

Almanac

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Published by the University of Pennsylvania

Volume 37, Number 18

INSIDE

- Smith Hall: Campus Debate Begins, pp. 2-3
- Discussion: Combined Campaign, or United Way? pp. 4-6
- SEC Actions January 16, p. 7
- New Ingres Software Partnership, p. 7
- New OSHA Standards in Chemistry, p. 7
- War Travel Advisory; CrimeStats, Update, p. 8
- Pullout: Planning for the '90s—Penn's Five-Year Academic Plan

Almanac Photos by Shauna Selly



At Penn (above) and other area colleges Thursday, open-mike rallies were followed by a march to City Hall and a vigil at the Federal Building. As news of war spread so did advisories such as the one on travel (back page of this issue) and those at right. Provost Michael Aiken is sending out reminders of regulations on confidentiality of records, Open Expression Guidelines and other relevant policies. Human Resources Vice President Barbara Butterfield urged all managers to be aware of the policy on leave of absence for military service (Almanac September 4) and to be supportive of those affected.

On the War in the Persian Gulf

The war has begun. Whatever our individual views on the issues involved, we can all join in hoping that the death and destruction will not be prolonged. While I, too, have my own views on the current crisis, as President of the University my first responsibility is to the University. As I see it, the University's role is three-fold: First, to provide an open forum for the expression of opinion by members of our community. Second, to respond to the crisis by doing what we are best equipped to do—offer the knowledge and understanding of our faculty to illuminate the complex and consequential issues that face us all as citizens. Finally, the University community has a responsibility to all of its members—no matter what their views—to be supportive and caring in a time of intense stress.

In order to assure ourselves of the University's readiness to fulfill its responsibilities, my office and the offices of the Provost and Vice Provost for University Life have begun to identify the potential effects of the war on the Penn community and to distribute information regarding relevant University services and policies. While no one can predict exactly how the current crisis will unfold, I am confident that adherence to existing policies on open expression, combined with a sense of compassion for others, will enable the University to provide an open, civil and essential forum for the exchange of views. Similarly, many existing resources, such as the Counseling Center, Faculty/Staff Assistance Program, International Programs Office, Student Health Psychiatry, Residential Living and University Life staff members, religious affiliates, academic advisers, as well as individual faculty and staff members, stand willing and able to provide support, advice, referral, and assistance. Most especially, as members of a single community, we ought to have an active regard for the welfare of other members of the community, and we should take special care to nourish the bonds of human

sympathy that link us to people with whom we may disagree.

Perhaps most important is the University's special obligation at this critical time to serve as a source of knowledge and analysis that can be brought to bear upon the current crisis. Our resources—embodied in the faculty and other members of the community—are unexcelled. Therefore, I hope that groups and individuals across the University, including residences, academic departments, student organizations, and other groups, will undertake to organize appropriate educational and informational efforts, such as discussions, teach-ins, lectures, and public fora, to help us all to understand better the historic moments through which we are living.

—Sheldon Hackney, President

A Message for the International Community at Penn

Sent January 17, 1991, to all students and visiting scholars from abroad

We, at the Office of International Programs deeply regret the outbreak of war in the Middle East. We fervently hope that the international community will find the political will and the diplomatic means to bring hostilities to a quick end and to find lasting solutions to the conflicts that threaten the peace of the region.

In this time of high tension and anxiety, please remember that the Office of International Programs stands ready to assist you with any special concerns or problems that may arise as a result of the conflict in the Middle East. We are anxious to do whatever possible to ease any financial, practical or personal problems that you may experience in connection with the war and current tensions in the region.

We trust that the high standards of mutual respect and tolerance required of a scholarly community will be observed at the University throughout this period. OIP is firmly committed to these standards and would wish to respond to any instance where it appears that they have not

Blood Drive: January 30

Penn faculty, staff and administrators in conjunction with the American Red Cross will host a winter bloodmobile in the Faculty Club on Wednesday, January 30, 10 a.m.-3p.m. Prior to the start of the Persian Gulf War, the Red Cross was advised that the Department of Defense would ask for additional supplies of blood and blood products to aid in medical treatment of soldiers. The target is five hundred units of blood to be sent to the Persian Gulf daily from the Penn-Jersey region.

Workshop on the War in the Gulf

A special noontime workshop will be held Thursday to discuss the effects of the Gulf Crisis on people with family, friends or acquaintances in the military or living in the Middle East, and feelings brought up from remembering past military conflicts.

While the nature of our relationship to the Gulf crisis may vary, we have all been affected by recent events in Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Israel and the Middle East. Fear, anger, guilt and anxiety are but a few of the emotions raised by the threat of war.

We at the Faculty/Staff Assistance Program would like to provide the University community with an opportunity to discuss, share and support one another during this difficult time. Please join us for this special noontime workshop led by FSAP director Carol Bennett-Speight and FSAP counselor Frank Guarnaccia, which will be held Thursday, January 24, noon-1 p.m. in the Ben Franklin Room of Houston Hall. To register, call Ext. 8-7910.

—Bette Begleiter, for the FSAP Staff

been honored. We would be grateful if you would call to our attention any instance affecting the University community where you feel that proper respect for persons or peoples has not been shown.

We, as members of the international community of scholars, also have a special concern to respond to the serious humanitarian needs in the Middle East certain to arise from this conflict. To this end we are coordinating the collection of relief funds to be contributed to the International Committee of the Red Cross, Geneva. The ICRC, working in concert with local Red Crescent, Red Cross and other affiliated societies, is involved in the relief of civilian populations and prisoners of war caught up in the Persian Gulf Conflict. Anyone wishing to further the work of the ICRC in this crisis may bring contributions to OIP.

Again, please let us know if we can be of assistance to you in any way in this very difficult time. —Ann Kuhlman, Associate Director

A Request to Reconsider Demolishing Smith Hall

On the day after Thanksgiving, a bright orange-red sign appeared on the door of Smith Hall (215 S. 34th St.) announcing the Administration's intention to seek a permit to demolish this historically certified building.

Thus was the University community made aware of the plan to construct on the site of Smith Hall a new laboratory for a proposed "Institute for Advanced Science and Technology." This plan was produced by a small circle of interested people, mainly from chemistry and engineering, plus University administrators, with minimal participation from the general faculty, student body, or trustees.

On December 18th the architectural committee of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, having heard presentations from both sides, split two for and two against. Nevertheless, on January 15th the full Commission voted eight to one to approve demolition. There was no discussion of the issues.

Since a permit will not be granted until the University shows that it has funds in hand, however, it is not too late for the University community to weigh the issues involved and to ask themselves: Is this what we really want?

Fundamental issues are involved. What will be the costs of the destruction of an historic precinct and an historic building? What alternative sites are there for the proposed institute, and have they been taken seriously? Should the allocation of prime campus space be driven by the needs of funding agencies—the Pentagon, in this case? Or should it reflect a rational long-term vision of what the faculty, students, and alumni want their University to be? What kind of precedent is set by a planning process that was confined to a small circle and kept out of the public eye until it was a *fait accompli*?

Friends of Smith Walk are not opposed to the proposed Institute for Advanced Science and Technology. Quite the contrary, we feel that strong science departments benefit the whole university. We are opposed only to the Administration's present plan. We believe that the costs of destroying an historic part of the campus are too high, and that viable alternative sites do exist that do not require such destruction.

What will be destroyed in the present plan? First, a charming and historic precinct of the campus. Smith Walk below 34th Street is the only place left where one can stand and see nothing but 19th century or turn-of-the-century buildings: Furness Library, Smith Hall, Morgan-Music, Hayden Hall, and the Towne Building. It is the last place on campus where one can still experience Penn's distinctive late-Victorian urban campus. The proposed new wing to the Chemistry Building would destroy the integrity of this precinct and make it impossible for future generations to enjoy a special historical experience.

Smith Walk, perhaps the most beautiful vista on campus, would also be destroyed. The proposed new wing would jut halfway into Smith Walk. The space between Smith and Morgan is now about 100 feet; the architect's plan would narrow it to 50 feet. Looking west up Smith Walk we now enjoy a magnificent full view of Furness Library. In the proposed plan we would see only the apse, peeking around a looming block of laboratory. The architect, Mr. Robert

Venturi, denigrated the present view of Furness as "indeterminate" and lauded a new element of "surprise." This, in my view, is sheer rationalization. The lovely Smith Walk vista will be destroyed forever.

Finally, there is the historical value of Smith Hall itself. Built in 1892, it was the first fully realized laboratory of hygiene and bacteriology in the United States. Both in its modest and functional exterior design and in its internal layout of laboratory spaces, Smith Hall embodies the pragmatic research ideals that transformed American universities and civic cultures in the 1890s. Largely unaltered, Smith Hall is a remarkable survival of a formative period in our history. It is the first of its kind. None other survives at Penn. There may be nothing comparable in such a state of preservation in any university.

Smith Walk blocked, an historic campus precinct invaded, and an historic building destroyed—is this not a very high price for the University community to pay so that the proposed institute can be adjacent to the chemistry lab?

I think it is too high a price.

This was also the conclusion of the "Campus Development Plan" drawn up in 1983-84 by the Graduate School of Fine Arts under the direction of Professor Alan Levy. "A primary objective of any development of the block," this report states (pp. 33-35) "must be to preserve and reinforce the form and character of Smith Walk. Smith Walk is not only the central axis of this precinct and its ordering element, it is the key segment of the larger campus-wide spine connecting Locust Walk and College Green with the Athletic Precinct."

Demolition of Smith Hall, this group concluded, would seriously compromise the integrity of the historic precinct: as the oldest building of the group, it is "a critical contributor to the unique quality of the campus providing a collegiate atmosphere along 34th Street. It is also important to the very special environment of Smith Walk" (pp. 72-73).

Yet the Levy Report was ignored by the small group who opted for the one plan that would entail demolition of Smith Hall, and drastic changes for the worse in the aesthetic character of Smith Walk and the last complete historic precinct on our campus.

Are there viable alternatives? The administration says no, but the evidence suggests that there are. Referring again to the Levy Report, a highly suitable site exists at the large parking lot on Walnut Street between 34th and 33rd Streets. Also considered (and rejected) is the tennis court site on 33rd adjacent to the Physics Laboratory. Both of these sites would accommodate a large laboratory and leave room for expected future expansion (which the Smith Walk site would not). Why then did the chemists and engineers reject them?

They give several reasons in their planning document, the most weighty one being cost. An alternative site, the chemists and engineers claim, would cost \$61 million in comparison with \$45 million for the Smith Walk site. Close examination of these figures by an experienced architect, however, suggested that advocates of the Smith Walk site do not give a fair cost comparison.

Item: A standard replacement or "land development" cost (\$7 million) was charged to the alternative plans but a comparable sum (say, \$5.5 million) was not charged to the Smith Walk plan.

Item: A cost of \$7.5 million for "minimal" renovation of Smith, Morgan, and Music Buildings was charged to the alternative plans, although these buildings would have no part in the program of the new Institute and should not properly be charged to it.

Item: A charge for inflation (\$1.5 million would be minimal) was not included for the Smith Walk plan, which would be executed in two stages.

Computed symmetrically and fairly, the cost of comparable buildings on the Walnut and Smith Walk sites would be about \$53.5 and \$52 million, respectively. They would, in effect, cost the same.

Other reasons against alternative sites were similarly flawed by a failure to do direct comparisons with the costs of losing an historic precinct and building. Building on the tennis court site would destroy an important open space and public amenity. True; but so too would the invasion of Smith Walk. As for the Walnut Street site, the administration says it intends to build a chilled water plant there. A service plant on one of the most central and choices sites on campus, in the very place described in the 1988 Campus Master Plan as the "gateway" that ought to be improved? Is this more important than preserving the last historic precinct of the campus?

Open and direct comparison of the tangible and intangible costs and benefits of alternative sites has never been done. Planning and cost accounting has been carried out exclusively by a small group of immediately interested parties: those who would inhabit the new institute and the architects who would build it. Not surprisingly, the favored plan reflects their own immediate interests. Of course it is good for chemists and engineers to have a new building adjacent to their present quarters. But is it good for the University community as a whole?

Perhaps the greatest casualty in all this has been the planning process itself. It has not been done in an open, democratic, and participatory way, as befits a major university. Important decisions about space cannot be made behind closed doors by small groups of interested parties. The results must reflect, as in this case, parochial interests rather than the interest of the whole. Trust and a sense of participation must be eroded, to the long-term detriment of all.

On behalf of the Friends of Smith Walk, I request that the Administration appoint a representative committee to review the process that produced the present plan for the Smith precinct, and to reopen the question of alternative sites. We request that relevant documents be made available to the University community and that all plans for demolition and new construction on Smith Walk be halted until a fully participatory and democratic planning mechanism can be created.

—Robert E. Kohler, Professor of the History and Sociology of Science

(For testimony from the hearing, see next page.)

On Smith Hall: Balancing Past and Future

Ed. Note: The following statement was made before the Philadelphia Historical Commission January 9, 1991. Vice Provost Barry Cooperman notes that copies of the full presentation by the University will be available for inspection in the Reserve Room of Van Pelt Library; in addition, Provost Michael Aiken has written to both the UA and to GAPSA [which passed motions opposing the demolition] offering to make a presentation to them regarding the building of a portion of the IAST on the Smith site.

Testimony on Smith Hall:

My name is Sheldon Hackney and I am the President of the University of Pennsylvania. I come before this Commission to request a demolition permit for one of the University's buildings, Smith Hall, under the city code which provides for demolition of a certified building, on grounds of economic hardship and in the public interest. You can be assured that if you grant our demolition permit request, discussions within the University community will continue about the design of the new facility on the Smith site to assure that it will blend aesthetically with the other historic structures to be restored within our historic science precinct. Both the staff report from the Architectural Committee of the Historical Commission and the preliminary review letter from the State Bureau for Historical Preservation indicate that the Smith site is the most prudent and feasible site for providing needed expansion space for new research laboratories. As I understand it, since State and Federal funds are involved, and since a historical building is to be demolished, additional State and Federal review of our project and its design will also take place.

Our request for the demolition of Smith Hall has not been an easy decision for the University or for me personally. I am a historian by training and therefore I care deeply about the past and the lessons that we can learn from it. As the University completes its 250th year, I am especially mindful of Penn's history stretching back to its original site in two buildings on Fourth Street south of Arch. The University has grown in reputation and size since inhabiting those modest quarters. Indeed, change has been the hallmark of this university which did not list its address as West Philadelphia until 1872.

Since its founding 250 years ago, the University of Pennsylvania has grown into a university of the first rank, noted both for the education it offers its students and for the research it undertakes. Today, it is regarded as one of the nation's premier centers of higher learning and stands out among great research universities for its ability to foster innovative connections among its wide array of disciplines.

As a university, Penn never will be completed. Each generation must renew it in the light of current realities. As the world changes, as our knowledge of the world expands through fresh combinations of disciplines, universities must evolve.

Even as we change, Penn must strike the right balance between honoring the past and anticipating the future.

A generation ago Penn was not always as

sensitive as it might have been to issues of preservation. During the past decade our record has improved considerably. To avoid the mistakes of the past, in part due to our work with this Commission, we have completed an inventory of our historic resources under the guidance of Drs. Brownlee, Delong and Thomas; our design review committee which monitors all new building construction and renovations includes representation from our distinguished program in historic preservation. We now consider our architectural heritage as an integral part of our campus master plan.

Though we have learned to appreciate more fully our historic buildings, our appreciation comes with a substantial price tag. A campus-wide facilities' audit revealed needs for maintenance and restoration that will require \$180 to 200 current dollars to address. These are daunting numbers for any institution, but we have committed ourselves to meeting these needs over time, guided by the priorities of our historical inventory.

Based on those studies, we have: largely refurbished the Quadrangle Dormitories in seven phases for \$40 million; replaced the terra cotta roof and completed exterior pointing on the University Museum for \$3 million; rehabilitated the exterior of the Old Small Animal Hospital for \$4 million; we are putting the finishing touches on a five-year restoration of the Furness Library that cost \$16.5 million; and we are presently working on the restoration of College Hall estimated to cost over \$18 million; along with the exterior rehabilitation of Logan Hall estimated to cost over \$15 million; the scaffolding is being erected on Evans Dental School Building to begin an exterior renovation projected to cost almost \$7 million.

Though we are sensitive to our history, we also face difficult problems brought on by the compact nature of our campus. Within this context, we are confronted with the need to maintain and enhance the excellence of our research and teaching programs. If we are to meet our responsibilities to sustain the University's mission of research and education, and if we are to adapt to the requirements of new research and scholarship, we must be permitted to make those changes in accordance with the city codes that are critical to Penn's future.

The program for the Institute of Advanced Science and Technology is part of an overall plan to reinvigorate our research efforts in the natural and engineering sciences, and to preserve and enhance our position as the leading research university in the Middle Atlantic Region, and as a leader nationally. The Institute will be a state-of-the-art science and technology center, placing Penn, Philadelphia and the Delaware Valley in the vanguard of the 21st century science and technology.

The IAST project is so critical to Penn because we have been unable in past years to make the appropriate investments in the natural sciences and engineering. We now need not only to catch up, but to move ahead to explore the boundaries of knowledge through transdisciplinary collaboration.

I want to stress the importance of proximity to the programmatic success of scientific and engineering research activities. To find the best

possible solution that incorporates the needs of our diverse community, we have undertaken a series of studies that have examined a number of possibilities for fitting new research facilities into the physical sciences and engineering area. With the guidance of members of our Historic Preservation and Art History faculties, we have examined the site and evaluated our options. Our architects have worked with the program requirements and our campus planning guidelines. The site for the IAST, which will unfortunately require the demolition of Smith Hall, has been selected only after a careful weighing of the alternatives. The question of whether or not a demolition permit should be granted for this project hinges on several issues.

A. Is a remote site feasible, thereby avoiding the demolition of Smith Hall? As our feasibility report and subsequent addendum indicate, the answer is, no. A remote site would divide the programs, require the costly duplication of facilities, amounting to \$17 million to \$23 million, and would divert those resources outside the main portion of campus that would otherwise be used as part of this project to renovate and restore four historically significant buildings within the core of the science precinct: Towne, Morgan, Music, and Hayden. A remote site would present a real economic hardship for the University in these straitened times and ironically delay or prevent the preservation of other buildings due to the increased cost.

B. If the IAST needs to be built adjacent to the existing engineering and chemistry labs, then is the recommended alternative the most prudent and feasible, consistent with good preservation practice? The feasibility study reviews previously proposed plans and investigates several alternatives. After a careful weighing of the alternatives, we believe that the site we recommend is the most appropriate one. As a result of the two review meetings with the Architectural Committee, a variation incorporating a partial preservation scheme for the Smith Building was also developed. This latter scheme is not a good alternative. It doesn't work from several points of view: urban design, architectural character, construction cost, and preservation practice. Both the State Preservation officer and staff report from the Architectural Committee confirm that the proposed partial demolition of Smith is contrary to accepted preservation practice.

C. What is the architectural and historic significance of the Smith Building? As you are aware, there has been much debate concerning this issue. The question is not—is the building significant, but rather, how significant is it and what is the best way to acknowledge its importance when it occupies the site best suited for the construction of the IAST?

You will hear that Smith is the last of the pioneer laboratories designed to allow students to carry on experiments themselves: to learn by doing and to create new knowledge. There are those who believe that Smith Hall should be preserved despite the very real economic and programmatic costs to the sciences at Penn.

Here is the rub. As a historian, I, too, wish to preserve and interpret the past. As the President of a major research University, I must

continued on page 7

DISCUSSION

This year's Penn's Way/United Way Campaign has been the most successful in Penn's history. Over \$360,000 has been raised for charitable organizations. Over the past two years, there has been much discussion on campus about alternative forms which our future charitable workplace campaign might take, and informational presentations on the two major options will be made to the University Council at its January meeting. The background materials starting at right have been prepared by the United Way and the Committee for a Combined Charitable Campaign. Council's consideration will be followed by further discussions in the various representative assemblies and an employee referendum in early March.

*Sheldon Hackney,
President*

Almanac will be pleased to publish additional debate on this topic in the Speaking Out column, which is open to all members of the University community.—Ed.

Toward Fairness in Fundraising: The Case for a Combined Campaign

For many years, the University has granted the United Way exclusive access and University support for solicitation of employees in our Fall charitable fundraising campaigns. We believe that it is time for faculty and staff to have full freedom of choice in deciding which community fundraising organizations to support. We urge the University to adopt a Combined Campaign model for charitable fundraising on campus that includes community fundraising organizations in addition to the United Way as partners during our campaign.

In July, 1988, members of Penn's faculty and staff formed the Committee for a Combined Campaign at Penn to broaden Penn's annual charitable fundraising campaign to include, in addition to the United Way, other well-established local community organizations which raise and distribute funds to a wide variety of social services and programs in the Delaware Valley. Several faculty and staff organizations as well as numerous individual University members endorsed the initiative—some of their resolutions and letters of support are printed here.

Prior to the 1989 Fall Campaign, when the United Way had exclusive control of Penn's campaign, the campus was regularly below University goals. In the 1989 and 1990 Fall campaigns, President Hackney permitted four funds—Black United Fund, Bread & Roses Community Fund, United Negro College Fund, and Women's Way—to participate more directly by providing information about the services they support. As a result, the campaigns were invigorated and the level of giving substantially increased. For example, total giving increased from \$256,000 in 1988 to \$365,000 in 1990 (a jump of 43% in just two years), and 1000 more faculty and staff made donations in 1990 than previously. Significantly, all the fundraising organizations, including the United Way, shared in this dramatic increase. Clearly, information

about additional community fundraising organizations inspires the Penn community to increase our participation and generosity in a charitable campaign.

Having chosen to encourage employee philanthropy by bringing a fundraising organization on campus, the University should bring other equivalent fundraising organizations to its workplace donors. A "United Way" campaign is a monopolistic campaign. The United Way's "Donor Choice" Program, instituted in 1981 as the result of protests over the United Way's stranglehold on workplace fundraising, is a limited improvement over the old system. Under this system, agencies which are not members of the United Way may receive donations, but only if the United Way lists them alphabetically in its directory and only after the United Way has withheld 18% as an "administrative fee."

The management of the United Way retains exclusive control over a "United Way" workplace campaign. Its Donor Choice program limits the information that employees can receive about alternative choices for giving. Moreover, the United Way excludes numerous charitable organizations based on political considerations. Also, under the United Way system, funds and federations, which must recover their own administrative costs, additionally incur the United Way's 18% administrative assessment, a cost they would not have in a true Combined Campaign.

The need for broad-based charitable support is greater than ever. The number of non-profits is three times greater than in the '60s. In the past 10 years, governmental funding has drastically declined, particularly in programs serving the poor, including housing, education, emergency food and shelter. Corporate and foundation support have not filled the gap created by these reductions, and, in the current economy, cannot be expected to do so.

Individual giving to non-profits is the backbone of their support, comprising 86% of all non-profit funding. Individ-

Why You Should Vote for the Penn's Way/United Way Campaign

It's Important That You Vote

The United Way of Southeastern Pennsylvania raises money for 2,700 organizations. These include everything from the smallest groups like the Emergency Food Cupboard, which without our help could hardly afford the costs of fundraising, to larger groups like the Black United Fund, United Negro College Fund and Women's Way.

The wide range of community needs addressed in the campaign have never been more severe. Problems related to substance abuse, the AIDS epidemic, care for the elderly, homelessness, family violence, racial discrimination, unemployment and a whole host of other social ills require our greatest energies and monies—especially in the face of a painful economic recession and exceedingly scarce public resources.

In March your personal concern for these issues will be expressed in your vote. Just as we have urged you over the years to give generously, we now are urging you with the same intensity to vote for United Way in this referendum.

Will the Real Combined Campaign Please Stand Up?

Our region's United Way Campaign is the *most open and fair charitable campaign in the nation, giving equal access to 2,700 organizations.*

The Committee for a Combined Campaign at Penn represents four *special interest groups*: The Black United Fund, United Negro College Fund, Bread and Roses and Women's Way.

These groups are already a part of the United Way Campaign and have been included for many years—see page 16 of our 1990 "Guide to Caring"—the missions of their organizations are published there for all to see.

By now you may be wondering, if these groups are already included in the Penn's Way/United Way campaign, what more do they want? What they want at Penn

is a campaign that will give them a *powerful marketing advantage* over the other 2,696 that are also included in the United Way Campaign.

These special interest groups want a *permanent place at the head of the line*. They want you to put them *first on the list* of human needs that Penn donors should address. They want a special position in your campaign which will result in *more money for them*.

And what they want discriminates against and is unfair to the 2,696 other groups that have an equal right to a fair chance to win your contributions. *Our position is that Penn should not give a marketing advantage to any groups, no matter how worthy. It sets the wrong precedent.*

The *Philadelphia Inquirer* recognized the danger of this style of combined campaign and called this strategy "seriously flawed" in its October 5, 1990 editorial. It said:

"...any hustling charity will soon realize that it too can jump the line by getting together with a few other charities, dubbing themselves 'Funds R Us,' and insisting on being included." [in a Combined Campaign]

The Penn's Way/United Way campaign benefits *all those in need*, not just those receiving services from a few, select groups.

Three Reasons Why

In this article, we will focus on three reasons why you should vote for the continuation of the Penn's Way/United Way "Combined" Campaign:

- 1) It offers you a *broad range of choices*, unrivaled by any community or university in the nation.
- 2) It provides *open and fair access* to organizations that want to participate and, as a result, *it benefits the most people in need*.
- 3) The *costs are low* and the campaign is *easy to manage*.

continued past insert

ual giving is facilitated best through workplace fundraising: individuals are more generous when they can give through payroll deduction, and the workplace is the most efficient place to distribute information and educate donors about non-profit choices.

Many social change, women's, and minority community-based agencies which did not have access to traditional funding sources have begun to work together in the last 10 years. These new funds and federations, such as the four which participated in this year's Penn's Way/United Way Campaign, are dedicated to constituent decision-making as well as careful control of the quality and efficacy of the programs and agencies that they support. A Combined Campaign is a single campaign which provides workplace donors a choice among the United Way, other community fundraising organizations, and individual agencies through a Donor Choice option. Penn has a moral obligation under its policies of open expression and non-discrimination to provide equal access to its community's other fundraising organizations.

Other employers have granted alternative funds parity with the United Way in their workplace campaigns. Harvard University, the University of Massachusetts, Brown University, and the University of Minnesota allow their employees to contribute to other federated charities. In Philadelphia, city employees have doubled their contributions since 1982, the year before their first Combined Campaign. Employees of the School District did even better, increasing their gifts by 153% from the pre-Combined Campaign period.

The increased choice for employees and the

increased funds for alternative fundraising organizations do not come at the expense of the United Way. In fact, a well-run Combined Campaign, with the cooperation of the participating organizations, the administration and workplace donors, infuses a campaign with enthusiasm and results in significantly increased gifts to the United Way, as this past Penn's Way/United Way Campaign results promise. In the city, United Way receipts have increased by 24% since 1982 and School District employee gifts to the United Way have increased by 80%.

The United Way has stated that Combined Campaigns will undermine support for small agencies supported by the United Way, lead to hostile competition among fundraising organizations, and are unmanageable for employers. None of these assertions is true; the United Way objection to this campaign model can only be fear of losing exclusive control over workplace fundraising.

First, if the United Way's smaller agency members are receiving fewer funds, then the United Way's allocation process should be reviewed rather than blaming Combined Campaigns for "diverting resources to a few high profile groups." Second, Combined Campaigns do not create divisive competition but rather cooperative pooling of solicitation resources under the employer's direction. Moreover, friendly competition generates more information about services and generates greater donor interest and participation.

Finally, the experience of other Combined Campaigns demonstrates that they are both efficient and manageable if appropriate criteria are developed by the employer to select participat-

ing partners and to identify the nature of their commitment to the campaign process. Our Committee already has submitted to the president a proposed set of criteria which would fairly and equitably govern selection of qualified funds and federations. Under these criteria, Penn's campaign would not be burdened by an unmanageable multiplicity of participants. Moreover, the campaign would include a single, comprehensive booklet of information and a simple form for designating among a limited number of partner organizations.

If the true goals of a workplace charitable campaign are increased giving, diversity, and equal access to deserving self help and service non-profits, then the Combined Campaign model will best serve the University of Pennsylvania community.

—Submitted by the Committee for a Combined Campaign at Penn

[The Committee wishes also to bring to the attention of the community three existing statements of support. The first is an excerpt from *Actions Taken by the Senate Executive Committee Wednesday, January 10, 1990, in Almanac January 16, 1990*]:

Charity Drive/United Way.—After discussion with Professor David Rudovsky, the following resolution was adopted: "The Senate Executive Committee requests that the President open the United Way program to include other federated charities who wish to participate in the coming year."

[Second is a resolution—next page—adopted by several campus organizations.]

—continued next page

Your Range of Choices

United Way is the "combined campaign" that represents the most organizations—a total of 2,700 groups. Among these are the Black United Fund, Bread and Roses, the United Negro College Fund and Women's Way.

Last year, Penn donors selected a total of 450 groups as recipients of their contributions. A review of the list reveals that Penn donors are sending help to every group in need and to every corner of the greater Philadelphia area. To look at just the ten groups receiving the most support at Penn offers a glimpse of the diversity of your charitable interests:

Donor Designated Group	#Penn donors
The Hungry and Homeless	134
Women's Way	98
Children & Youth At Risk	92
United Negro College Fund	59
Families & Women	54
Planned Parenthood	44
The Elderly	30
Action AIDS	29
Health & Rehabilitation	29
Catholic Charities Appeal	28

In comparison, the other style of campaign narrows your choices. It focuses your attention on a short list of organizations: the Black United Fund, the United Negro College Fund, Bread and Roses and Womens Way. These groups would be featured throughout your campus campaign—in brochures, on posters, in newsletters, etc.

Again, these four organizations are promoting this style of campaign because it offers them a powerful marketing advantage. In essence, they would raise more funds, at the expense of other groups. To give them this advantage

discriminates against all the other groups participating in the campaign.

In summary, The Penn's Way/United Way campaign offers a broad range of choices, enabling you to fully express and fulfill your charitable interests.

Who Benefits?

The most important aspect of any campaign is who benefits. The groups receiving funds from the Penn's Way/United Way campaign this year benefit men and women of all ages, all races, nationalities, creeds and from all walks of life.

The four groups seeking a special marketing advantage at Penn often present themselves as having some type of exclusivity in funding services for women and minorities. This is far from the truth.

Half the people served by United Way funded agencies alone are members of minority groups. And minority-governed agencies like the Urban League of Philadelphia, Black United Fund, the United Negro College Fund, Congreso de Latinos Unidos, Concerned Black Men, the Korean Community Development Services Center, Lao Family and Community Organization, Women's Christian Alliance, Stephen Smith Home for the Aged, and the list goes on—receive many millions of dollars through the United Way campaign.

On the subject of funding for women's services: late last year, a study issued by Delaware Valley Grantmakers cited United Way of Southeastern Pennsylvania as the leading funder of women's agencies and of agencies primarily serving women.

And this study looked only at the undesigned dollars—those that United Way distrib-

utes based on community need. If the study had counted donations that are donor designated for women's groups, such as Women's Way—the amount of money raised in the United Way campaign going for women's services would be even more impressive.

For example, Women's Way has been in the top ten of United Way's Donor Choice program for the past ten years, receiving approximately \$2.0 million through the United Way campaign.

No one is left out of the United Way of Southeastern Pennsylvania's Campaign. By creating equal and fair access for all health and human service organizations in our geographic area—all groups in need are best served.

Low Cost

United Way's fundraising and administrative costs are 11%. The average of the four other groups is 23.8%. We're pretty proud of our record of efficiency. It's been the hallmark of our organization and one of the reasons why the entire community rallies to support the campaign each year.

The four other groups have spread some bad information around about our costs and we would like to take a minute to clear up any misinformation you may have received.

A portion of any fundraising campaign's pledges are never paid. People who make pledges sometimes change jobs, get laid off, move away, die, etc.—and their pledges just don't get paid. These four groups are lumping these uncollectible pledges—which run at approximately 9% for employee campaigns, with our fundraising and administrative costs and declaring that United Way costs are 20%.

Untrue and unfair.

If you would like to see evidence of our

Request for Expanded Employee Choice in Payroll Contributions at the University of Pennsylvania

Whereas: The Black United Fund of Pennsylvania, Bread and Roses Community Fund, The United Negro College Fund, and Women's Way are all fundraising organizations which exist for the purpose of raising funds for five or more constituent organizations and they all support grassroots community efforts for the improvement of the citizens and communities in the Delaware Valley, and they all work on the pressing issues of our time: racism, discrimination against women, poverty, homelessness, and discrimination.

The University of Pennsylvania is committed to freedom of speech and the resolution of community problems.

Other employers locally and nationally have recognized that it is fair and equitable to grant these charities parity with United Way in their fall campaigns.

The City of Philadelphia granted payroll deduction and solicitation opportunities to these groups beginning in 1982 and the School District of Philadelphia did so in 1985.

Harvard University, University of Massachusetts/Boston, Brown University, and the University of Minnesota allow their employees to contribute to groups similar to these federated charities through both direct cash contributions as well as payroll deduction.

The United Way Donor Option Program limits the information that employees can receive and charges an 18% fee on every contribution made through payroll deduction and excludes some organizations that employees want to contribute to.

These federated fundraising organizations have a history of cooperative relationships with each other and would like to work with the University of Pennsylvania to develop a "Combined Campaign" for University of Pennsylvania employees. All campaign materials and paperwork

will be the responsibility of the participating organizations; there will be minimal disruption in employee operation.

Therefore be it resolved that:

The undersigned employees of the University of Pennsylvania support the University's authorization of the following federated fundraising organizations for solicitation and payroll deduction privileges:

Black United Fund of Pennsylvania
Bread and Roses Community Fund
United Negro College Fund
Women's Way

[Passed as-is by the A-1 Assembly and the Association of Women Faculty and Administrators, and by the Librarians' Assembly with an addition:

Be it further resolved that: The Librarians' Assembly requests that the University establish a committee which will include representatives from all recognized groups of staff and faculty (or add to the charge of an existing committee), and which committee will examine and rule upon the requests of federated charitable organizations for solicitation and payroll deduction privileges at the University.]

[Third, as published by the A-1 Assembly leadership in *Almanac* November 6, 1990]:

On the Workplace Campaign

The Executive Committee of the A-1 Assembly is pleased to support the University's efforts to reshape Penn's workplace charitable fundraising campaign. The principle change for the Penn's Way/United Way Campaign, which kicked off on October 31, 1990, substantially responds to the Executive Committee's 1988 resolution presented to President Hackney requesting expanded employee choice in payroll contributions for our workplace charitable drive.

Our resolution requested that the University authorize the following fundraising organizations, in addition to the United Way, to participate in solicitation and payroll deduction privileges

during the campaign: Black United Fund of Pennsylvania, Bread and Roses Community Fund, United Negro College Fund and Women's Way. During this year's campaign, for the first time, the University will send 100% of any contribution designated to one or more of those organizations directly to that organization, without administrative processing through the United Way. This program will apply whether the contribution is made by check to the Penn's Way/United Way Campaign or requested to be a payroll deduction.

Through our resolution, the A-1 Assembly Executive Committee has endorsed a faculty and staff initiative to reshape Penn's workplace charitable drive into a "Combined Campaign" in which fundraising organizations participate as partners with The United Way in a single campaign at Penn. The four organizations listed above exist for the purpose of raising funds for numerous agencies and programs which provide services to people in need and for grassroots community efforts throughout the greater Delaware Valley. These services are not otherwise directly funded by The United Way.

The "Combined Campaign" model already has been working successfully at other Philadelphia workplaces: The City granted payroll deduction and solicitation participation to these groups and others in 1982 and the School District converted to a combined campaign in 1985. Other universities around the country which employ such models include Harvard, the University of Massachusetts, Brown and the University of Minnesota.

The A-1 Assembly Executive Committee continues to support such a model for Penn that would create a true partnership among fundraising organizations which raise money to serve the needs of our larger community. We welcome discussion about this initiative and we urge other faculty and staff groups and individuals to lend support to this effort.

—The Executive Committee of the A-1 Assembly

claims about costs, the IRS requires that our annual 990 form, which lists our income and expenses, be made available at our offices to anyone who wants to see it. Or, we would be happy to send you a copy of the audited financial statement published in our annual report.

A second issue on cost: all the organizations participating in United Way's campaign share equally in the costs. That is, they receive the amount designated for them less 11 percent for fundraising and administration. Except this year at Penn. The four special interest groups made a special deal with the University and will not pay anything toward campaign expenses.

Our position is this: *if it is to be done for some it must be for all*. There is no justification for this type of first class treatment for a few groups and second class treatment for everyone else.

A final issue on cost: what will be the cost for Penn of a campaign that becomes an increasingly larger and more complex administrative burden? The University administration did its own internal assessment and found that the alternative to a United Way campaign will be more costly, requiring far more effort from administrative staff.

And the costs for Penn which can be assessed today are only a small portion of what they will be a few years from now under the alternative style campaign. Each year there will be more umbrella groups at your door. Each will multiply your data processing workload.

The United Way Campaign is designed to be *easy to manage and administer for the em-*

ployer. Our fundraising and administrative costs cover everything you need: from pledge cards and literature for the campaign to the data processing of donor designated pledges. In addition, we research community needs and monitor agencies—services that add value for the many Penn donors that give Community and Targeted Care pledges.

Enthusiasm and Hard Work Raise More Money

Before summarizing our major points, we would just like to mention the issue of which style of campaign raises more money.

The four special interest groups often claim that the alternative style of campaign they are promoting raises more money. They will even use this year's highly successful campaign at Penn as an example to support their argument.

The fact is, *this year's campaign at Penn was a United Way campaign*—the only difference was that the four special interest groups were given the opportunity to distribute their literature, attend training meetings, and be exempt from paying any costs associated with the campaign.

But that doesn't mean we're taking credit for your success. There is no magical style of campaign that automatically raises more money. We should all be wary of anyone who makes that claim. At Penn, just like at workplaces throughout the Delaware Valley, *it's the people who work on the campaign that make or break it*. This year's campaign committee at Penn was outstanding and their results show it.

Our Final Pitch

We've put a lot of issues before you and

given you our honest assessment of what is at stake at Penn. We very much want Penn to continue conducting an open and fair campaign on your campus, among faculty and staff, because we believe it is what's best for all concerned.

At the same time, we recognize that United Way isn't perfect and we hope we aren't coming across as saying we are.

We are volunteers, donors, health and human service organizations and staff striving to meet a diversity of needs—some critically urgent, others having a more subtle impact on the quality of our lives.

The United Way of Southeastern Pennsylvania is a national leader in providing donors with the ultimate in giving options. Our list of 2,700 organizations is unrivaled by any other United Way in the nation. Not that more is better—but the list reflects you, our donors. An organization gets on the list by being selected by you, and then they must pass a test of meeting some very basic requirements.

The Penn's Way/United Way Campaign offers donors the most choice to benefit the most people at the lowest cost. Without United Way, the special interest groups offer you very limited choice, benefit far fewer people and at significantly greater cost. The only reason to choose their style of a campaign is if you believe that these four special interest groups deserve special positioning—at the exclusion of thousands of other worthwhile groups.

We urge you to vote for the continuation of the Penn's Way/United Way Campaign in the March referendum.

President's Testimony on Smith Hall

continued from page 3

assure that Penn grows, that Penn meets its obligation to provide the best in teaching and research facilities for today's, and tomorrow's, faculty and students. As our 250th celebration demonstrated, Penn honors its past achievements, but it has grown to its current stature because it has not been constrained by them. The University simply cannot afford to memorialize every space on campus where new methods of teaching have been born or where discovery has taken place. Just as part of Smith Hall itself was demolished seven years after its completion to accommodate new programmatic needs in science, the University must build to meet the needs of today's science.

D. How will we address future expansion of the science programs located within the science precinct? We cannot predict what our needs will be beyond the next 20 years. With the exception of modest renovations to buildings within this precinct, we do not foresee additional major development of this block. As the science programs within the block continue to modernize their facilities there may be a time when one of the major users of the block will relocate, thereby providing expansion space for another. This is a natural and cost effective process which will not be necessary until many years from now. In the meantime, we will have restored four principal buildings on this block and be assured that they will provide the best possible facilities for our academic and research programs.

In the past, I have stated that the greatest challenge for Penn is to stay in the forefront of education and research in the emerging intellectual environment of the 21st century. To meet this challenge Penn cannot stand still. If we do, over time Penn will inevitably fall from the front ranks of major universities. If this should occur, we will not only have failed in our mission, but also done a significant disservice to the public interest. There has never been a time in our history when education: teaching, learning, and the creation of new knowledge through research, has been more critical to our national life.

Penn can only fulfill its promise as one of the nation's great universities by acting on the paradoxical truth that the way to remain true to our heritage is to continue to change. The basic personality of Penn was set long ago, and the more we change the more our energetic and inventive spirit is reinforced.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, I believe we have carefully balanced the past and future in the IAST project. I ask you to allow Penn to continue its heritage of growth and change.

Almanac

3601 Locust Walk Philadelphia, PA 19104-6224
(215) 898-5274 or 5275 FAX 898-9137
E-Mail ALMANAC@A1.QUAKER

EDITOR
ASSOCIATE EDITOR
EDITORIAL ASSISTANT
STUDENT ASSISTANTS

Karen C. Gaines
Marguerite F. Miller
Monique VanLandingham
Jennifer E. Burke, Ashley M.
Dupuy, Phuong Nguyen,
Shauna Selly, Amy Sykes,
Lynn Westwater

ALMANAC ADVISORY BOARD: For the Faculty Senate, June Axinn, Charles D. Graham (Chair), Almarin Phillips, Louise P. Shoemaker; for the Administration, William Epstein; for Staff Assemblies, Deverie Pierce (A1), Judith A. Vaughan-Sterling (Librarians); A3 representative to be named.

SENATE

From the Senate Office

The following statement is published in accordance with the Senate Rules. Among other purposes, the publication of SEC actions is intended to stimulate discussion between the constituencies and their representatives. We would be pleased to hear suggestions from members of the Faculty Senate. Please communicate your comments to Senate Chair Almarin Phillips or Faculty Senate Staff Assistant Carolyn Burdon, 15 College Hall/6303, Ext. 8-6943.

Actions Taken by the Senate Executive Committee

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

1. Academic Planning and Budget Committee. A report was made by AP&B Committee member Robert E. Davies, Past Chair, Faculty Senate.

2. Senate Committee on Committees. Nominations were made and a ballot will be circulated shortly to all SEC members.

3. Medical Center: School of Medicine and Hospital. Dean William N. Kelley discussed his plans for expansion.

4. Long-term Planning. Chief Planning Officer Robert Zemsky made a presentation and SEC members discussed the plans with Provost Aiken, Vice President Gravina, President Hackney, and Professor Zemsky.

5. Admissions. Following discussion it was moved and adopted unanimously "that the Senate Executive Committee recommends to the Steering Committee of University Council that consideration be given to the modification or deletion of the charge to the Council Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid."

New Software Partnership: Ingres

Since July 1, Penn departments, faculty, and students have had access at greatly reduced prices to Ingres state-of-the-art relational database management system (RDBMS) software and related products through a five-year partnership with the software vendor, Ingres Division of ASK Computer Systems. RDBMS software offers improved productivity for educational, research, and administrative applications development and end-user access to data, and is increasingly used as the basis for packaged "off the shelf" applications.

In October, the Office of the Vice Provost for Information Systems and Computing released prices for both software licenses and annual software support. These prices represent a substantial savings to the campus at large for the use of Ingres for just about any purpose: instructional, research or administrative. Software support costs include coverage for receipt of new releases, technical support offered by various Information Systems and Computing units now under development, and in some cases, direct technical support from Ingres.

The software is available on a number of PC, workstation, and midrange computer platforms. Gateways are also available to data residing in other RDBMS systems. Included in the site license are the Philadelphia and New Bolton campuses; the Hospital; the clinical practices; the Wistar Institute; Children's Hospital of Philadelphia; and home use by staff, faculty, and students. Users are required to sign a standard licensing agreement explaining the appropriate uses of the software.

A series of monthly programs is being run to introduce Ingres to the campus. Those interested in more information on Ingres, including pricing and support, are invited to call me at the Office of Data Administration and Information Resource Planning, 898-3029, or send an electronic message to arzt@A1.relay.upenn.edu.

—Noam Arzt, Office of Data Administration
and Information Resource Planning

OSHA's New Laboratory Standard

The Occupational Health and Safety Administration (OSHA), recognizing the unique characteristics of the laboratory workplace, has promulgated a new standard entitled "Occupational Exposure to Hazardous Chemicals in Laboratories." The standard applies to all laboratories that use hazardous chemicals including industrial, clinical, and academic laboratories. According to the standard, all laboratories must develop and implement a Chemical Hygiene Plan by January 31, 1991. This plan must include the necessary work practices, procedures, equipment, and policies that are capable of protecting employees from the health hazards presented by chemicals in their work area.

The Office of Environmental Health and Safety has developed a Chemical Hygiene Plan for University Laboratories. A copy of the University's Chemical Hygiene Plan along with the OSHA standard may be obtained by contacting the Office of Environmental Health and Safety at 1408 Blockley Hall/6021, or by calling 898-4453.

Staff training is a requirement under the new standard. The Office of Environmental Health and Safety presents programs on the safe handling of chemicals (Hazard Communication) throughout the year. The next seminar on the Hazard Communication Standard will be presented Tuesday, February 5 in Room 104, Medical Education Building, 2-3 p.m. Detailed information concerning the Chemical Hygiene Plan will be included in future training programs. Health and safety information in the form of material safety data sheets (MSDS's) is available at the Office of Environmental Health and Safety for all chemicals used at the University. To register for the seminar, or if you have any questions or want additional information, please call the Office of Environmental Health and Safety at 898-4453.

—Office of Environmental Health & Safety

Travel Security Measures During the Gulf War Crisis

Lyn Hutchings, the University's travel administrator, conveys the following advisory sent by Rosenbluth Travel as a result of the war in the Gulf and threats of terrorism.

The FAA has advised the airlines that security measures at all domestic and international airports have been substantially increased. As a result,

- Minimum domestic check-in time is one hour.
- Minimum international check-in time is three hours.
- No curbside check-in will be permitted.
- All passengers must check-in at the ticket counters.
- No one except ticketed passengers will be permitted beyond airport security checkpoints.
- There will be limited paging ability at all airports.
- For flights into and out of Germany only, severe restrictions will apply to any carry-on luggage and no battery-operated or electric appliances (i.e. hair dryers, radios, etc.) of any kind will be permitted in either hand or checked luggage.

There have been some airline flight cancellations due to a number of factors:

- 1) Decreased bookings to foreign destinations
- 2) Rising fuel costs, coupled with decreased passenger load
- 3) Dramatic increases in airline insurance costs
- 4) Emergency aircraft programs to support military operations.

The Travel Office urges Penn faculty, staff and students to carefully consider the need to travel internationally during this crisis, Ms. Hutchings said. For those who must travel, a list of international flight safety tips is available: contact Lyn Hutchings at Ext. 8-3307.

To Lab Workers: On Needles, Syringes

The use of needles and syringes requires special precautions. CDC-NIH guidelines recommend extreme caution when handling needles and syringes. To avoid self-inoculation and generation of aerosols, do not bend, clip, recap or remove needles from syringes following use. The use of needle nipping devices is *not* recommended and this practice must be discontinued. The needle and syringe unit should be promptly placed in a puncture-resistant sharps container and decontaminated, preferably by autoclaving before reuse or discard as infectious waste.

More information on the proper handling and disposal of needles and syringes may be found in the University's *Biological Safety Manual*. To request a manual or make inquiries, call Harriet Izenberg in the Office of Environmental Health and Safety at 898-4453.

Two Phi Beta Kappa Competitions for Students

The Executive Committee and Electoral Board of Penn's Delta Chapter of Phi Beta Kappa will conduct two competitions shortly. Either faculty or the student authors may submit entries and one need not be a member of Phi Beta Kappa to do so. Entries go to 200 Houston Hall by:

February 4: Elmaleh Prize and Humanities Prize, each with an honorarium of \$300; for undergraduate essays in the social sciences and humanities *that are not senior theses*.

April 1: Two \$500 Phi Beta Kappa prizes for *senior honors theses*, one in the humanities and social sciences and the other in the natural sciences.

Campus CrimeStats: The Penn Police report of Part I Crimes was unavailable this week due to computer failure. Data are expected for publication next week.—Ed.

18th District Crimes Against Persons Report

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

12:00 AM January 1, 1991 to 11:59 PM January 13, 1991

Total: Incidents—23, Arrests—4

Date	Time	Location	Offense/Weapon	Arrests
1/01/91	7:55 AM	4900 Woodland	Purse snatch/strong-arm	No
1/01/91	5:15 PM	3925 Walnut	Robbery/gun	No
1/02/91	9:53 PM	4600 Walnut	Aggravated Assault/gun	Yes
1/04/91	4:00 PM	3400 Walnut	Robbery/strong-arm	No
1/04/91	5:50 PM	4500 Ludlow	Rape attempt	Yes
1/04/91	8:03 PM	4000 Chestnut	Robbery/pipe	No
1/04/91	10:32 PM	4200 Baltimore	Robbery/knife	No
1/04/91	11:50 PM	200 S. St Marks	Robbery/gun	No
1/05/91	5:18 AM	4638 Linmore	Aggravated Assault/board	Yes
1/05/91	6:15 PM	3300 Market	Robbery/strong-arm	No
1/06/91	2:10 AM	4000 Sansom	Robbery/gun	No
1/06/91	3:35 PM	405 S. 45	Robbery/brick	No
1/08/91	4:13 AM	4700 Locust	Robbery/strong-arm	No
1/08/91	12:56 AM	4700 Walnut	Aggravated Assault/pipe	No
1/08/91	3:36 PM	4700 Walnut	Robbery/knife	No
1/09/91	8:40 AM	1416 S. Grays	Robbery/gun	No
1/09/91	5:23 PM	4500 Woodland	Robbery/gun	No
1/09/91	11:45 PM	3400 Civic	Aggravated Assault/knife	Yes
1/10/91	3:00 PM	4600 Market	Robbery/gun	No
1/11/91	3:00 PM	4600 Pine	Robbery/strong-arm	No
1/13/91	2:45 PM	3929 Walnut	Robbery/strong-arm	No
1/13/91	11:01 PM	4400 Market	Robbery/gun	No
1/13/91	11:05 PM	3909 Walnut	Robbery/strong-arm	No

Update

JANUARY AT PENN

FILMS

23 *The Peddler/Dastforush*; first in the Recent Iranian Cinema series, with commentary from guest speakers; 7:30 p.m., International House. Also January 24, 27, 31 and February 1 and 3.

MEETINGS

23 *Sobriety I: Less than 18 months in Recovery*; weekly support group addresses the challenges of maintaining sobriety from drug and alcohol addictions; noon-1 p.m., Room 301, Houston Hall (FSAP). Also January 30, Bishop White Room.

24 *Orientation for 7-part Freedom from Smoking clinic*; begins program developed by American Lung Association; noon-1 p.m., Training Center, Blockley Hall (The University's Wellness Program). Registration: 8-7517.

29 *When Those We Love have a Mental Illness*; strategies for relating to people with mental illness; Amy Baboff, counselor; noon-1 p.m., Room 305, Houston Hall (FSAP).

30 *Caregivers Support Group*; support group for individuals caring for an elderly relative; noon-1 p.m., Room 301, Houston Hall (Child Care Resource Network).

ON STAGE

23 *My Army*; a true story of a boy's journey to manhood and his dream of being an officer in the British Army; 7 p.m., Movement Theatre International Tabernacle Theatre (MTI). Also January 24-26, 8 p.m., and January 27, 3 p.m.

TALKS

23 *Recent Research in Oaxaca, Mexico*; Nancy Farris, History; Arthur Miller, University of Maryland; Angeles Romero, Centro Regional de Oaxaca, Mexico; noon, Bishop White Room, Houston Hall (Latin American Cultures Program).

24 *Intellect, Conscience and the Marketplace*; Carl Kaysen, M.I.T.; 5 p.m., Rare Book Reading Room, Van Pelt Library (Phi Beta Kappa).

28 *Drug Treatment of Isolated Systolic Hypertension*; Bruce Schechter, Philadelphia College of Pharmacology; 8-9 a.m. New VA Nursing Home, 1st Floor Conference Room.

The Role of TRH in Arousal; Andrew Winokur, psychiatry and pharmacology; noon, Pharmacology Seminar Room, John Morgan Building (Pharmacology/Medicine).

Interacting with singing birds; W. John Smith; 4 p.m., Room B-26, Stiteler Hall (Psychology).

29 *Film in History: Focus on the Holocaust*; Judith Doneson, Annenberg Research Institute; 5:30 p.m., Van Pelt Library (Jewish Studies Program).

Growth and Differentiation Characteristics of Human Skin Keratinocytes at Different Stages of Transformation; Norbert Fusenig, German Cancer Center, Heidelberg; 4 p.m., Wistar Auditorium.

30 *Malaria*; Jeff Stanley, Emergency Department/HUP; 8:30-9:30 a.m., E.R. Conference Room, Silverstein (General Internal Medicine).

The Making and Healing of the Wicked Stepmother/father; Nancy Schongalla-Bowman; 1-2 p.m., Marriage Council of Philadelphia.

Speech Processing in the Auditory Nerve and Cochlear Nucleus; Murray Sachs, Johns Hopkins; 4:15 p.m., Neuroscience Conference Room, John Morgan Building (David Mahoney Institute of Neurological Sciences).