say that we were wounded by the actions taken doesn't begin to state the depth of our feelings, since we all believe very strongly in our field of study, its students, and our colleagues around the world. But this isn't an opportunity to recount our personal feelings about the matter; rather, we would like to focus on the academic and institutional nature of the decision.

Our concerns with Dean Stevens' recommendations are divided into three parts: (1) the process (or the lack thereof) used to support the closing of the Department; (2) the grounds cited for closing the Regional Science Graduate Group; and (3) the relationship of the Regional Science Department to the development of urban and regional studies within the University.

(1) Although there does not appear to be much experience in the proper procedures for closing departments in the School of Arts and Sciences, simply examining earlier experiences within the University would lead us to believe that, in the interest of effective decision-making and keeping with the precepts of basic collegiality, (i) an internal and/or external review would have been undertaken; (ii) there would be thorough consultation with appropriate faculty committees; (iii) prior consultation with the members of the Department (or at least with the chairman) would have to be in order; and (iv) a review of the decision with the Department prior to its public announcement would have been initiated.

What happened, however, was an administrative decision which was made in secret, supported by a hand-picked committee which spoke to no one in the Department, and a published conclusion, circulated as a letter to the SAS faculty before those affected ever learned of it. This certainly poses a host of questions concerning the process with which the entire SAS faculty ought to be concerned. But from our point of view at this juncture it seems fruitless to do more than to tell the University about these seemingly extraordinary procedures.

(2) The questions concerning the closing of the Graduate Group—a decision that must involve not only the Dean but the Provost—raises many of the same issues as for the Department itself. With respect to the Graduate Group, however, the matters are far more troubling intellectually. Although one might say that Regional Science never made a significant impression on the undergraduate academic life of the University (there are a host of its majors who would argue strongly against this position), there is no question that the Regional Science Graduate Group is known world-wide as a leader and center of true excellence, that it attracts highly qualified students, has an outstanding record of graduate training, and places its graduates in excellent positions throughout the world. Last year we placed our four American students in tenure-track positions at Princeton, Illinois, Indiana and The New School for Social Research, and our foreign students went to comparably prestigious institutions in their own countries. By any standards, Regional Science has been a particularly successful graduate group at the University and, until recently when it was defamed by the administration, it had all of the prospects of continuing as such into the future. Again, however, the issue is not one of redress since the administration seems to be quite hard on this issue; what our colleagues at the University of Pennsylvania must appreciate, is that review and reflection do not seem to be playing a significant role in the current academic decision, and that only the need for immediacy seems to be pushing the matter.

(1) The final part of Dean Stevens' letter with which we are concerned is her perspective that, somehow, with the passing of Regional Science, there would be new opportunities for the development of urban and regional programs at the University, and that Regional Science is nothing more than applied economics or geography or a branch of city planning. Besides being a complete misunderstanding of the field, the suggestion, of course, is that Regional Science, as a Department and Graduate Group, has stood in the way of the development of such programs in the past. The Department does indeed have a stake in such programs, but we do not believe that we have been the roadblock in the University's growth of these programs. True, we have our intellectual perspective which we hoped would be included in the grand design. We never believed that urban and regional programs were "ours," and we would play the sole intellectual and visionary role in their development. No matter which way one looks at the issue, we do not believe that Regional Science is the problem, whatever difficulties Penn has had in developing this area more generally. We have tried to be cooperative and collegial and to see us as a roadblock is just misplaced caustion—and a gratuitous slap under the circumstances.

All this adds up to a picture of a quick decision, though for who knows what reasons, done in a largely uncritical manner that falls flat even by the standards of corporate downsizing programs. Indeed, Dean Stevens uses the term "streamlining" as if it has real meaning—when even in business the term is pretty much regarded as having virtually no substance. What has been presented is certainly not a picture of a collegially based review; it is certainly not a detailed analysis of what the potential of Regional Science is as a Department at Penn; and it is certainly not an analysis of the Graduate Group's reputation and its impact on the reputation of the University in the international community. Rather, what we find is something that has a sense of biased judgement supported only by the fact that Regional Science is too small to get recognition as a "pillar department."

— Masahisa Fujita, Ralph Ginsberg, Janice Madden, Ronald Miller, and Tony Smith, Professors; and Stephen Gale, Chair, Department of Regional Science
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Astronomy Department

The decision of the SAS Administration to close three departments of the School of Arts and Sciences and merge the Department of Astronomy into the Physics Department, constitutes a move that will diminish the stature of our School and the University.

The Dean’s letter pointed out that the issue is one of “effective and efficient organization of our intellectual resources” rather than “a response or a solution to ...financial exigency”. Thus, in the name of intellectual efficiency, 15% of the departments of SAS are to be eliminated. Will this move contribute to learning and the expansion of knowledge? Will it enhance faculty and student morale? Will it contribute to our stature as a great university? Will it help in fund raising? I fear that the answer to these questions is NO.

It is intellectual breadth and diversity that makes a university great. It is the ability to pursue in depth many avenues of thought and knowledge that produces a truly eminent educational institution. The road on which we are about to embark leads only to diminished learning and shrunken choices, fear of further contraction of our intellectual horizons, lowered expectations on the part of students and faculty and diminution of the stature of the University. These are the sentiments we have all seen in the articles, editorials and letters to the editor in The Daily Pennsylvanian during the past week; this is what we know in our hearts.

Let me now address the specific issue of the proposed merger of the Astronomy Department into the Physics Department. The Department of Astronomy has a long and significant history at Penn since its establishment 100 years ago. It was one of the founders of the American Astronomical Society at the beginning of this century. In 1913, the University Observatory, now the Flower and Cook Observatory, was established. A long period of impressive research, education of excellent graduate students and conduct of popular and exciting undergraduate courses ensued. In 1993, the department continues that past tradition. Its research efforts are still of world importance. Its total research funding is $400,000 to $500,000 per year. Its undergraduate courses attract 450 students per semester. About half of all SAS students take a course in astronomy while they are at Penn. In its recent evaluation of departmental efficiency, the Dean’s office gave the Astronomy Department a very high rating. What then has happened? What have we done wrong? Why the merger?

As stated in the Dean’s letter, the intent is to use the Astronomy positions to enlarge the astrophysics program in the Physics Department from the present four faculty to eight or nine. Astrophysics is a very exciting and promising field and one in which Penn’s representation should and must be enlarged, but astrophysics is no more astronomy than chemistry is applied atomic physics. The merger is tantamount to dropping astronomy as an independent intellectual activity at Penn.

Is it perhaps that I have missed the point and not kept track of national trends? Hardly so. Virtually all of our peer institutions, the major research universities, have independent Ph.D.-granting astronomy departments while nurturing astrophysics programs in their physics departments. That is what we find at Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Cornell, Princeton, Michigan, Chicago, Illinois, Texas, Berkeley, etc. Indeed, the trend is to separate joint departments. Maryland, for example, which for many years had a joint Department of Physics and Astronomy, with independent internal management, has just separated that department into two independent departments.

What is seen nationally and internationally is the spectacular growth of astronomy. Enormous telescopes, with eight-meter diameter mirrors are being built in both the northern and southern hemispheres. A series of space borne telescopes are either in place or to be launched in the coming decade. Planetary probes are throughout the solar system and unmanned landings on Mars are being planned. Every week we read of new astronomical observations, of new understanding of the astronomical realm. In the coming century we will embark on the GRAND ADVENTURE, the detailed exploration of the solar system and the possible establishment of human habitation outside the Earth.

What role will Penn play in this exciting new thrust? Will we develop a broad based multi-department and multi-school program that could lead in this GRAND ADVENTURE or will we retreat and shrink?

In last year’s five year plan the Astronomy Department presented the Dean with a picture of how Penn could be at the forefront of this adventure, how Penn can lead. We still can achieve this goal.

What we decide now will shape our future. Let us decide wisely.

— Kenneth Lande, Chair,
Department of Astronomy

Tanenbaum Hall: ‘a Students’ Building’ Housing Biddle Law Library and More

The University of Pennsylvania Law School’s new building will be formally dedicated during a convocation and ribbon cutting ceremony on October 14, beginning at 5 p.m.

Nicole E. Tanenbaum Hall is named in memory of the daughter of Roberta and Myles H. Tanenbaum. Mr. Tanenbaum is a University Trustee, a member of the Penn Law class of 1957, and the chair of the $52 million fundraising campaign for the School.

The five-story hall was designed by Davis Brody & Associates and built by L.F. Driscoll Company; Floss Barber and Diane Boone were the interior designers. The top four floors are the new home of the Biddle Law Library, founded in 1886 and housed in Lewis Hall since its construction in 1900. The collection includes more than 540,000 volumes in paper and microform, and is the major law library between New York and Washington, D.C. Its foreign and international collections and rare-book collection are intensively used by the Penn community, other academic institutions, the Philadelphia Bar, and visiting scholars. The Library has been called the research laboratory of the School.

The new library is fully wired: each desk, carrel, and table will be connected through the Law School network to other computers in the University and remote research databases. All the classrooms in the library are wired for audio, video, and computer use.

“This is a students’ building,” said the Director of the Biddle Law Library, Professor Elizabeth Kelly, who also served as Chair of the Faculty Building Committee. “The interior is light and warm, and the design is conducive to studying.” The first floor of Tanenbaum Hall will house the offices of career planning and placement, the public service program, the legal research and writing program, and the three student-edited law journals. This floor will also include a classroom and two seminar rooms, a student lounge, and a dining commons.
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The plan must be completed by August 31. OEHS has reviewed the plan and an updated version of the plan is now available on PennInfo or in hard copy or floppy disk from:

OEHS
1405 Blockley Hall/6021
898-4453

The plan must be completed by all principal investigators/area supervisors who work with human blood, blood products and other potentially infectious materials such as Human Immunodeficiency Virus, Hepatitis B Virus, non-A non-B hepatitis virus(es), Human T-cell Lymphotrophic Virus type I, malaria, babesia, brucella, leptospira, arboviruses, relapsing fever, Creutzfeld-Jakob Disease and viral hemorrhagic fever.

The completed plan must be accessible to all employees who work with human blood, blood products and other potentially infectious materials in their area.
New Guide to Networking
Curious—or confused—about PennNet, Gopher, E-mail, NetNews, telnet, file transfer, modems, network IDs, asynchronous, ethernet, and SLIP? Help is at hand.
PennNet PassPort, a guide to networking at Penn, has just been published by Data Communications and Computing Services (DCCS).
This 44-page overview of PennNet and the Internet, intended for students, faculty, and staff, introduces key services, software, and terminology in an attractive, non-technical package. Also covered are the services offered by DCCS, which operates PennNet and its connections to the Internet.
PennNet PassPort is available for purchase at Wharton Reprographics, 400 Steinberg Hall-Dietrich Hall, at a cost of $2. In addition, for those with access to FTP (file transfer protocol) software, a master file in PostScript format is available for retrieval and laser printing from ftp.upenn.edu, directory pub/ DCCS, document name PassPort_v1.1.ps. (The document is designed for back-to-back copying.)
The School of Engineering and Applied Sciences is making the PassPort available at no charge to all SEAS students, faculty, and staff in order to promote effective use of PennNet and the Internet; details will be posted in SEAS mailboxes. Other schools and departments are encouraged by DCCS to follow SEAS’ lead.
— Dan Updegrove, Associate Vice President, Information Systems and Computing

Update
OCTOBER AT PENN

CHILDREN’S ACTIVITIES

Recreation Class Registration: Saturday swimming, fencing and gymnastics classes October 23-December 18; $80/8-week class; register in Hutchinson or Gimbel Gym; Info: 898-6102. Register through October 19.

TALKS

7 Impoliteness Formulas in Egyptian Arabic; Devin Stewart, Emory, 11 a.m., Room 421, We East Center).

8 Approach to Gastrointestinal Bleeding; Gregory G. Ginsberg, Gastroenterology division; noon, Agnew-Grice Auditorium, 2nd floor Dulles, HUP (Medicine).

11 Noise, Communication and Cognition: The Harvard Psycho-accoustic Laboratory and the Second World War; Paul Edwards, Stanford; 4 p.m.; B-26 Stiteler Hall (Psychology).

12 Adjuvant Therapy of Breast Cancer; Kevin R. Fox, hematology/oncology division; 8 a.m., Medical Alumni Hall, 1st floor, Maloney, HUP (Medicine).

Money Matters for Women; Ann Diamond; noon; Alumni Hall, Faculty Club; Reservations: 440-5348 (Human Resources, Women’s Center).

Deadlines:
For the next monthly calendar, November at Penn, the deadline is noon October 12. For the weekly Update, the deadline is Monday for the following week’s issue.