Dedicating the John Paul Pryor, MD, Shock Trauma and Resuscitation (STAR) Unit in the
Trauma Center at Penn Presbyterian Medical Center

On Christmas Day 2008, Penn Medicine lost a friend and colleague with the death of John “JP” Pryor. Dr. Pryor was serving his second tour of duty in Iraq with a forward surgical team with the Army’s 1st Medical Detachment when he was killed by enemy fire (Almanac January 13, 2009). Feeling an obligation to lend his skills to help those serving our country and the many victims of war, Dr. Pryor had joined the Army Reserves after learning that trauma surgeons were desperately needed.

The impact of Dr. Pryor’s life and death resonated beyond his friends and family, and over the past few years, his memory has been a guiding force as Penn Medicine built its new trauma center at Penn Presbyterian Medical Center for Advanced Care. On May 4, Penn leaders welcomed Dr. Pryor’s family and friends—including military and congressional dignitaries—to celebrate the dedication of the John Paul Pryor, MD, Shock Trauma and Resuscitation (STAR) Unit in the Trauma Center at Penn Presbyterian.

Penn President Amy Gutmann said, “On John’s office wall, there hung a quotation from physician and theologian Albert Schweitzer. The quotation said, ‘Seek always to do some good, somewhere.’ That simple philosophy clearly guided this physician who so dedicated his life to serving others—and who ultimately gave his life in service.”

Penn Medicine’s Level One Trauma Center treated 17 percent more trauma patients (2,592 patients) in 2015—its first year in its new location since transferring from the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania—than in 2014.

Penn Medicine has a long and transformative history with the military, dating back to some of Penn Medicine’s earliest graduates’ involvement in the Civil War. More recently, the trauma program has taken an active role in training military surgeons in trauma and critical care—skills that are vital to saving lives on the battlefield. Since 1996, the trauma program has trained more than 20 military fellows who have returned to active duty. Dozens of Penn Medicine physicians and staff currently wear two uniforms, both working in medicine here and serving as members of the National Guard or Reserve forces.

The STAR Unit (Almanac February 10, 2015) includes a state-of-the-art, five-bay trauma resuscitation area and the largest known design dedicated to trauma resuscitation, which facilitates immediate access to “Corridor of Life” critical care treatment areas, including ceiling-mounted CT and MRI imaging and X-rays.

MBA Teaching Awards
The Helen Kardon Moss Anvil Award

This year’s recipient of the Helen Kardon Moss Anvil Award is Cade Massey, a practice professor, in the operations, information & decisions department. The award is presented annually to the member of the Wharton MBA faculty who exemplifies outstanding teaching quality in the classroom. Nominees are selected through a vote of current MBA students. He was chosen from among the nominees by a committee of past recipients, Wharton students and senior administrators.

The Class of 1984 Award

The Class of 1984 Award is presented annually to the member of the Wharton MBA faculty with the highest average instructor rating on his or her course evaluations over the previous two semesters (Fall 2015 and Spring 2016). This year’s recipient is Adam Grant, Class of 1965 Wharton Professor of Management.

Excellence in Teaching

Jennifer Blouin, associate professor of accounting

Eric Bradlow, K.P. Chao Professor of Marketing, Statistics & Education

Kartik Hosanagar, professor, operations, information & decisions

Joan Lamn-Tennant, adjunct professor of business economics & public policy

Asuka Nakahara, lecturer, real estate

Emil Pitkin, lecturer, statistics

Nicolaj Siggelkow, David M. Knott Professor, management

Joseph Simmons, associate professor, operations, information & decisions

(continued on page 2)
Celeste Corrado: Wharton Small Business Development Center Director

The Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania has announced that Celeste Corrado will serve as the new director of the Wharton Small Business Development Center (Wharton SBDC). Ms. Corrado was appointed after an extensive search by a committee of University of Pennsylvania, Wharton Entrepreneurship and Pennsylvania Small Business Development Center leaders. She brings to her new role over 20 years of professional experience in consulting, innovation, strategy and education.

“Celeste Corrado’s experience managing complex and challenging projects is perfectly suited to the role of Wharton SBDC director. We are delighted that local businesses and the Wharton student consultants assisting them will benefit from Celeste’s leadership,” said Karl Ulrich, Wharton vice dean of entrepreneurship & innovation. “With Celeste’s arrival, the Wharton Small Business Development Center continues its work to support Penn’s vision of inclusion, innovation and impact through guiding Philadelphia area entrepreneurs and business owners to achieve their growth objectives.”

Founded in 1980, the Wharton SBDC leverages the students, faculty and staff of Wharton, as well as partnerships with experienced professionals and leading outside organizations, to provide courses, workshops and consulting services to hundreds of regional businesses annually. The Wharton SBDC serves the dual function of helping entrepreneurs start and grow their companies, while offering Wharton students the opportunity to apply their academic coursework to real-world entrepreneurial practice.

As director, Ms. Corrado will set the strategic direction for the Center, support regional start-ups and high-growth companies in their business development, manage all aspects of client recruitment, design student consultant training and education, collaborate with the Pennsylvania SBDC lead office on statewide goals and spearhead grant administration, fundraising and regional stakeholder outreach and communication.

Prior to arriving at Wharton, Ms. Corrado ran her own consulting practice, Vizeon Solutions. Prior to Vizeon, she was employed as senior strategy & innovation lead for new ventures at Lockheed Martin, where she was responsible for launching and leading a commercial venture incubator. Ms. Corrado has also served as an instructor at George Washington University.

She holds an MBA from UCLA’s Anderson School of Management and an MS in information systems from Drexel University. Ms. Corrado is a Certified Management Consultant and a Certified Lean Six Sigma Black Belt, and has completed Harvard Business School Executive Education courses in strategy & competition and corporate ventures.
2016 Wharton Teaching Awards

Jennifer Blouin  Eric Bradlow  Kartik Hosanagar  Joan Lamm-Tennant  Asuka Nakahara  Emil Pitkin

Nicolaj Siggelkow  Joseph Simmons  Peter Fader  Corinne Low  Arthur van Benthem  Senthil Veeraraghavan

G. Richard Shell  Jules van Binsbergen  Lisa Warshaw  Wayne Guay  Diana Robertson  Thomas Donaldson

Katherine Klein  Katherine Milkman  Samir Nurmohamed  Jeremy Siegel  J. Michael Steele  Steven Blum

(continued from page 2)

Katherine Milkman, associate professor of operations, information & decisions
Samir Nurmohamed, assistant professor of management
G. Richard Shell, Thomas Gerrity Professor; professor of legal studies & business ethics and management; chair, legal studies & business ethics
Jeremy Siegel, Russell E. Palmer Professor of Finance
J. Michael Steele, C.F. Koo Professor; professor of statistics; professor of operations, information & decisions

William G. Whitney Award
Five awards are given to non-standing faculty based upon their course evaluations.
Steven Blum, lecturer, legal studies & business ethics

Stewart Friedman, practice professor of management; director, Wharton Work/Life Integration Project
Jerrilyn Greene Marston, lecturer, legal studies & business ethics

Morvarid Taheripour, lecturer, legal studies & business ethics
David Wessels, adjunct associate professor of finance
Robert S. Blank, Emeritus Trustee

Robert S. Blank, L’65, Emeritus Trustee at the University of Pennsylvania, died on April 30. He was 75 years old.

Mr. Blank was the son of two Penn graduates, noted Alzheimer’s disease fundraiser Ruth Saler Blank, Ed’37, and Pennsylvania state representative Samuel A. Blank, W’29, L’32. He earned his undergraduate degree from Cornell University, then graduated from Penn Law in 1965.

He began his career as an assistant US attorney. He was an associate in mergers & acquisitions with Goldman Sachs and an associate at Blank, Rome, Klaus & McCauley, the prominent law firm founded by his father. In 1971, he joined Whitney Communications Company, where he eventually became co-chairman and co-chief executive officer. He was also a partner of its subsidiary, Whitcom Partners.

Mr. Blank joined Penn’s Board of Trustees in 2000. He served on the Budget & Finance, Development, Student Life and Audit & Compliance Committees, as well as the Proxy Subcommittee, which he chaired from 2005 to 2009. He also served on the Penn Medicine Board, where he sat on the Executive Committee and chaired the Audit Committee. He was an emeritus member of the Board of Overseers of Penn’s Law School, where he was a member from 2002 to 2011, and a former Overseer of the Wharton School, where he also served on the Undergraduate Executive Board. The Law School presented him with its Distinguished Service Award in 2009.

He made several gifts to Penn in honor of his parents, including the Samuel A. Blank Endowed Professor in Legal Studies at the Wharton School, the Samuel A. Blank Endowed Professorship at the Law School and the Samuel and Ruth Blank Classroom in Jon M. Huntsman Hall, a gift he and his wife, Nancy, made with their children.

Mr. Blank gave generously to Penn Law, Wharton and Penn Medicine, providing support for faculty, undergraduate and graduate financial aid and athletics. In 2013, he gave to Penn in support of a lecture program, a laboratory and a conference room in memory of Kenneth L. Kershbaum, a cardiologist at Pennsylvania Hospital.

He was also a member of the Penn Alumni Board of Directors, the Penn Alumni Council and the Parent Leadership Committee. Most recently, he served on the Steering Committee of the Making History campaign, which raised $4.3 billion.

Mr. Blank is survived by his wife, Nancy; their children, Wendy, C’98, Samuel, C’01 and Matt, C’03, L’07, WG’08; and seven grandchildren. In lieu of flowers, donations can be made to either Memorial Sloan Kettering (http://www.nyp.org/giving) or New York Presbyterian Hospital (http://www.nyp.org/giving).

Albert Pepitone, Psychology

Albert Pepitone, professor emeritus in the department of psychology at Penn, died in suburban Philadelphia on March 17. He was 93 years old.

Dr. Pepitone’s contributions to the field of social psychology opened up areas of research that significantly broadened its scope, particularly by calling attention to cultural issues. He earned his BA from New York University and his MA from Yale, then entered the aviation psychology program of the Army Air Force, where he worked on the selection and training of personnel. After working for the Commission on Community Interrelations in New York and briefly studying at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, he followed Leon Festinger, a social psychologist noted for cognitive dissonance and social comparison theories, to the University of Michigan, where he completed his doctoral dissertation (published in 1950) on the effects of motivation on social perception. He came to Penn in 1951, rose through the ranks and helped to maintain social psychology as an area represented in the department.

Dr. Pepitone studied a great variety of topics, including beliefs about justice and fair distributions, group cohesiveness, hostility, quantitative aspects of judgment, interpersonal attraction and the use of “nonmaterial beliefs,” such as the belief in fate, to interpret life events. When possible, he took a cross-cultural approach to these topics. His concern for issues of perceived injustice and injustice extended to practical applications, such as judgments of appropriate punishment for crimes. His book, Attraction and Hostility: An Experimental Analysis of Interpersonal and Self Evaluation, was published in 1964 and reissued as a new edition in 2006.

He also contributed to the overall discussion of the nature and purpose of social psychology. He believed human behavior to be multi-determined, and that a micro-analysis of any one facet (the psychological, the biological or the social) was terribly inadequate. He was fascinated by animal behavior and was a serious student of history, sociology and politics. Whether discussing the migratory patterns of birds or the impact of Marxism on later social movements, he was constantly making connections and bridging areas of understanding. His view of social psychology was similarly broad in scope. He saw individuals in their sociocultural worlds from this complex, multi-layered perspective. This view was his most significant contribution to the field.

His distinguished career included Fulbright research fellowships to the University of Groningen in the Netherlands and the National Institute of Psychology in Rome. He also held visiting professorships to the University of Rome, the University of Venice and the University of Bologna. He lectured in Italian and spoke several languages. He was elected president of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (1975), the Society for Cross-cultural Research (1978) and the Society for Personality and Social Psychology (1983). He retired from Penn in 1992 but remained active in research.

For many years, Dr. Pepitone and his wife, Emmy, also a social psychologist and a professor at Bryn Mawr College, opened their Ardmore home to faculty, colleagues and graduate students from Penn and Bryn Mawr for conversation on far-ranging topics.

He is survived by his three daughters, Leslie, Jessica and Andrea; and six grandchildren.

Of Record

Recognized Holidays for Fiscal Year 2017

The following holidays will be observed by the University of Pennsylvania in the upcoming fiscal year (July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017) on the dates listed below:

- Thanksgiving, Thursday and Friday, November 24 & 25, 2016
- Christmas Day, Monday, December 26, 2016
- New Year’s Day, Monday, January 2, 2017
- Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, Monday, January 16, 2017
- Memorial Day, Monday, May 29, 2017

To the University Community:

Each year, the President, Provost and EVP assess the feasibility of observing Penn’s traditional Special Winter Vacation. Thus, the Special Winter Vacation granted to faculty and staff will be December 27, 28, 29 and 30, 2016. If an employee is required to work to continue departmental operations for part or all of this period, the special winter vacation can be rescheduled for some other time.

Staff members who are absent from work either the work day before a holiday, the work day after a holiday or both days will receive holiday pay if that absence is charged to preapproved paid time off or to sick days substantiated by a written note from the staff member’s health care provider.

Vacations and holidays for hospital employees or those staff members in collective bargaining units are governed by the terms of hospital policies or their respective collective bargaining agreements.

Division of Human Resources

To Report A Death

Almanac appreciates being informed of the deaths of current and former faculty and staff members, students and other members of the University community. Call (215) 898-5274 or email almanac@upenn.edu

www.upenn.edu/almanac

ALMANAC May 10, 2016
University Council Committee on Committees

Report on the Functioning of Council Committees during Academic Year 2015-2016

Executive Summary

This report summarizes the general functioning and procedures of University Council (UC) Committees during the 2015-2016 academic year. These committees are: Committee on Academic and Related Affairs (CARA), Committee on Campus and Community Life (CCL), Committee on Diversity and Equity (CDE), Committee on Facilities and Committee on Personnel Benefits (CPB).

Suggestions for enhancing the functioning of these committees include: (1) designating a representative from the Faculty Senate, preferably a Senator, as the Tri-Chair or Senate Committee chair, to participate when possible in each Council committee meeting in order to provide continuity between the ongoing work of the Faculty Senate and University Council; (2) Council committee members should commit to serve for at least two consecutive years, and committee members’ terms should be staggered in order to provide continuity and institutional memory; and (3) new student and other committee representatives should be identified by the end of each spring semester so that committees may engage in optional preliminary work over the summer period.

Mechanism of Evaluation

Members of the Committee on Committees (UCCoC) collected information for this report. Information was collected via in-person, phone and/or email interviews, using the list of questions below as a guide. UC-CoC members interviewed committee members from their own constituencies. Faculty Senate, faculty members interviewed committee chairs, as well as faculty representatives, as available. Although the undergraduate students on the UCCoC were asked to complete interviews with the student representatives on the UC committees, they declined to do so, and graduate student feedback was provided only in limited fashion. This report provides an overview of the general findings from the data collected and comments on the functioning and procedures of each committee. The UC Steering Committee is encouraged to refer to the individual committee reports for more information on the functioning of each committee.

Questions Posed to Each Committee Chair

1. Was the committee’s specific charge for this year clear and appropriate?
2. What changes, if any, do you think you need to be made in the committee’s general charge? Do you feel the scope of the committee is appropriate?
3. What issues did the committee address this year? Were these issues resolved or will they likely be resolved by the end of the academic year?
4. Were there any issues in the committee’s charge that are unlikely to be addressed or resolved by the end of the academic year? What do you see as issues emerging for consideration next year?
5. How many times did the full committee meet? Were any subcommittees created? If so, how many were created, how often did they meet, what were their purposes and did they achieve their goals?
6. Which members would you recommend to serve on the committee next year? Is anyone on the current committee a logical successor as chairperson, either now or in the future?
7. Is the membership of the committee well suited to the committee’s charge in terms of relevant expertise, representation of interests, etc.? Does the chair demonstrate sufficient leadership?
8. What was the role of the administration’s liaison in your committee? (The liaison is an administrative person who can provide relevant information for a committee charge or connect the committee with others on campus with relevant information.)
9. Did someone from the administration provide explicit feedback on last year’s recommendations? Was the feedback satisfactory? Were there any aspects that have not been resolved or for which a path to resolving them has not been developed?
10. What problems did the committee encounter (e.g., limitations on access to necessary resources or information)?
11. Was the committee effectively structured to accomplish its charges? Were there appropriate opportunities for the committee to provide advice, to work with its administrative liaison to resolve specific issues and/or to generate grander recommendations?

Each committee has been charged to operate with three approaches: 1) To perform general advisory review of their area of concern—which may not reveal any specific problems to deal with; 2) Where there are specific issues that the committee wants to address (or has been charged to address), to try and resolve them working through the administrative liaison; 3) Where the intra-committee level effort is not able to resolve issues, to generate recommendations to be addressed outside of the committee as formal proposals to be forwarded to the administration or for the University Council to consider.

12. What recommendations about the committee’s process and organization do you have?
13. Is there any question that should have been asked about process that was not included?
14. For staff and students only: Do you feel that your voice was heard as part of the committee?
15. For students only: Was there a primary and an alternate student representative on each committee?

General Comments

Each University Council committee has two major roles:

1. Performing a broad review in its area(s) of interest, as well as monitoring to determine whether there are any issues requiring deeper exploration. Sometimes no recommendations flow out of this process, but the University is well served by having a representative body tracking important institutional and community matters on a consistent basis.

2. Additionally, performing a more in-depth consideration of a small number (typically three to five) issues that arise from last year’s agenda and its recommendations, or new information relating to the work of the previous year’s committee. These issues, which are developed in consultation with previous committee members, Faculty Senate leadership and University leadership, might be examined by the committee as a whole, or by subcommittees, and will likely involve multiple meetings and conversations with people around the University engaged with the issue. Most can be resolved by working directly with the administrators responsible in the focus area to clarify issues and consider policy modifications. In the absence of a resolution of a given matter, the relevant committee may request that Council Steering re-examine the issue. Committees and Council Steering should nevertheless bear in mind the importance of closure on matters addressed by the various committees.

In order to be effective in fulfilling the above two roles, the most important factors are: the clarity of the chairs in explaining the purpose of the committee; delineation of the roles of the various members of the committee; scheduling meetings so that as many as possible of the members can attend; and beginning to meet as soon as feasible in the fall semester. In the review by the University Council Committee on Committees, many University Council committee members again this year asked for more orientation and a better explanation of their role in the committee, and the committee’s role in the University as a whole. Some committees felt they were underprepared to participate fully in substantive discussions on the issues their committees deliberated.

In light of the foregoing, and other feedback UCCoC received, specific recommendations for next year include the following:

1. Enhance orientation and explanation of duties to new members, especially for students. Provide the prior year’s committee reports to committee members and encourage them to review the charges and outcomes. This recommendation continues from the 2014-2015 report.
2. Invite and encourage representatives from the Faculty Senate, especially those serving as Tri-Chairs and Senate Committee chairs, to participate in each Council committee meeting when possible to share relevant information and ensure that committees’ specific charges are clear.
3. Ask Council committee members to commit to a minimum of two years of service with terms that are staggered so that committee turnover occurs in a segmented fashion and the committee benefits from continuity and institutional memory.
4. Identify student representatives no later than the end of the spring semester during the year prior to allow for committees to engage in optional preliminary work over the summer period, should it choose to do so. This modification would alleviate beginning-of-year scheduling delays that many committee members experienced in recent years.
5. Ask each committee to formally re-consider its general committee charges and report annually to the Committee on Committees.

(continued on page 6)
University Council Committee on Committees
Report on the Functioning of Council Committees during Academic Year 2015-2016

(continued from page 5)

Committee on Academic and Related Affairs (CARA)

General Comments:
The Committee met four times in person and twice online and considered the Penn Libraries system (including off-site storage, study spaces and electronic borrowing), the performing and visual arts at Penn and the culture of respect and safety within Penn Athletics. CARA is positioned to resolve all three of these issues in the upcoming year. There was a suggestion that the Athletics Department did not maintain suitable data for proper comparative analysis across peer institutions; this data limitation may have inhibited some of CARA’s work on that issue. Suggestions were made to clarify future specific charges so that the Committee can spend its time solving problems rather than determining how to frame them. The Committee also noted the need to devote more attention to the University’s research environment.

The University Council Committee on Committees recommends that CARA extend its standard meeting length from 60 to 90 minutes in order to allow more time for discussion during committee sessions and follow-up on content-related action items. CARA is poised to submit recommendations on three major issues from 2015-2016 charges in the upcoming year. As such, membership continuity on the Committee should be maintained through 2016-2017 whenever possible.

Committee on Campus and Community Life (CCL)

General Comments:
CCL met six times over the year and received specific charges that were only loosely related to the previous year’s final report. Issues of focus this year included inclusion of international students and student mental health concerns. It was noted that the role of CAPS was a matter too complex for CCL to appropriately handle, and it was suggested that the Committee on Personnel Benefits should undertake a comprehensive review of student benefits. Some continuity was lost due to the turnover of the administrative staffer to the Committee, and students were not as involved in discussions as they had been in years past, perhaps due to the complexity of the issues. CCL wishes to continue its study of student employment arrangements into the upcoming year.

The University Council Committee on Committees recommends that CCL continue its work on these issues in 2016-2017 with an aim toward providing a set of recommendations that University leadership can use to achieve positive outcomes for the Penn community. Given the need to continue discussing this year’s charges, membership continuity on the Committee should be maintained for 2016-2017 whenever possible.

Committee on Diversity and Equity (CDE)

General Comments:
The Committee charges were large and complex; the Committee focused on two: the experiences of first-generation and low-income students and the diversity of graduate students. For the latter, CARA examined the experiences of current graduate students before considering prospective students. CDE will generate recommendations on both of these issues, which will require follow-up in the upcoming year. The Committee had trouble scheduling its meetings (six this year). It would be helpful to identify student and other Committee members for 2016-2017 at the end of the current academic year. Linking this Committee with the Senate Committee on Faculty Development, Diversity and Equity (SCFDDDE) is important. Some members wished to further define Penn’s vision for diversity as it continues its work. Some noted the dominance of faculty members during conversations and the need for greater efforts to solicit voices of students and staff members. Some also called for greater information about work accomplished during the prior year.

The University Council Committee on Committees recommends CDE schedule 90-minute meetings during 2016-2017 and continue its work on the issues it began working on this year. It further recommends that Committee members be named no later than June 2016 so that the Committee may work electronically over the summer and begin work on Committee charges at its first meeting early in the academic year.

Committee on Facilities

General Comments:
The Committee met eight times. The charge about reducing barriers to interdisciplinary teaching was unclear. The Committee resolved most of its specific charges, but believes these charges should be revisited in the future at regular intervals. It held a joint meeting with CARA to discuss the future role of the Penn Libraries and this joint work should continue. The Committee wishes to undertake further discussion of distribution and availability of classroom and group collaboration spaces on campus. Members asked that relevant background information on issues be shared so that members could be prepared. Some members of the Committee expressed an interest in establishing a mechanism to solicit University-wide questions and comments for the Committee. They also wished to identify ways to make the Penn community more aware of the Committee’s purpose and work.

The University Council Committee on Committees recommends that any questions about specific charges be directed to the UC Steering Committee for further clarification. Committee members should be fully briefed at the beginning of their terms of service and provided with relevant background information. The Committee’s staff member should work with the Chair to ensure that such information is provided.

Committee on Personnel Benefits (CPB)

General Comments:
The Committee on Personnel Benefits met eight times and addressed most of the charges. Because the number of charges was large, the Committee did not reach topics toward the end of the list. Attendance was poor among some members. Some members requested to be consulted in the development of benefits, such as revisions to healthcare plans, instead of being consulted at the end of the process. Faculty members on the Committee noted that attention to benefits focused on staff, not faculty, and suggested that the Faculty Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (SCESF) is a more appropriate Committee for examining faculty benefits. The Committee worked to clarify language around the retirement “Rule of 75” and wishes to continue this discussion in 2016-2017. The Committee also wishes to continue attention to same-sex partner benefits and undertake a review of maternity and paternity benefits for Penn staff. Some also noted the need for greater communication to employees about existing benefits.

The University Council Committee on Committees appreciates the Committee’s steadfast work on a lengthy list of charges and its success in developing a strong working relationship with the staff liaison. It notes that SCESF’s role is to gather and organize data on salaries and benefits and to represent the faculty in the determination of University policy on salary issues, which is accomplished by identifying a SCESF member to serve on the Committee on Personnel Benefits. It further notes that SCESF by design is not positioned to negotiate on matters of University policy issues, but rather serves as a resource for this information. It recommends continued attention to unresolved charges and coordination with SCESF about issues pertaining to faculty benefits.

Committee on Committees 2015-2016

Chair: Laura Perna; Staff: Patrick Walsh and Joseph Gasiwiski; Faculty: Claire Finkelstein, Firoozeh Kashani-Sabet, Karen Glanz, Reed Pyeritz, Florian Schwarz, Christophe Van den Bulle; PPSSA: Kuan Evans; WPPSSA: Loretta Hauber; Graduate Student: Sanyga Agarwal; Undergraduate Student: Michael Roberts

Ed. Note:
See the supplement in the April 26, 2016 issue for the 2015-2016 Year-end Reports of the Standing Committees of University Council.
College Search Workshops for Penn Faculty & Staff Families: June 7

In collaboration with Penn’s Division of Human Resources, Penn Admissions will host workshops for Penn faculty and staff families with high school-aged students to help answer questions about the college search process.

College-bound students and their parents can be overwhelmed by the choices and requirements of college admission. What courses are important to take in high school? How significant are good grades, extracurricular activities, essays, test scores and interviews? What should a prospective student look for in a college?

Workshops on Tuesday, June 7 will discuss these questions and more with Penn faculty and staff and their families, whether students plan to apply to Penn or elsewhere. The program will run from 4:30 to 6:30 p.m. in room G-06 of Jon M. Huntsman Hall, and will feature Eric J. Purda, C’87, dean of admissions; Elaine P. Varas, senior University director, Student Financial Aid; and Margaret Lewis, manager of Tuition Benefits, Human Resources; as well as Penn Admissions staff who will lead grade-specific discussions and exercises.

Register for the June 7 program at https://key.admissions.upenn.edu/register/FS2016

If you have questions, please contact admrsvp@admissions.upenn.edu

The University of Pennsylvania Police Department Community Crime Report

About the Crime Report: Below are all Crimes Against Persons or Crimes Against Society from the Philadelphia Police Department for the 18th District for April 25-May 1, 2016. Also reported were 22 Crimes Against Property (15 thefts, 3 other offenses, 2 frauds, 1 auto theft and 1 burglary). Full reports are available at: www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v62/s34/crreport.html Prior weeks’ reports are also online. —Eds.

This summary is prepared by the Division of Public Safety and includes all criminal incidents reported and made known to the University Police Department between the dates of April 25-May 1, 2016. The University Police actively patrol from Market Street to Baltimore Avenue and from the Schuylkill River to 43rd Street in conjunction with the Philadelphia Police. In this effort to provide you with a thorough and accurate report of public safety concerns, we hope that your increased awareness will lessen the opportunity for crime. For any concerns or suggestions regarding this report, please call the Division of Public Safety at (215) 898-4482.

18th District Report

Below are the Crimes Against Persons from the 18th District: 7 incidents with 1 arrest (2 aggravated assaults, 2 assaults, 2 domestic assaults and 1 indecent assault) were reported between April 25-May 1, 2016 by the 18th District covering the Schuylkill River to 49th Street & Market Street to Woodland Avenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Case Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/28/16</td>
<td>9:33 PM</td>
<td>4012 Walnut St</td>
<td>Complainant assaulted by boyfriend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/28/16</td>
<td>11:44 AM</td>
<td>119 S 39th St</td>
<td>Female choked by known male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/27/16</td>
<td>9:32 AM</td>
<td>3401 Civic Center Blvd</td>
<td>Complainant threatened by female with knife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/28/16</td>
<td>6:20 PM</td>
<td>3400 Spruce St</td>
<td>Confidential sex offense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/28/16</td>
<td>3:50 PM</td>
<td>3900 Spruce St</td>
<td>Confidential sex offense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/29/16</td>
<td>3:51 PM</td>
<td>3600 Chestnut St</td>
<td>Confidential sex offense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quaker Adventure Camp: July 18-22

Campus Recreation at Penn will host a week-long summer camp session for children ages 6-12 years old. Quaker Adventure Camp will be based at the Pugh Center Health & Fitness Center and will incorporate activities such as swimming, arts & crafts, rock climbing and much more. The cost of $350 includes lunch. Camp will take place Monday, July 18-Friday, July 22 from 9 a.m.-4 p.m., before and after care is available for $20/time slot. For more info and to register, call (215) 746-2127, email dria_adventurecamp@pobox.upenn.edu or visit http://www.upenn.edu/recreation/summer-camp

For more about summer camps and programs at Penn, see Almanac’s January 26, 2016 supplement.

The University of Pennsylvania Police Department
Community Crime Report

About the Crime Report: Below are all Crimes Against Persons or Crimes Against Society from the campus report for April 25-May 1, 2016. Also reported were 22 Crimes Against Property (15 thefts, 3 other offenses, 2 frauds, 1 auto theft and 1 burglary). Full reports are available at: www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v62/s34/crreport.html Prior weeks’ reports are also online. —Eds.

This summary is prepared by the Division of Public Safety and includes all criminal incidents reported and made known to the University Police Department between the dates of April 25-May 1, 2016. The University Police actively patrol from Market Street to Baltimore Avenue and from the Schuylkill River to 43rd Street in conjunction with the Philadelphia Police. In this effort to provide you with a thorough and accurate report of public safety concerns, we hope that your increased awareness will lessen the opportunity for crime. For any concerns or suggestions regarding this report, please call the Division of Public Safety at (215) 898-4482.

18th District Report

Below are the Crimes Against Persons from the 18th District: 7 incidents with 1 arrest (2 aggravated assaults, 2 assaults, 2 domestic assaults and 1 indecent assault) were reported between April 25-May 1, 2016 by the 18th District covering the Schuylkill River to 49th Street & Market Street to Woodland Avenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Case Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/26/16</td>
<td>9:33 PM</td>
<td>4012 Walnut St</td>
<td>Domestic Assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/26/16</td>
<td>11:57 PM</td>
<td>119 S 39th St</td>
<td>Domestic Assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/27/16</td>
<td>10:59 AM</td>
<td>3401 Civic Center Blvd</td>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/27/16</td>
<td>4:21 PM</td>
<td>30th &amp; Market St</td>
<td>Assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/28/16</td>
<td>4:46 PM</td>
<td>216 S 48th St</td>
<td>Aggravated Assault/Arrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/29/16</td>
<td>6:28 PM</td>
<td>3400 Spruce St</td>
<td>Indecent Assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/29/16</td>
<td>9:22 PM</td>
<td>216 S 48th St</td>
<td>Assault</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Writers House is celebrating its 20th year. We were founded in 1995-1996 by an intrepid group of writers, students, faculty, staff, alumni of Penn and Philadelphia colleagues and neighbors, settled into the Tudor-style 1851 cottage at 3805 Locust Walk, planned each space in the 14-room house and then opened with a first public program in the early spring of 1996. That program was called “Writing a Community.” And a total surprise: some 150 people came, with people spilling out of the doors and standing outside of the windows looking in, and we were off.

Twenty years later we are having a party to celebrate. Join us on Friday, May 13 starting at 5 p.m. And please join us again the next day on Saturday, May 14 for an open house in the early afternoon for a special event from 2-5 p.m. That program will feature 20 people from across the Writers House years and generations. To reserve a space at either of these events, call (215) 746-POEM.

Thanks for supporting us over the years with your interest, your attendance at programs and your financial support.

—Al Filreis, Kelly Family Professor of English; Director, Center for Programs in Contemporary Writing; Faculty Director, Kelly Writers House

Kelly Writers House: Twenty Years Old and a Flourishing Creative Haven at Penn

The Kelly Writers House (KWH) was founded to be a hub “in which creative writing activities could be organized, promoted and shared.” It was named in honor of Rita P. and Thomas J. Kelly, Jr., the parents of Penn Emeritus Trustee Paul K. Kelly, C’62, WG’64, whose $1.1 million gift made the house possible (Almanac January 28, 1997). Built in 1851 by Samuel Sloan, one of the most important Philadelphia architects of the mid-nineteenth century whose practice had national impact, it had been the home to Penn’s former chaplain for many years. During 1997 the cottage was renovated entirely—although the original design was untouched, it needed totally new wiring, plumbing, roof, re-supporting, HVAC, etc. In late 1997, when it was finished, they opened again and had a huge celebration.

Led by founding director Al Filreis, the Kelly Family Professor of English, KWH hosts over 300 programs and projects a year, including book and poetry readings, lectures, screenings, workshops, webcasts, exhibits, seminars and more. Originally run by a volunteer committee of 20 people, the Writers House has expanded to a 90-member planning committee and a full-time staff. On the jacket of the CD made when the KWH turned ten, Dr. Filreis noted that “several academic and poetic generations changed the local literary landscape.”

Today around 500 people visit the house each week to participate in its many programs. Over the past 20 years, KWH has welcomed world-class authors such as Joan Didion, David Sedaris, Russell Banks, Joyce Carol Oates, Jamaica Kincaid, Grace Paley, Robert Creeley and John Edgar Wideman through its Writers House Fellows Program. This year’s KWH fellows were Samuel R. Delany, Eileen Myles and Matthew Weiner.

There are many ways to get involved in KWH. All programs at the Writers House are free and open to the public. Community-organized reading and writing groups meet in the upstairs classrooms. Alumni contribute their time as mentors or join online book groups that convene throughout the year. Many people get involved by becoming Friends of KWH.

Alumni, parents and friends of the Writers House have supported the project generously. For 17 years, Mr. Kelly has funded the Kelly Writers House Fellows Program, which enables Penn students to interact with eminent writers in an intimate seminar. In 2002, Mr. Kelly and the Kelly Family Foundation made a $3 million gift to endow a professorship in the English department and to provide additional program support for Kelly Writers House (Almanac December 10, 2002). In 2014, Mr. Kelly joined with other supporters—Gary and Nina Wexler, Jay and Nancy Zises and an anonymous donor—to build the Kelly Family Annex to the Writers House, which includes the Wexler Recording Studio, a Student Projects Space and an outdoor performance stage.

In May 2002, members of Penn’s Class of 1942, celebrating their 60th reunion year, pledged to support the complete renovation of the Writers House garden. The resulting space is a quiet haven where writing classes can meet and Penn people—students, faculty and staff—often gather to enjoy the peaceful green space. Television talk-show host and University of Pennsylvania alumnus Maury Povich made a $1 million gift to KWH to establish the Povich Fund for Journalism Programs (Almanac March 22, 2011). In announcing the gift, Dr. Filreis said, “Maury Povich has long been a friend of the Writers House and of Penn, having previously provided funding for journalism in the curriculum.”

In 2006, Mr. Povich, C’62, and his wife, TV journalist Connie Chung, enabled the CPCW and School of Arts & Sciences to appoint Dick Polman as the first-ever full-time Povich Writer-in-Residence. On October 10, 2006, Mr. Povich and Ms. Chung visited the House to inaugurate the Povich Writer-in-Residence. Mr. Polman, a full-time member of Penn’s Center for Programs in Contemporary Writing (CPCW) faculty, has been teaching courses in advanced journalism and a political blogging class. He was a political columnist and blogger for The Inquirer; where he spent 22 years on the writing staff; he is now the national political columnist at Newsworks.org.

“Now, we feel, Maury is completing the scene, by making it possible for us at the Writers House to organize the events and programs in support of the classroom learning already taking place in this rapidly changing field of writing,” Dr. Filreis said. “We are grateful to Maury—and to Connie—for their strong belief in what we do at 3805 Locust Walk.”

The Povich Fund has supported seminars, workshops, presentations, talks and symposia in journalistic nonfiction writing in all its forms at the Writers House as well as visits to the House by both eminent and emergent writers in the field of journalism.

Mr. Povich said, “The Kelly Writers House is a unique opportunity for writers both in the fiction and nonfiction fields. Connie and I have an unabiding admiration for journalists, particularly those who have taken on the challenges of journalism in this new media age. Al Filreis is the perfect captain to navigate these waters and provide the Kelly House writers with an opportunity like no other college institution.”