

Almanac

Tuesday, March 5, 1991

Published by the University of Pennsylvania

Volume 37, Number 24

INSIDE

- VPUL Recommendation on 'Castle,' p. 2
- Committee to Review SSW Dean, p. 2
- VPISC Search Committee Report, p. 2
- Debating the HTLV-I/Sheep Case, pp. 3-5
- Referendum on Penn's Way, p. 5
- Debating Smith Walk, pp. 6-8
- BRSG Grants; Bulletins; Deaths, p. 9
- Student Coalition Retreat, pp. 11
- CrimeStats, Update, p. 12

Pullout: Safety & Security Report, 1990

To: Members of the Faculty Senate
From: Almarin Phillips, Chair
Subject: Senate Nominations 1991-92

1. In accordance with the requirements of Sec.11(b)(i) of the Senate Rules, official notice is hereby given of the Senate Nominating Committee's slate of nominees for the incoming Senate Officers. The nominees, all of whom have indicated their willingness to serve, are:

Chair-elect: David K. Hildebrand (statistics)
Secretary-elect: Peter Dodson (anatomy/veterinary)
At-large Members of the Senate Executive Committee
(to serve a 3-year term beginning May, 1991):
Roger Allen (Oriental studies)
Irving M. Shapiro (biochemistry/dental)
Susan Wachter (finance)
Herbert S. Wilf (mathematics)

At-large Member of the Senate Executive Committee
(to serve a 1-year term beginning May, 1991):
June Axinn (social work)

Assistant Professor Members of the Senate Executive Committee
(to serve a 2-year term beginning May, 1991):
David Boyd (English)
Catalina Herrerias (social work)

Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility
(to serve a 3-year term beginning May, 1991):
Jill Beech (clinical studies/veterinary)
Robert F. Giegengack (geology)
Mark Stern (social work)

Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility
(to serve a 2-year term beginning May, 1991):
Liliane Weissberg (German)

Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility
(to serve a 1-year term beginning May, 1991):
Ian Harker (geology)*
Barbara J. Lowery (nursing)

Senate Committee on Conduct
(to serve a 2-year term beginning May, 1991):
Madeleine Joullic (chemistry)
Howard Lesnick (law)
Gino Segre (physics)

Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty
(to serve a 3-year term beginning May, 1991):
Peter Freyd (mathematics)
Ellen Prince (linguistics)

Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty
(to serve a 1-year term beginning May, 1991):
Robert Summers (economics)

2. Again pursuant to the Senate Rules Sec. 11(b)(i) you are invited to submit "additional nominations, which shall be accomplished via petitions containing at least 25 valid names and the signed approval of the candidate. All such petitions must be received no later than 14 days subsequent to the circulation of the nominees of the Nominating Committee. Nominations will automatically be closed 14 days after circulation of the slate of the Nominating Committee." Pursuant to this provision, petitions must be received at the Faculty Senate Office, Room B, 3rd floor, Faculty Club, by 5 p.m., Tuesday, March 19, 1991.

3. Under the same provision of the Senate Rules, if no additional nominations are received, the slate nominated by the Nominating Committee will be declared elected. Should additional nominations be received, an election will thereafter be held by mail ballot.

*One-year replacement term 1990-91 extended additional year

Voting on 'Penn's Way' by March 22

President Sheldon Hackney has sent ballots to the 8500-plus full-time faculty and staff who are annually solicited for charitable donations, asking them to vote on two questions.

The first one, "Should Penn continue to have a workplace charitable campaign?" is a yes-or-no question. The second, "If we have a campaign, how should it be organized?" offers two options—a United Way Campaign with Donor Option, in which all funds are funneled through United Way of Southeastern Pennsylvania to agencies or groups of agencies; or a Combined Campaign in which employee donations are sent directly to various federations and fund-raising "umbrella" groups, including but not limited to United Way. (Dr. Hackney's more detailed description of the options is in a letter sent with the ballot, printed on page 5 of this issue.)

Ballots, printed on blue-weave "transcript paper" to prevent photocopying (the word "VOID" would appear in the blue design if reproduced), are to be returned unsigned by March 22. Although the referendum is nonbinding, and the President openly expresses a preference for a "yes" to Question #1, he urges all faculty and staff, at all levels, to give their views through the referendum.

Security Alert: Attempted Rape on 36th Street

The attempted rape of an employee, at 7:20 a.m. Saturday on 36th Street between Locust Walk and Spruce Street, has prompted a resumption of extra patrols in the early morning hours, Campus Public Safety Commissioner John Kuprevich has announced.

The staff member, who received facial injuries fighting off her assailant, was treated at HUP and released. She described the attacker as clean-shaven, black, in his early thirties, about 5'8". Campus and city police are investigating the incident.

Despite increased patrols, Commissioner Kuprevich urged members of the University traveling at dawn, dusk or nighttime to walk together or call Escort Service—or beyond Escort hours, call the police dispatcher at Ext. 8-7297 or 8-7298.

VPUL's Choice for 'Castle' Occupancy

On page 2, Vice Provost for University Life Kim M. Morrison announces her recommendation for use of the Psi Upsilon fraternity house at 36th and Locust Walk known as "The Castle." She proposes a living-learning house based on community involvement. The Castle has been vacant since last June when the fraternity's recognition was withdrawn with a stipulation of three years' wait before a new application can be made.

Search Committee for Dean of SAS

Provost Michael Aiken has announced the make-up of the search committee to advise on the selection of a successor to Dean Hugo Sonnenschein of the School of Arts and Sciences, who will return to Princeton this term as provost. At Council, Provost Aiken said the committee will be asked to work quickly, with a view to naming a new dean by September 1. The committee members and the constituencies that designated them:

SAS Faculty: David Balamuth, Physics
Rebecca Bushnell, English
Samuel Preston, Sociology
John Sabini, Psychology
President and Provost: Beth Allen, Economics
Lawrence Bernstein, Music (chair)
Mary Berry, History
Marvin Lazerson, Dean, GSE

Undergraduate Assembly: Niranjan Karnik, College '93
Graduate Students Association Council: Julie Pearce, Anthropology
SAS Board of Overseers: Gloria Chisum, Alumna and Trustee

Tax Alert: FICA Taxes

The 1990 Revenue Reconciliation Act has dictated some changes to the methodology for withholding and reporting FICA taxes. Until 1991 there has been a combined FICA-medicare tax rate (7.65% of \$51,300 in 1990). The combined rate was eliminated for 1991 when separate taxable wage bases took effect for social security and medicare (\$53,400 for social security and \$125 for medicare). The tax rates remain unchanged from their 1990 levels (6.2% social security and 1.45% for medicare for a total of 7.65%). The Internal Revenue Service is requiring that these taxes be reported and withheld separately.

These changes will not impact your net pay since the tax rate did not change. The only apparent change will be that two taxes will replace the current FICA tax on the pay stub. These new tax lines will read FICA/OASDI and Medicare.

—Marstin Alexander, Assistant Comptroller

Review Committee for Dean of Social Work

Under University statutes, deans are reviewed seven years after their initial appointments with a view to reappointment for an additional five years' service. As Dean Michael Austin of the School of Social Work approaches the seven-year point, Provost Michael Aiken announces the make-up of the committee and the constituencies that designated its members:

SSW Faculty:	June Axinn Howard Arnold (Chair) Richard Caputo Vivian Seltzer
President and Provost:	Richard Estes, SSW Raymond Fonseca, Dean, Dental Paul McDermott, GSE Neville Strumpf, Nursing
Graduate Students:	Lani Nelson Anthony Butto
SSW Board of Overseers:	Wilbur E. Hobbs, Overseer/ Alumnus

Recommendation on The Castle: A Living-Learning Center

Since the beginning of this academic year, the question of who or what should fill the vacancy of "The Castle," at 300 S. 36th Street has been a question of significant importance to the University community. President Hackney has asked me for a recommendation on this question and, in considering the issues raised by this recommendation, I have sought advice from the Committee to Diversify Locust Walk on the subject of what constitutes an ideal residential community, and particularly one that might exist on this site.

Through its discussion and consideration, the committee has offered useful guidelines for the Castle: that its residents should be both heterogeneous and pluralistic; that it should offer activities through its programs and public space that are beneficial to a wide segment of the University community; that it should incorporate both the intellectual and social spirit of a living-learning community; and that it should embody the idea of welcoming presence that we as a committee seek for the whole of Locust Walk. The committee has also suggested that we treat this new project as experimental and subject to review to assure that it continues to meet successfully the goals established.

Both I and the committee have also benefitted from a number of interesting proposals and suggestions from individual students and from groups throughout campus for the use of the Castle. Many of these suggestions are worthy of strong support as we look to the future of Locust Walk; we did not try to rank order them, but rather to draw from them some common principles to inform our thinking and discussion.

As I have considered the Committee's advice, I have also considered the special features of the Castle itself. Built and used as a fraternity house for nearly a century, it sits in stony splendor in the heart of campus, a pivotal point in the physical transition from the corridor of Locust Walk to the openness of College Green. The building is a dominant feature of

the landscape; all who use the Walk or its intersection at 36th Street must pass by. This physical centrality of being at the heart's core requires a corresponding centrality of program and of purpose.

My recommendation for the Castle is to create within it a pluralistic living-learning residence dedicated to service to the wider community, a place in the heart of our campus where undergraduate and graduate students, supported by faculty and staff members, can explore the key issues of service and community involvement in answer to the question, "What good may I do?"

This is not a new idea; a programmatic requirement of community service was indeed part of many of the proposals we received. There are also many faculty, staff and students on our campus involved in programs dedicated to the exploration of community service ideas and practice upon whom we should call in the initiation of this endeavor. From these individuals we will form an advisory board to draw up guidelines for this residential community, to aid in the identification of a diverse group of undergraduate and graduate student residents and graduate fellows dedicated to exploring service issues, to offer programmatic support to this house as it begins to function next year, and to aid in the process of evaluating the success of this enterprise. Its goal should be to ensure that in this house, learning and service are joined in constructive common good.

The presence of a Community Service House in the heart of campus makes a powerful statement about the central place of service in our overall University program. It is a statement that many of our students have already made individually, and it seems appropriate to acknowledge this with a corresponding physical and programmatic commitment.

—Kim M. Morrisson, Vice Provost for University Life

Final Report of the Consultative Committee in the Search for a Vice Provost for Information Systems and Computing

The Consultative Committee in the Search for a Vice Provost for Information Systems and Computing was convened in May 1990 by Provost Aiken. The Committee members were: Dr. Ronald Arenson, Professor and Associate Chair, Clinical Services, Radiology; Dr. Joseph Bordogna, Alfred Fitler Moore Professor and Dean Emeritus, School of Engineering and Applied Science; Dr. David Balamuth, Professor of Physics, School of Arts and Sciences; Mr. William Davies, Information Systems Specialist, Office of the Senior Vice President; Dr. Martin Harris, Department of Medicine; Dr. Paul R. Kleindorfer, (Chairman), Universal Furniture Professor of Decision Sciences and Economics; Dr. Robert Kraft, Undergraduate Chair, Religious Studies, School of Arts and Sciences; Dr. Paul Mosher, Vice Provost and Director of Libraries; Mr. Robert Pallone, Director of Development Information Systems.

The committee solicited nominations from faculty members, alumni, overseers, deans and faculty in other institutions, heads of foundations and friends of the University. Advertisements were placed in *The Philadel-*

phia Inquirer, *New York Times*, *Chronicle of Higher Education* and *Communication of the ACM*. There were 14 women in the applicant pool and 10 ethnic minority candidates.

During the 1990-91 academic year, the committee held 16 meetings. The committee was supported in the search process by Michael Lusk, an executive search consultant specializing in academic search.

The committee considered a total of 184 candidates, two of whom were internal. Of these, a total of eight candidates, including two women, from both on campus and off campus were interviewed by the committee, selected deans, and senior information systems staff at the University. In January of this year, the committee submitted to the president, the provost, and the senior vice president the names of four people considered likely candidates for the position. Dr. Peter Patton's name was on that list, and he was subsequently named vice provost.

—Paul Kleindorfer, Chair

Ed Note: Dr. Patton's appointment was announced in *Almanac* 2/19/91.

Following are four texts that relate to exchanges in the February 19 issue, beginning with the University News Bureau's announcement of findings in the investigation of charges of misconduct in research. The principle investigator's remarks, starting below, are followed by letters from two faculty members, page 4, and by the Provost's response to Dr. Ferrer, page 5.

The HTLV-I Incident: Comments on the Provost's Response to AAUP

This is to comment on Provost Aiken's response of February 15, 1991, to the letter which Dr. Elsa Ramsden, President of the University of Pennsylvania Chapter of the AAUP, wrote on February 12, 1991 stating that, in the opinion of the AAUP Board, the penalties imposed on me by Dean Andrews as a result of the HTLV-I/sheep incident contravenes University procedures and infringes on the principle of academic freedom. These communications and my statement on the HTLV-I/sheep incident were published in the February 19, 1991, issue of *Almanac*.

My comments on the Provost's response are as follows:

1. The University's official Procedures Concerning Misconduct in Research, which were applied to deal with the HTLV-I/sheep incident, state in paragraph 3.1: "If the report of the formal investigative committee finds the charges to be unfounded, the matter shall be dropped..." and "The Dean and the Provost have the responsibility to take an active role to repair any damage done to the reputation of the respondent..." The report of the formal investigative committee states: "none of the parties involved in this incident, including Dr. Ferrer..., are guilty of misconduct in research." Despite this unambiguous conclusion, on the advice of the Provost, Dean Andrews imposed on me penalties that will cause irreparable damage to a long-standing research program, to my career and probably to the careers of my associates.

In his letter of February 15, 1991, the Provost discharges his and the Dean's responsibilities as specified in paragraph 3.1, and attempts to justify the penalties imposed, arguing that the committee report, while concluding that there was no misconduct in research, did not state that "the charges were not unfounded." It is obvious that if the committee report states that there was no misconduct in research it was because, upon examination of the charges of misconduct in research, the committee concluded that these charges were unfounded. It is equally obvious that if the committee would have found the charges of misconduct in research to be founded, it would have concluded that I was guilty of misconduct in research. Therefore, the claim that the charges of misconduct in research were not found to be unfounded by the committee is clearly untenable.

The official finding of the University is that I am not guilty of misconduct in research. Given this unambiguous fact—and semantics aside—the language and spirit of the rules stated in paragraph 3.1 of the Procedures require the Dean and the Provost to drop the matter without imposing penalties and to take an active role to repair any damage done to my reputation.

2. The Provost invokes paragraph 3.2 of the Procedures to support the Dean's right to impose penalties even in the face of the committee's conclusion that I was not guilty of misconduct in research. However, paragraph 3.2 only authorizes the Dean to impose penalties "If the report of the formal investigative committee finds the charges against a faculty member to be substantiated..." There is no statement in the Procedures Concerning Misconduct in Research, nor in the Just Cause Procedures or in any other section of the Faculty Handbook, indicating that, in a case of alleged misconduct in research, the Dean or the Provost have the right to impose penalties if the committee concludes that there was no misconduct in research. It seems evident, therefore, that by imposing penalties, with the concurrence of the Provost, the Dean has abandoned the rules, i.e. the Procedures, which were applied to this case, and has done so without notifying the parties involved, after the matter was investigated and after the committee issued the report.

3. In supporting the Dean's right to impose penalties, the Provost refers to a revised form of the Procedures "now making its way through the Faculty Senate." It appears, therefore, that the Provost considers it

appropriate to use, without previous notification to the parties involved, a still unapproved version of the rules as a basis for imposing penalties in connection with a matter already judged on the basis of the rules currently in effect which preclude imposing penalties if the investigation does not substantiate the charges. Applying a set of rules to investigate and deal with the charges and then, when the accused is found not guilty, to abandon these rules and apply another set of rules for imposing penalties, is clearly inconsistent with the most basic principles of justice.

4. From his letter it appears that the Provost believes that the penalties imposed on me by the Dean are "minor" and "reasonable." The Provost states that restrictions "such as monitoring of laboratories, giving no salary raise, and requiring participation in certain learning experiences" have been imposed on faculty. The Provost has evidently failed to realize that the two major penalties imposed on me by the Dean are of a much more severe nature and, far from being "minor" and "reasonable," will have very destructive consequences. The following remarks may help to put into perspective the gravity of these penalties.

a) The first penalty prevents me from conducting animal research. As I have been told by the Dean, this restriction also applies to my animal research with the bovine leukemia virus (BLV), a virus with which our research program has been mainly concerned during the last 25 years. Animal work has been an integral and essential component of this research program and continues to be so. With the exception of the HTLV-I incident, there has never been any violation of biosafety rules in my animal or laboratory work with BLV.

b) The second major penalty prevents me from conducting or supervising studies on HTLV-I or other known or suspected pathogens. Yet my laboratory work with HTLV-I has not been the subject of an investigation. My laboratory has been inspected regularly by the University's Office of Environmental Health and Safety and found to be in compliance with the stipulated biosafety procedures.

The fundamental objective of my research program during the last 25 years has been to contribute to human leukemia and retrovirus research. As recognized by leading experts in the field, our research program has had an important impact on the research that led to the discovery and characterization of HTLV-I, the first known human leukemia retrovirus. The main interest of our research program continues to be the extrapolation and application of our findings on BLV to HTLV-I and human leukemia research. Thus, the prospect of funding for our research program depends largely on our ability to make this extrapolation and link our work on BLV to HTLV-I and human leukemia research. Thus, in addition to being arbitrary and unwarranted, and in violation of the Procedures, the two major penalties imposed by the Dean put in serious jeopardy my entire research program.

Even more importantly perhaps, the two major penalties imposed by the Dean—which the Provost seems to believe are "minor" and "reasonable"—represent an infringement on the freedom of inquiry and, therefore, on the principles of academic freedom.

The Provost states in his letter that the Chair, past Chair and Chair-elect of the Faculty Senate concurred with his advice to the Dean that sanctions could be imposed in this case. However, from the Provost's statement it is not clear that the Chair, past Chair and Chair-elect of the Faculty Senate, when consulted by the Provost on this point, were made aware of the specific nature and implications of the penalties which were to be imposed. Another indication of the punitive and destructive nature of the actions taken by the Dean and Central Administration in this case, is the Dean's and Vice Provost for Research's interception of February 1, 1991, of my grant application to the National Institutes of Health,

which was due on the same day. Even if the penalties would have not been arbitrary and unjustified, this action is, in itself, an arbitrary infringement of my academic freedom because, as I have explained to the Dean, the research proposed in the grant application does not necessarily conflict with the restrictions involved in the penalties. My grant application was intercepted without beforehand giving me an adequate opportunity to comment or to make any clarifications, and despite the fact that a few days earlier the Dean (or his designee) and my Department Chairman had approved and signed the application. My grant application continues to be retained even though I have explained in detail to the Dean the reasons why the proposed work does not conflict with the restrictions.

5. The Provost does not comment on another violation of the Procedures by the Dean, to which Dr. Ramsden refers in the letter she wrote to the Dean on behalf of the Board of the Pennsylvania Chapter of the AAUP. This violation concerns the rule of confidentiality of the Procedures which state: "All committees and parties to an inquiry or investigation have the responsibility to maintain maximum confidentiality throughout the proceedings" and that "The Dean shall also make every effort to protect the identity of both complainant and respondent with respect to the larger community" (paragraph 1.2). During the investigation of the HTLV-I/Sheep incident, Dean Andrews and other University officials repeatedly violated this rule by releasing my name to the press, announcing that I was charged with misconduct in research, casting me as the sole blameworthy person, and making reference to the possibility of me being fired.

In referring to his breach of the confidentiality rule, the Dean stated that the issue became public when, in a meeting held before the investigation began, I expressed to some members of the faculty regret for my error in interpreting the biosafety rules and leaving the inoculated lambs for six weeks with the flock. Apparently the Dean has failed to recognize, from the standpoint of the confidentiality rule, the difference between my statement to a small group of faculty members and his statement to the press announcing that I was charged with misconduct in

research, a charge which, by itself, is enormously damaging. Moreover, this and other premature, injudicious and potentially prejudicial statements by him and other University officers casting me as the sole responsible party were made public even after the report of the preliminary investigative committee referred unambiguously to the responsibility that University offices also had in the incident.

6. The Provost hopes that in addressing the matter, the AAUP Board will consider the worry and possible harm the incident has caused to various people. As I understand it, the AAUP's role in matters of this nature is to protect the academic freedom and the rights of faculty. It seems that the Provost is trying to influence the AAUP to go well beyond this function. Regardless of whether or not the Provost's request to the AAUP is appropriate, and even though it now seems clear that exposure of humans to HTLV-I never occurred as a result of my experiment, I will always deeply regret my error in interpreting the biosafety level 2 requirements, an error which—together with failures in communication and other deficiencies on the part of University offices, and an independent error in judgment by another party—has regrettably caused the incident. Although the risk posed by the inoculated lambs would have been exceedingly low, even if they had become infected, I fully recognize the need to implement corrective—not punitive and destructive—measures and to exercise a degree of caution even greater than that which, with the exception of the HTLV-I incident, I have always exercised during almost 30 years of research with leukemia viruses.

I trust that University officials, especially the Vice Provost for Research who has "the overall responsibility for the control of potentially infectious and biohazardous materials," will also recognize the deficiencies on the part of the University offices which, as stated in the reports of the preliminary and formal investigative committees, contributed to the incident, and will implement corrective—not punitive—measures accordingly.

—Jorge F. Ferrer, M.D., Professor of Microbiology/Vet Head, Comparative Leukemia & Retrovirus Unit

Additional Comments on the HTLV-I Case: On the Sanctions and the Process

In Defense of Dr. Ferrer

One major aspect of the HTLV-1 case now under discussion in *Almanac* which has not received attention is the unusual nature of the punishment meted out to Professor Ferrer by the University and the possibility that this punishment represents a serious breach of the standards of academic freedom of the University. I am referring to the broad, all inclusive proscription of Professor Ferrer's right to carry on animal research of any kind. This proscription is not limited to any particular kinds of research related to this case and would, in my opinion, seriously interfere with any research Professor Ferrer might want to do and as such represents a very broad invasion of freedom of inquiry essential to scholarship and research. (This academic aspect of the case is entirely apart from the legality of University action as noted by Professor Ramsden in *Almanac*, Feb. 19).

All parties to this controversy fully understand the pivotal role of freedom of inquiry as essential to the pursuit of excellence, which has always been the paramount consideration at this University. Penn has always prided itself for its unflagging defense of the freedom of inquiry and has been a national leader in this regard for the last half century. In my view, the punishments exacted in the HTLV-1 case are inconsistent with the principles of academic freedom and will seriously compromise this record.

Because of the all-inclusive nature of the ban placed on animal research it acts as a complete barrier to research since the necessity to utilize animal experimentation may exclude whole areas of inquiry appropriate to Professor Ferrer's research experimentation for its logical continuance. Can such a proscription be anything less than a total negation of freedom of inquiry comparable to barring a historian from the library or a statistician from using a computer? For these reasons it is completely unclear why the University chose such a broad attack on the ordinary rights of a faculty member when the remedy of specific restrictions was not only at hand but was also being used.

Furthermore, it is even less clear, given the imposition of sanctions that barred Professor Ferrer from continuing the offending line of research, a restriction also open to challenge as an invasion of academic freedom, and given the further requirement for special surveillance and training, why it was necessary to carry over the broader restriction from the investigative phase of the case, even after Professor Ferrer had been cleared of all charges of misconduct in research by an official University committee following established procedures.

On the face of matters, there would seem to be insufficient linkage between the University's action and the nature of the case including the risks involved and the official findings to sustain any of the sanctions imposed and certainly not the broad proscription of a faculty member's right to carry on research.

—Robert J. Rutman, Professor Emeritus, Biochemistry/Animal Biology/Vet

Dr. Ferrer and Academic Freedom and (Ir)Responsibility

As a past Provost once said, academic freedom and responsibility should arise from the Faculty rather than be imposed by the Administration. If Dr. J. Ferrer (see *Almanac* February 19 [and March 5]) believes that there has been a miscarriage of justice, that he has a grievance and/or that his academic freedom has been infringed, then he should file a grievance with the Faculty Grievance Commission or a complaint with the School of Veterinary Medicine Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, or go to court.

The Administration has followed the "Procedures Concerning Misconduct in Research" to a conclusion. However, if members of the Faculty of the School of Veterinary Medicine believe that there may have been a miscarriage of justice and that they do not have all the facts since (1) the membership of the "Preliminary Inquiry Committee" and the "Formal Investigation Committee" has not been made known, nor were they either selected or approved by the Faculty of the School and (2) the full details of their reports have not been published or otherwise been made available to them, then they have the following recourse.

In order to ensure that a committee elected by the Faculty can judge whether Dr. Ferrer should be cleared of all charges, deemed irresponsible, or even guilty of misconduct in research, 10 members of the Standing Faculty of the School should sign a written request to call a Special Meeting of the Faculty in order to create a Group for Complaint, in accordance with the Operating Procedures and Policies of the School and of the published procedures in the *Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administration* (1989) p. 47. This Group for Complaint, properly elected by the Faculty, and whose judgment would be trusted, could then investigate the whole matter and resolve the outstanding issues.

—Robert E. Davies, Benjamin Franklin Professor of Molecular Biology and University Professor Emeritus Biochemistry/Animal Biology/Vet

see also Provost's response, next page

Provost's Response to Dr. Ferrer

Let me respond to Dr. Ferrer as clearly and briefly as I can.

1. The review committee did not find the charges against Dr. Ferrer to be "unfounded." The Committee found that he was principally responsible for the incident. They also found that he was not guilty of "misconduct in research" as defined in the University's policy, but made findings of fact that support the Dean's sanctions.

2. The penalties imposed by the Dean do not derive from the Misconduct in Research Policy since the committee found that Dr. Ferrer did not commit "misconduct in research." They do not derive from the Just Cause Procedure; this is only used in cases where the issue is suspension or termination. They constitute some of the normal penalties that a Dean may put in place in circumstances where suspension or termination is not an issue. Such penalties are commonly referred to as "minor" in comparison with suspension or termination, which are denoted as "major."

3. My reference to the "revised procedures now making their way

through the Faculty Senate" was cited to show the general acceptance of a Dean's right to impose minor sanctions. I did not say that this right was derived from any policy revision that is not in force.

4. It was Dr. Ferrer's failure to follow his agreed-upon protocol that lies at the root of the problem and has resulted in the restrictions imposed by Dean Andrews.

5. The grant application in question was not forwarded because it failed to comply with some of the sanctions imposed by Dean Andrews and also because it was incomplete and inaccurate in a number of ways that relate to normal documentation. It has been returned to Dr. Ferrer with specific guidance about the areas that need to be addressed or corrected before it can be forwarded.

6. The reason that Dr. Ferrer's name was known to the press early in the proceedings appears to be his self-identification at an open meeting at New Bolton Center. When the press approached the administration for comment, the reporters knew that he was the scientist involved.

—Michael Aiken, Provost

From the President

Following is the text of the letter sent with ballot to all faculty and staff March 1, 1991.

On the Penn's Way Referendum: Deadline March 22

Dear Colleagues and Friends:

Charitable giving is one of the important opportunities that a free society offers each of us to meet our responsibilities as citizens for the well-being of our fellow human beings. At Penn charitable giving by employees through a workplace campaign has become a tradition. Such campaigns provide a convenient way of giving through payroll deduction and express Penn's commitment to our surrounding community. Thanks to your efforts, we raised over \$360,000 in this year's campaign. Finally, workplace campaigns help to reduce competition among charitable organizations so they can devote that much more of their resources to the services they provide.

There has been much discussion and debate on campus for the past two years regarding what form a workplace campaign should take at the University of Pennsylvania. The question has also been raised as to whether Penn should undertake any kind of workplace campaign. As my comments above suggest, I believe that a workplace campaign is a good idea—for Penn, for its employees, and for the community of which we are a part. However, you and your colleagues who actually have the opportunity to participate in our workplace campaign should have a major voice in deciding whether Penn should continue to have one, and if so, what form it should take. For that reason I urge you to complete the attached advisory referendum ballot and return it to my office in the enclosed envelope no later than March 22, 1991. Your advice will guide my decision regarding the future of the workplace campaign at Penn.

The enclosed ballot asks two questions:

First, should Penn continue to have a workplace charitable campaign? I believe we should. Let me have your opinion.

Second, if we have a campaign, how should it be organized?

I ask you to choose between two different types of campaigns. I want to emphasize that this is not a popularity contest. Rather, I am asking you to tell me what type of campaign you believe is best for Penn.

Neither alternative on the ballot is identical with this past year's highly successful Penn's Way/United Way campaign, which combined elements of the two alternatives presented on the ballot. The Penn's Way/United Way campaign was a one-year-only, interim solution, designed to allow time for the campus-wide discussion and the employee referendum that we are now conducting.

A little history may help to clarify the two alternatives. In prior years, Penn participated in the United Way of Southeastern Pennsylvania's annual campaign, with gifts going to United Way for distribution to specific agencies. In recent years, United Way has included a "Donor Option," allowing employees to designate their gifts for distribution to specific United Way agencies or federations of non-member agencies. This option is presented on the ballot as "a United Way Campaign with Donor Option." United Way would continue to be the only organization to solicit, receive and distribute employee gifts, while also providing employees with the opportunity to direct their gifts to specific United Way member agencies, purposes, or non-

member groups of agencies, etc. The administrative overhead deducted from gifts by United Way is the same whether or not the Donor Option is exercised.

The second alternative on the ballot is what is called "a Combined (or Partnership) Campaign." This alternative has been proposed and promoted by a committee of Penn faculty and staff over the past two years. In a Combined Campaign, several groups of agencies (generally called "federations" or "funds") would solicit, receive and distribute employee gifts. The United Way (including the Donor Option) would probably be one of these groups, but in addition, other federations of agencies that are not part of United Way would also participate. Employee contributions would be directed to one or more of these federations, which then distribute the money to the agencies they represent. Administrative overhead deducted from gifts varies from one federation to another.

Please note that neither the United Way nor the federations represented in a combined campaign are in the business of providing direct services. Rather, their primary role is to solicit, receive and distribute funds to member agencies, which then provide services to the community.

A United Way campaign does permit employees to make undesignated gifts that are then distributed by United Way. Traditionally, United Way campaigns have been a way of reducing competition among individual agencies for your charitable dollar. With 2700 member agencies, United Way provides wide choice, considerable breadth of interest and services, and includes many smaller agencies that might not otherwise have access to your contributions.

A Combined Campaign will allow for gifts to any past recipients of your donations. In addition, other agencies and federations, who are not members of United Way, would also be eligible to receive your contributions, and they would do so without being subject to the administrative overhead charges of United Way. Many of these considerations have been aired in the campus media, at University Council, and in other forums during the past two months. With your views in mind I will decide what form the University's workplace campaigns should take. I need to know your preferences. Please complete and return the attached secret ballot by March 22.

This advisory referendum is being conducted in a way that assures the freedom and confidentiality of your response. The ballot paper cannot be duplicated (the word "VOID" will appear). Ballots are not identified by individual. I encourage you to express your honest opinion. While vigorous debate is appropriate, no member of the University community should be subjected to inappropriate pressure or harassment regarding his/her vote. Any such incidents should be reported to my office at 898-7221.

Thank you for your attention and participation.

Sincerely yours,
Sheldon Hackney,
President

In the following exchange, Dr. Robert Kohler raises issues he presented at a forum February 13, arranged by the Provost for GAPSA and UA following those organizations' adoption of resolutions raising concerns about Smith Hall, Smith Walk and/or the planning process. The Vice President for Facilities Management responds on page 8.

Smith Walk and the University's Changing Center of Gravity

According to its proponents, the proposed "Institute for Advanced Science and Technology," is a grand design, conceived by a broadly representative group of people who had a long-term vision of the development of the sciences at Penn, and a sensitivity to environmental and community values. The reality, however, is somewhat different. The planning documents suggest that the planning process was neither representative of university interests nor designed to be sensitive to aesthetic and environmental concerns. Study of alternative plans, which were rejected for the present plan for construction on the Smith Building site, reveals that a truly bold and long-term vision of campus development was passed by in order to satisfy short-term interests of a few space-hungry departments.

The principle documents reveal how the present plan—seriously flawed plan, in the opinion of many—emerged from the planning process. Consider, first, the "Campus Development Plan" or "Levy Plan" of 1983-84. Supervised by Alan Levy, the chairman of our Architecture Department, this plan was the third and final stage of a comprehensive campus plan done by the Graduate School of Fine Arts in 1981-84. It focuses on the campus's historic precinct, the block between 33rd and 34th and Walnut and Spruce Streets.

The Levy Plan is a well-informed, judicious, and statesmanlike view of a part of the campus that presents unusually difficult problems for developers. A concentration of historic buildings imposes very high aesthetic and historic costs on any new construction in this special precinct. The buildings around Smith Walk constitute the last remaining intact part of Penn's 19th century urban campus. At the same time, the presence of an unusual number of disciplinary interests—chemistry, engineering, fine arts, music, English, and history of science—within this small area heightens the turf wars that have been simmering for years. (Engineering, for example, recently took over Hayden Hall from the School of Arts and Sciences.)

The "Levy Plan" recognized the conflicts between development and environmental values and balanced them in a plan that represents the interest of the whole campus, the whole community, not just those departments who stood to gain. It is an impressive document.

Consider next the "Science and Engineering Facility Planning Report" (*Almanac*, May 24, 1988). This document was the product of a year's quiet work by an ad hoc committee made up of representatives of the physical science departments (mathematics, chemistry, physics), four engineering departments, and psychology, plus administrators, three of whom were also professors of chemistry or physics. It was a narrow group, representing only those groups immediately interested in new construction. There was no representation from fine arts, humanities, or social sciences, even though they occupy space in the historic precinct. There was no one to speak for historic preservation. Apparently, this narrow representation was deliberate. The hard questions of conflicting priorities and values had, it seems, already been made behind the scenes in College Hall.

The report produced by this ad hoc group is quite unlike the Levy Report. Not surprisingly, it reflects the special needs and interests of the immediate beneficiaries: namely, chemistry and engineering. Only two paragraphs of the report deal with issues of the siting of new buildings (two buildings were then envisioned, one on the site of Music-Morgan and another on the site of Smith Hall). Historic and aesthetic costs of demolition and construction in an irreplaceable historic precinct are not addressed at all. It had already been decided, it seems, that the immediate claims of chemists and engineers overrode those of other disciplines and also the interest of the community as a whole in the survival of a much used and appreciated historic precinct.

Consider, finally, the "Feasibility Study, Institute for Advanced Science and Technology" of November 1990. This document is the feasibility study of the chemists' preferred plan by the architects, Venturi Scott Brown Associates. The preferred plan was for a large chemistry labora-

tory ("wet lab") on the Smith site, and a new building behind Music-Morgan for a computer facility ("dry lab"). Alternative sites were discussed only very briefly, then dismissed. The architects focused on various alternative designs for the Smith site. (Since this site is small and constrained, fitting a large new structure into it was no easy task.)

These three documents reveal that the planning process began early, moving deliberately in a disinterested and statesmanlike way and taking a broad view of the whole University community. About two years ago, however, there was a change. The pace sped up, and the planning process was taken over by a smaller circle of people who had a particular plan in mind and who had been empowered to focus on their particular needs. There was limited participation and no consultation with other departments or student groups. The work of the ad hoc committee was given minimal publicity, and its report was presented to the University community as a fait accompli.

The limitations of the planning process show in the result. The present plan grossly undervalues the historic and aesthetic costs of large new construction in the historic precinct, a point made emphatically in the Levy Report. Why? Because there was no one on the planning committee to speak for historic and environmental values. The present plan dismisses too easily alternative sites outside the historic precinct, which are far more in harmony with the basic precepts of the Levy Report. Why? Because there was no one in the planning group to speak for the community interest.

The present plan does not address issues of balancing interests—engineering, humanities and arts, science—issues that were fundamental to the Levy Report. There is no discussion of balance between the need for research laboratories and the equally urgent need for more classroom space in the humanities, arts, and social sciences.

The present plan for the "Institute for Advanced Science and Technology" is as limited and parochial as the Levy Report is broad-minded and sensitive to the community interest in aesthetics, environment, and equity.

I will not dwell here on the aesthetic and historic costs of a large new construction on the Smith site, except to say that the Levy report came out in the strongest possible way for the preservation of Smith Walk and Smith Hall, as the axis and cornerstone of the last remnant of Penn's historic 19th-century urban campus. (Levy Report, pp. 33-35, 60-62, 72-73.) Preserving Smith Hall was not optimal for the chemistry department, the Levy group acknowledged, but "from the standpoint of the Campus image and quality of environment, preserving the Smith Building is the correct choice." (p. 76). They were right!

Bear in mind the massive building that is proposed: a looming five-story structure, with virtually no setback from the sidewalk (only about 5 feet!) and extending halfway into Smith Walk. It would cut off this main pedestrian walkway and completely dominate what would remain of the historic precinct in the same way that Van Pelt Library dominates College Green. The architects tout these features as advantages, but their arguments seem more like rationalizations of a siting problem that could not be resolved. Smith Walk and the historic precinct would not survive, that is obvious.

The architects did struggle to accommodate the chemists' large demands to the limitations of the site. One of the rejected designs called for an even more massive six-story building, which would have had the virtue of not intruding on Smith Walk, but which would have been even more dominating of the precinct. The longer five-story building is somewhat less massive but at the cost of destroying Smith Walk.

The plain fact is that the Smith site is too small and too constrained for the large building that the chemists say they must have. The present plan is not a bold, forward-looking plan but a flawed compromise, designed to accommodate short-term interests of a few departments. A bolder, more long-term vision is needed.

continued past insert

Such a vision is provided by the Levy Report. It calls for future expansion of the campus northward and eastward: expansion of recreational facilities along the Schuylkill River, and development of the underutilized space on the north side of Walnut east of 33rd Street. The Levy group envisioned this area—now an open parking lot—as the Gateway to the Campus. It is the first sight of the campus that visitors see coming west on Walnut. It is a large and commodious site, with potential room for expansion.

What better site, from the point of view of campus planning, for the new Institute for Advanced Science and Technology? Here it would be not an intruder on a crowded and historic site but the center of a large new precinct for science and engineering.

Two sites in particular seem viable sites for the new Institute: the Tennis Courts on 33rd Street, and the open parking lot on Walnut Street east of 33rd Street adjacent to the Laboratory for Research on the Structure of Matter (LRSM)—the Campus Gateway in the Levy Plan. Both sites are far more congruent with the basic principles of the Levy Report than is the Smith site. New construction here, completely outside the historic precinct, would eliminate all conflict between the demands of preservation and development. The University could build for the future without sacrificing its past. The Gateway would be developed grandly as the Levy Report envisioned, and there would be ample room for future expansion in an underutilized area of the campus. Is this not a plan worthy of a great university? Why accept less?

Why indeed? Because, basically, a few departments insist on a facility adjacent to their present quarters.

Listen to the architect's reasons for rejecting the Tennis Court site ("Feasibility Study," p. 16): "This site is a major landscape focus and recreational and civic area for both the public and the University. It is a significant resource in the Campus Open Space Plan and should not be built on. It also has the liability of not being directly adjacent to the existing engineering and chemistry facilities."

True, construction would reduce open space, but so would the proposed intrusion on Smith Walk. True the tennis courts are an important recreational facility, but is there no alternative place for them, e.g. at Hill Field or along the River? The argument comes down to adjacency for the chemists.

Listen, too, to the reasons given for rejecting the Walnut Street site ("Feasibility Study," p. 16): "It is a workable site for a new science building—rather safe in that its large size and context, outside of the historic buildings district, would allow more freedom for a building design in terms of height, bulk and scale. This location is rejected, however, because it is needed for the construction of new campus chilled water facility and for expansion of the LRSM and Physics. The site is also rejected because it lacks proximity to the existing engineering and chemistry facilities."

A chilled water facility? Put a chilled water facility on this choice piece of real estate at the Gateway to the Campus?! Listen to what Levy Report had to say about potential of that site (p. 64): "It [the new laboratory] would be extremely prominent and could be an exceptional addition to the image of the University of Pennsylvania Campus." What would a chilled water facility at the gateway do for the University's image?

Is the present plan a bold, long-term vision? Or the result of a political process that has been dominated by those with specific short-term interests?

Sift out the wheat from chaff in the arguments against the Tennis Court and Walnut Street sites, and it always comes down to the issue of adjacency. The chemists want to keep the new "wet lab" under their wing, and University administrators and architects took their preference as axiomatic.

The Levy Report, it should be noted, also concluded that the two non-adjacent sites seemed unfeasible. That, however, was at a time when new construction was projected to be just an expansion of the chemistry department, not a new Institute that united chemistry and engineering technology. In 1983-84 replacement of the Cret building or an addition alongside Smith Hall seemed adequate for the chemists' immediate needs.

The present plan for an Institute of Advanced Science and Technology is far more than a mere expansion of chemistry—or should be. It is grander and more ambitious. It proposes to unite basic research with engineering and technological development. It looks forward to Pentagon and corporate grants and contracts, and has nothing to do with undergraduate teaching. It is no longer an extension of an academic department but a new kind of entity, with demands that reach beyond

immediate academic needs. In short, the Institute project has outgrown the space adjacent to the present chemistry laboratory.

The new Institute for Advanced Science and Technology deserves its own ample space. It belongs alongside the Laboratory of Research on the Structure of Matter, a highly productive operation that has, separate from the physics department, succeeded brilliantly in wedding basic research with advanced technology. Indeed, the concept of the new Institute was modeled on the LRSM. History reveals that a certain distance from traditional science departments has a liberating and stimulating effect on research on the borderline of science and engineering. Would the LRSM have done better under the control of physics? It seems unlikely. Will the new Institute be more likely to unite science and technology if attached closely to the chemistry department? Perhaps not.

It is true that neither the Tennis Court nor the Walnut Street sites are optimal for the immediate needs of the chemists. They would have to walk a block to undergraduate classrooms. A few professors of chemistry would have their research laboratories separate from their academic department. Some sacrifice of convenience would be entailed to reap the benefits of a larger and uncompromised site.

But it is hard to see that such sacrifices would be burdensome for many. Engineers would suffer little. Both sites are very close to present engineering buildings, just across the street. Is inconvenience for a few not a modest price to pay for a more intimate and productive connection between basic research and practical application?

It is clear that the University will expand to the east and north, as the Levy Report envisioned. The new student center at Walnut and 36th Streets is a step in this direction, and a new east-west axis will take shape just north of Walnut. The new Institute should be made a cornerstone of this future development, not squeezed opportunistically into an already crowded historic precinct.

From the point of view of campus planning, the Walnut Street site is the ideal place for the Institute for Advanced Science and Technology. Putting it at the Gateway to the campus would symbolize the University's commitment to excellence in science and to the unity of basic research and practice. And it would entail no loss of irreplaceable historic and aesthetic resources. A Gateway site would preserve the present mix of intellectual activities in the historic precinct and make possible expansion of desperately needed teaching facilities adjacent to College Green.

Looking ten or twenty years into the future, we can envision a grand precinct for science and engineering, stretching in an arc around the historic area, from Spruce Street along 33rd into the Gateway? We can see the Gateway, with the Laboratory for Research on the Structure of Matter and the new Institute—sister institutes—as the core of vital new center of intellectual life. The center of gravity of the University is moving eastward. Why not do it in a rational and planned way, by making the LRSM and the new Institute into the nucleus of a new campus center?

The chemists insist that the new Institute just has to be adjacent to their present building. In the long-term perspective of campus planning, however, their insistence on adjacency begins to seem like a narrow self-interest. In this larger perspective the present plan for the Smith site begins to seem like a short-term tactic in a turf war, in which two groups united to divide up a piece of contested space.

Is the new Institute to be something genuinely new, or is it just an excuse for existing departments to expand their present operations? If it is the latter, then we need to reconsider plans that would satisfy strictly departmental needs by infills and additions. If the Institute really is to live up to its promise, it should be the nucleus of a new center of the campus outside the historic precinct. University planners need to shun short-term compromises and go back to the basic principles of long-term campus planning that are embodied in the Levy Report.

The Friends of Smith Walk call upon the President and Provost to establish a representative body to review plans for the new Institute in the light of long-term campus development. How compelling are the urgent pleas for adjacency, really? How viable are the alternatives? How can the architectural and intellectual promise of the Gateway best be realized? What, for the historic precinct, is the optimal mix of research and teaching, science and humanities? These basic issues have not been adequately addressed and can only be decided in an open and democratic way, with all voices being heard, not just those of a few.

—Robert E. Kohler, Professor of History & Sociology of Science, for the Friends of Smith Walk

response next page

Response to Friends of Smith Walk

[See discussion beginning page 6]

Professor Kohler argues for a representative body to review the decision for the siting of the proposed IAST project claiming that the decision was made by the stakeholders only. It must be noted that the preferred scheme was considered for detailed evaluation only after considerable consultation with members of a committee formed to evaluate and inventory the historic resources of the University.

This committee was chaired by David Delong, Chairman of the Department of Historic Preservation and Professor of Architecture, with members David Brownlee, Associate Professor History of Art, Al Levy, Chairman of the Architecture Department and author of the 1984 "Campus Development Plan," Lee Copeland, Dean of the Graduate School of Fine Arts, George Thomas, historic architect of the Clio Group, a firm specializing in architectural history and preservation, myself, and staff members from the Division of Facilities Management, the Office of the General Counsel and the Office of the Provost.

The committee heard presentations on the program of the IAST by Barry Cooperman, Vice Provost for Research and reviewed alternative sites. The committee found unacceptable the original plan calling for the demolition of all three buildings along 34th Street. However, they found the argument for construction of a wet lab adjacent to the existing chemistry building compelling, for the same reasons detailed in the feasibility study [done by Venturi Scott Brown, on file in Van Pelt Reference]. After careful deliberation the preferred scheme was formulated, calling for the preservation of Morgan, Music, the reuse of Hayden Hall, and the demolition of Smith Hall. The committee also established guidelines

- a) for the design of the proposed construction on the Smith site, retaining the site line of the Furness Library along Smith Walk (letters from Al Levy and Lorrie Olin, landscape architects of College Green, follow),
- b) constraining the massing of new construction to preserve the scale of the precinct,
- c) for building setbacks, and
- d) for improved open space.

These findings were then reviewed and approved by the University's Design Reviewed Committee and the Trustees Committee of Facilities and Campus Planning.

—Art Gravina, Vice President for Facilities Management

Letter to Titus Hewryk from Professor Levy, 1/4/91

In response to our recent discussion, I have reviewed the design for the new science building along 34th Street south of Smith Walk and the earlier study done by the Center for Environmental Design and Planning of the Engineering and Science Precinct. The following are my observations on the issue.

The proposed science building creates a number of situations different from the earlier studies. The relationship of the new building to the axis of Smith Walk is one of the more important differences.

It is my understanding, based on an earlier presentation of the project to the Design Review Committee, that the new building definitely maintains the visual axis to the Furness Building although it reduces the visual corridor considerably. The movement path however shifts on an angle toward the north in line with the steps around the apse of the Furness Library. I see no problem with the proposed path. In fact, the current path is not on axis as it reaches 34th Street. So long as the visual axis is

maintained, the redirection of pedestrian movement to where the path actually continues west of 34th Street seems fine in my view.

If you need to discuss this further please call me.

Sincerely,
Alan

Letter to Titus Hewryk from Mr. Olin, 1/4/91

I am writing to share my thoughts regarding the Feasibility Study by Venturi, Scott-Brown for the Smith Building site (proposed Institute for Advanced Science and Technology) on 34th Street.

After a review of the proposal, I find it to be an excellent, thorough study that reaches several good conclusions which I support. The best solution of these discussed is the one indicated graphically on Page 34, which not only adheres to the principles put forth in the Landscape Architecture Master Plan of 1976-77, but in fact strengthens this particular subregion of the campus. Specifically, the use of a new, more attractive building on the Smith site to maintain and continue the street wall (and landscape idiom) on 34th Street while simultaneously reinforcing, enlarging and enhancing an inner quadrangle space within the block to the south toward Hayden Hall is exactly what the LAMP plan made a case for and urged. Secondly, the relationship between Smith Walk and Locust Walk as it comes south through Blanche Levy park and jogs around the apse of Furness has never been perfect, but has been an essential part of every plan since the 1930s, even to the extreme notion once put forward to demolish all or part of the Furness Library. The proposal suggested by VSB greatly helps to resolve this awkward jog by rebuilding the western portion of Smith Walk cranking it to lead more directly to the stairs between the GSFA and Furness, thereby moving the crosswalk into a more direct line for pedestrian traffic on this major north-south access route, making it a safer, less problematic crossing, a benefit for both town and gown. It should not pass unnoticed that this affords a design opportunity for a new and enhanced element, by a fresh set of designers to contribute to the landscape and pedestrian life of the campus. Therefore, as far as campus planning and landscape history are concerned, Penn and the city are improved and well served by the scheme.

Finally, on a personal and aesthetic note, let me say I applaud the scheme and possibility for this distinguished firm of architects and planners to do such a work. I labored long and loud during my tenure at Penn to preserve (and improve) Morgan Hall and the music building, defending them against the Engineering departments and desires to demolish them, while at the same teaching Design of the Environment classes in Smith Hall. Smith is one of the least distinguished, and most unpleasant buildings on a campus with serious competition in the realm of mediocre buildings. Morgan, Music, Hayden, Bennett and Paul Crey's little chemistry building at 33rd and Spruce, however, are delightful, intelligent works of architecture. Having recently had the pleasure of visiting Wu Hall at Princeton, and seeing the new National Gallery addition come out of wraps in London, I can assure you that whatever Bob Venturi and his colleagues conjure up, it will be infinitely better than Smith Hall and a worthwhile addition to the University campus.

I have gone on a bit, but to summarize: The plan is sound, it implements and extends goals and proposals of the Landscape Plan headed by Sir Peter Shephard and myself, it will improve safety, circulation and internal campus life; and it will replace a mediocre, out of date building with a better, more distinguished work of architecture.

I wish you and Venturi Scott Brown success in this endeavor.

Very truly,
Laurie D. Olin

Resolution on HIV/AIDS Education Proposed and passed at GSAC February 19, 1991

In academic year 1990-91, the budget for the University-wide AIDS Awareness Week has been substantially reduced by the Student Health Service. There is subsequent concern that this reduction will have a deleterious effect on the dissemination of information about HIV/AIDS.

At the same time, centralized programs are not the only way to reach graduate and professional students. School-based programs are often a good way to disseminate information to graduate students. Most of the schools or departments conduct orientations for their students. A component on HIV/AIDS education could be included in the school-based orientations.

Likewise, through co-sponsorship of an annual program on HIV/AIDS, the Graduate Student Associations Council (GSAC) could make certain that a program on HIV/AIDS is available for students in the Graduate Division of Arts and Sciences. This program would be open to others from outside of SAS, of course.

The Medical, Dental and Nursing Schools already provide limited

educational programs on HIV/AIDS for their students. These programs could be used to help guide the other schools to HIV/AIDS educational programs.

For these reasons be it resolved:

- 1) GSAC urges the Council of Graduate Deans to recommend that each school, which has not already done so, should assume responsibility for sponsoring an annual program on HIV/AIDS education. (This program might be included in the orientation program for incoming graduate and professional students, in those schools which conduct student orientations).
- 2) Each year GSAC shall offer co-sponsorship of an educational program on HIV/AIDS. The program shall be open to all students, and to interested others.
- 3) GSAC commends the efforts by the Medical School, the Dental School and the Nursing School to educate their students about HIV/AIDS.

OF RECORD

BC/BS-100 Deductible: \$200

Effective July 1, 1991, with the start of the new plan year for the health insurance plans, the deductible amount on the major medical portion of the Blue Cross/Blue Shield 100 Plan will change from a \$100 family aggregate to a \$200 family aggregate.

Given the current cost environment of employer medical plans, this is a prudent step. The deductible amount has not been adjusted for over two decades. This increase in the aggregate deductible will result in cost savings to the plan which will assist in slowing the rise in the Blue Cross/Blue Shield Plan 100 plan costs and premiums.

This change was reviewed through University process before being implemented.

—Human Resources/Benefits

InfoSessions on Retirement

The Benefits Office has invited each of the carriers for the University's Tax-Deferred Retirement Plans (TIAA-Cref, Vanguard and Calvert) to sponsor sessions on campus. These sessions will contain information about the retirement programs as well as about retirement planning.

Faculty and staff will soon receive mailings from each carrier regarding these sessions.

Both current participants and those considering enrolling will find these sessions informative since they will explain program fundamentals and cover recent changes regarding new funds, alternative payout options, and transferability.

These sessions will be held starting the latter part of March at the Faculty Club. Specific times for the sessions, as well as how to enroll, will be announced in the mailings from the carriers.

—Human Resources/Benefits

Biomedical Research Support Grants: April 1 Deadline

The Biomedical Research Support Grant is intended to strengthen, balance and stabilize existing Public Health Service-supported biomedical and behavioral research mechanisms. The funds are awarded to the University to complement and enhance the efficiency of biomedical and behavioral research, and to permit on-site judgment regarding emphasis, specific direction and content of activities supported. It will allow the institution to respond quickly and effectively to emerging opportunities and unexpected requirements that develop frequently in the course of research.

Grants from the program are intended to support primarily those biomedical and behavioral research activities not readily or normally supported by PHS categorical research grant programs.

Examples of the usage of BRSBG funds include:

- Pilot research
- Support of new investigators
- Unexpected research requirements and emergencies
- Continuation of research during temporary interruption of grant support
- Emerging research opportunities
- Setting up new laboratories
- Improvement of investigators' research skills
- Investigations in new fields and in fields new to the investigator
- Central shared research resources
- Compliance with animal welfare requirements
- Research opportunities for minorities and women

Certain expenditures are prohibited in this grant, including the following:

- Indirect costs
- Previously incurred cost overruns
- Training stipends
- Construction
- Support for grant projects disapproved by advisory councils
- Library support, aside from specialized publications
- Travel, unless directly related to research activities

Research salary support for tenured faculty is permitted only on a short-term basis and with justification. Ongoing PHS grants can be supplemented only for emergency needs.

Submitted with an original and seven copies, proposals should take the form of mini-grant applications, three to five pages long, and should be transmitted via the departmental chairperson.

The cover page of the proposal should contain the following information:

1. Name, Rank, Department, School
2. Title of proposal
3. Amount requested
4. Does the project involve the use of human subjects or animals?
5. 100 word abstract of need
6. 100 word abstract of significance of research
7. Amount of all current research support
8. Do you have an application pending that includes support of the same request made here?
9. List BRSBG support for past three years (years, amount and which BRSBG)
10. Have you made requests from other BRSBG committees this year? If so, was it from the Dental, Medical, or Veterinary BRSBG and was it for the same or a different proposal?

The second page should include the budget, listing and justifying the specific items requested, and if possible assigning a priority to each.

Please also include a one-page NIH biographical sketch, giving your education, professional appointments, honors, and five most recent publications. If you had a BRSBG award, please include a one-page summary of results.

The proposal itself should give a brief description of the research and a statement of the specific needs to be covered by the proposed grant.

As the funds available are limited, investigators with appropriate needs are encouraged to apply before April 1, 1990 in order to ensure proposal consideration. While there is no fixed size of the awards to be made, we expect that they will be in the \$3,000 to \$10,000 range.

Please contact Dr. Eliot Stellar (Ext. 8-5778) for substantive or procedural questions. Proposals should be submitted to the Office of the Vice Provost for Research, 106 College Hall/6381.

—Office of the Vice Provost for Research

DEATHS

Dr. Phillip Mechanick, professor emeritus of psychiatry, died February 28 at his home in Bala Cynwyd. He was 64 years old.

In 1946 Dr. Mechanick became the youngest Phi Beta Kappa graduate of UCLA at the age of 19. Four years later he finished medical school at the University of California at San Francisco Medical School at age 23.

He came to Philadelphia in 1953 as a resident in psychiatry at the U.S. Naval Hospital. In 1976 he joined the Penn community as director of education in the department of psychiatry. Before retiring in 1989 Dr. Mechanick served in many roles during his years at Penn—including acting vice provost for undergraduate studies and University life, director of psychotherapy in the department of psychiatry, and instructor of personal and career development at the Wharton School of Business Administration. He was also president of the Faculty Club, 1980-82.

In 1983, Dr. Mechanick received an honorary doctorate from the Semmelweis Medical University in Budapest—accepting in Hungarian. He also spoke French, German, Italian and Hebrew.

Dr. Mechanick is survived by his wife, Leah Mechanick; a son, Stephen Mechanick; two daughters, Judith M. Vetter and Andrea M. Braverman; and three grandchildren.

o

Evelyn M. Holmes, the longtime secretary in public relations (now University relations), died February 16 at the age of 83. From the late 'fifties until her retirement in 1976, Mrs. Holmes worked with Donald T. Sheehan, now University Secretary Emeritus.

Mrs. Holmes was active in the Hospital Volunteers at HUP, spending lunch hours helping patients with craft projects. Well into her retirement she continued to work as a volunteer at HUP's information desk.

In the course of gathering information on Mrs. Holmes's death, *Almanac* belatedly learned of the death last November 27 of her sister, **Lillian Mewha**, the former administrative assistant in City and Regional Planning at GSFA who joined Penn in 1960 and retired in 1975.

Surviving the two sisters are Mrs. Mewha's sons, M. Kent and Douglas.

o

Gael Mathews, a third-year doctoral student and assistant instructor in the Graduate School of Education, died February 26 at the age of 36.

Ms. Mathews was in the professional psychology program in GSE's psychology in education division, and was preparing to begin her dissertation on sexual harassment from the perspective of women who have been harassed. An alumna of the University of California at Santa Cruz, Ms. Mathews had also studied business at the University of Western Carolina before coming to Penn in 1987. She took her master's degree from the Graduate School of Education the following August.

A scholarship fund in Ms. Mathews's honor has been established to support doctoral students doing work on issues surrounding gender and race. Inquiries or donations should be directed to Maureen Cotterill, Ext. 8-4176, Room D6, GSE, 3700 Walnut/6216. Ms. Mathews is survived by her husband Bill Van Buskirk, her parents, and two sisters, Carole and Peggy.

Report of a Student Coalition's Retreat, Fall 1990

On November 3, 1990, 22 graduate and undergraduate student leaders met at the Penn Tower Hotel to:

- increase communication among leaders, particularly between undergraduates and graduate students
- increase understanding among organizations
- provide information to leaders
- provide an opportunity for student leaders to meet and discuss student concerns and issues
- create a collective agenda and develop a cooperative strategy for achieving it.

During the course of this retreat, four "brainstorming" sessions were held on areas those present felt were particularly important, and it was resolved to produce this document in order to follow up on the ideas discussed. The four larger issues were: Safety and Security, Space and Facilities, Administrative Support, and Diversity.

Safety and Security

Students were generally pleased with the quick response to the recommendations of STAAR and the Safety and Security Committee of University Council, and felt that these new measures would be quite helpful. There were a few additional suggestions concerning the escort services:

- To coordinate a central dispatching service so that when students call escort they can be provided with walking escort, riding escort, or directions to the nearest PennBus stop. In this way, the dispatcher can inform students as to the most appropriate service to use for the trip described, and increase the efficiency of the services.
- To have the green route start earlier, particularly in the winter months when it gets dark earlier.
- To make the boundary of escort vans just on the eastern side of the Schuylkill, so that students are dropped off or picked up in more populated and better lit areas.
- To keep up efforts to publicize the services throughout the year and emphasize the provision of timely and courteous service.

Another topic was PennWatch, and while many praised the efforts to include a wider range of students, a number felt it needs to include members of the community. It was pointed out that such a move would not only enhance the effectiveness of the service, and calm the fears of many community members, but would also be to the advantage of those who administer the program. The IFC and UA were encouraged to work together to do this.

Along similar lines, there should be greater encouragement by the Office of Off-Campus Living or other Student Life offices for students who live off campus to become involved in their communities. Students need to recognize that they are part of West Philadelphia, and do not live on the Penn campus, and therefore should participate in the communities and be sensitive to community issues. Students should know their neighborhood associations.

Many felt that a safety and security awareness/training program needed to be a mandatory program, like health insurance, for all incoming students.

We also call on the UPPD to recognize that the crime report and their statistics are an important public service, and not public relations. Efforts need to be made to report all crimes—as many crimes as possible—rather than trying to reduce the number reported using technicalities, such as that a particular case may have been handled by city police. These reports and statistics are currently undermined by the fact that some serious incidents that become well known on campus often do not appear in the reports. Standard report forms should be used so that all incidents can be recorded, rather than only those that go through the police.

Several students expressed concern about building security and called for a greater use of card readers across campus. Security guards also need to be adequately trained and paid in order to provide an acceptable level of service.

Finally, students were unanimous in calling for a van and/or a smaller vehicle to be made available through the office of student life for student groups in general to make use of for activities, conferences, etc., much

as the sports teams and certain academic schools and departments have. Current vehicles are not generally available to student groups.

Space and Facilities

Temporary or Reservable Space and Services

Houston Hall: Students felt that because there are no charges for the rooms in Houston Hall and Irvine, these rooms should be exclusively for the use of students. Outside groups, corporations doing interviews or presentations, academic departments and programs, should be referred to other facilities on campus. There was also a feeling that there should be some penalty for groups that reserve rooms and then do not use them, and there should be some sort of cap on the amount of time or space any one group can reserve. Groups need to be encouraged to cancel rooms and spaces they have decided not to use.

Facilities Services: Students feel that it is not appropriate for them to be charged the same rates as any facility users for maintenance and physical plant fees, since students are already paying large amounts of money in tuition and fees to use the facilities here at the University. Labor and other charges need to be at least partially subsidized by the Office of Student Life, or other appropriate University department, instead of charging individual student groups. The students would also like to meet with union officials to see if there are some ways students can work together with the staff that provides these important services.

Many students were concerned about the lack of recreational and athletic facilities, particularly for students not involved with major intercollegiate athletics.

Students expressed concerns over the progress and limitations of the new Campus Center, and how decisions regarding funding, prioritization and dedication of space, and construction timetables were being made.

Permanent Space and Facilities

Houston Hall, and particularly its performance spaces, must remain available to student groups even after the construction of the campus center, which all have acknowledged will not fulfill the needs outlined by the planning committee.

There must be greater access to computer lab space for graduate students, since currently the bulk of general computer labs is concentrated in residences. A distinction needs to be made between computer labs used mainly for classes, and those that are for general student use.

Buildings must be properly maintained, and current rules regarding facilities enforced. The University has declared that no advertising is allowed in classroom buildings, and yet this rule is not enforced, and many bulletin boards in classrooms and classroom buildings are covered with distracting advertisements.

Several new buildings have been constructed without bathroom security, including 3401 Walnut, or without blue light phones. These facilities should be a part of the design process from the start, and not added later due to complaints.

The current facilities planning process seems seriously flawed, particularly in the notion that buildings must somehow generate income to support themselves. This has led to the disastrous construction of 3401 Walnut and the Wharton Executive Center, both seriously wasteful uses of valuable parcels of center-campus land. As the main generators of income for the University, students feel that their money should be used to support classrooms and classroom buildings. Fine shopping and dining facilities are no comfort when the spaces where students learn are shabby and inadequate.

Students also feel that they must be an integral part of facilities planning, and that such planning must be done with a longer-range time frame. The current process seems very ad hoc, producing very poor, expensive, and non-functional designs, such as the renovations to the 1920 Commons. The primary users of these facilities should not merely be informed, but have a say in the planning and design process. There must be feedback and openness in the University planning process.

All students must be provided with complete and timely mail service in campus residences, and should not be deprived of mail as part of cost-cutting or work/study complications.

(continued next page)

Administrative Support

Student directories should be distributed to all graduate students, and to students who live off-campus. The directories should include academic majors and emphasize accuracy.

Undergraduate students who have declared majors should be included in the directories and considered as members of academic departments.

The students applauded the efforts being made to form a committee to examine student financial services. Students felt that there needs to be some way to ensure that students on aid receive money to start the school year while waiting for loans, stipends, or other paper work to clear.

There was also a suggestion that there be a fund for special project support or research that students take on, perhaps in being able to travel to archives or conferences. These would be strictly academic in nature.

As graduates and undergraduates work together to create a system for communication and evaluation of T.A.s, students also feel there should be a way to complain about poor professors who may not give fair assignments or assessments, have unclear expectations, or do not honor office hours.

All University committees, task forces, commissions and other information-gathering or policy-recommending groups must have adequate student representation. The general composition formula of most University Council committees should be followed in all cases. We are particularly concerned by the lack of students on the provost's committee on international education, which has supplanted a similar University Council committee, the removal of the GSAC president from the graduate council of deans, and the inadequate representation of graduate students on the Locust Walk committee.

To build up and demonstrate a commitment to teaching on campus, we look for support of Teaching Assistants, both in their stipends and their training, and for their importance to undergraduate learning to be stressed. Overall, teaching at Penn should be tied into the research program, and not seen as a lesser sideline. Undergraduates must be included as partners in this project.

Diversity

In faculty and staff recruitment, work to be sure that there is minority presence throughout the campus and all academic programs. In many cases this involves fostering and cultivating future faculty.

Minority presence and voices cannot just be "added," but the majority must also change and welcome them. Include international students and graduate students more closely in the life of the institution.

The admissions office must pay attention to diversity issues by social class, and spread recruitment efforts beyond private and elite schools. Issues of retention should not be based on socioeconomic class. Those with class privileges must be made to realize them and accommodate those from less privileged backgrounds.

We urge the faculty to make a commitment to a "perspectives" requirement for all students, and to ensure that all voices are included in introductory and other current curricular offerings. The image of nontraditional programs must be changed so that they are accepted as serious, academic courses by all.

The required diversity education must move beyond comparing 'differences' and emphasizing community in a half-day to a more serious examination of divisions and their consequences in our society.

Submitted by the Student Coalition Retreat, Fall 1990

Eric Werwa, Kite and Key

You-Lee Kim, Undergraduate Assembly

Maureen Hernandez, Panhellenic Council

Colleen McCauley, Penn Volunteer Network

Emily Nichols, Connaissance

Libera Melchionna, School of Social Work

John Shu, United Minorities Council

Varsha Rao, Social Planning and Events Committee

Stacey Wroble, Social Planning and Events Committee

Jim Rettew, Inter-Fraternity Council

Sharon Kershbaum, Women's Alliance

Gretchen Hackett, GSAC Vice President for Academics

Eric Borguet, Graduate Inter-school Activities Council

Helen Jung, Daily Pennsylvanian

Lynn Westwater, Daily Pennsylvanian

Celeste Yeager, PEARL/Penn Women's Center

Michael Polgar, GSAC

Joe Nasr, Graduate School of Fine Arts

Erick Santos, Graduate Students Engineering Group

Sue Moss, Student Activities Council

A.T. Miller, GAPSA

Roz Evans, Women's Leadership Network, SPEC

Keyword/Boolean Searches Through Dial-In Connections

Keyword/Boolean searching is now available through dial-in connections from PCs and non-Library terminals. Through keyword searching, one can locate items among the 1.5 million records in Franklin by using a word or words which belong to title, author subject, and many more. Boolean searching allows searchers to combine elements, for example, two or more subjects, books from a certain publisher on a specific subject, or to locate conference proceedings with only the sketchiest information.

Until now, Franklin has been an online mirror of the card catalogs, allowing searchers to find items by keying in the beginning of a title, the beginning of a correct subject heading, or the beginning of an author's last name. Keyword/Boolean opens new avenues of access: searchers are no longer bound by the order of the title, author, or by subject classifications. Furthermore, since virtually all parts of a book's record are indexed it is now possible to search by publisher, content notes, language, date, etc.

Keyword/Boolean searching is currently available on Franklin terminals in all libraries. Franklin is part of PennLIN, the Penn Library Information Network.

PMS Study

Women, age 18 to 45, are needed by the Premenstrual Syndrome Program at HUP for a research study of a new antidepressant as a treatment for depression in PMS. Free treatment for two months and a stipend of \$100 at the completion of the two months are offered to eligible women. Further information is available at the PMS Program, 662-3329.

PENNPLUS March Events

PENNPLUS provides University staff and faculty with discount programs as well as recreational and cultural activities. At right are their offerings for March. Office hours are 9 a.m.-4 p.m., Monday-Friday. PENNPLUS accepts cash or checks/money orders made out to "Trustees of the U. of PA." Tickets cannot be held unless full payment has been received, and all ticket sales are handled on a first come, first served basis. Call Ext. 8-7517 to ensure that preferred tickets are still available. Penn I.D. is required.

1991 Philadelphia Flower Show

"Endless Spring... New Days Dawning 'Round the World," Philadelphia Civic Center, Sunday, March 10-Sunday, March 17, Sundays, 10 a.m.-6 p.m., Monday through Saturday, 10 a.m. to 9:30 p.m. This year's Philadelphia Flower Show will highlight Kenya, Holland, and Italy as these countries team up with the U.S. to create a 6,600-square-foot display of cut flowers, the largest central feature exhibit ever created for the Philadelphia Flower Show. \$10 (regular price \$10.50)

Ice Capades

The Spectrum, lower level, Sunday, March 10, 6 p.m. Champion skaters perform in productions that include children's characters. \$13.50 (regular price \$14.50)

Ballet Du Nord

ZellerbachTheater, Annenberg Center, Wednesday, March 27, 7:30 p.m., Thursday, March 28-Friday, March 29, 8 p.m., Saturday, March 30, 2 p.m. and 8 p.m. This French ballet company will perform "Marie Antoinette." \$19 orchestra, \$17 balcony (regular price \$24 orchestra, \$22 balcony)

Philadelphia 76ers vs. Cleveland Cavaliers

The Spectrum, 2nd level seats, Sunday, March 31, 12:30 p.m. \$10 (regular price \$12)

Update

MARCH AT PENN

FILMS

19 *Once Upon a Time in the West*; directed by Sergio Leone, 1968; 6:45 p.m., Logan Hall 17 (Italian Film Festival).

SPECIAL EVENTS

9 *Early Spring Flowers*; guided tours of the Morris Arboretum, Saturdays and Sundays in March at 2 p.m. from the Widener Education Center. \$3 adults, \$1.50 children and senior citizens, members and children under 6 free.

Information/directions: 247-5882.

17 *Third Annual Celtic/Appalachian Celebration*; a tribute to Celtic influences in American music culture. Daytime programs start at noon and continue throughout the afternoon; the evening concert 7:30 p.m. Tickets for the concert only are \$14, \$12 for students and senior citizens and \$10 for International House members; daytime program tickets are \$5; combination tickets are \$17. Tickets are available at Ticketmaster outlets at 336-2000 or the Folklife Center, 895-6537. For more information contact Gail Bower, 922-0427 (International House).

TALKS

6 *The Jewish Disease. Tuberculosis and Immigration at the Turn of the Century: Newcomers' Perspectives*; Alan Kraut, The Ameri-

can University; noon-1 p.m., Room 103 McNeil Building (Department of Sociology).

HIV Cytotoxicity and Cell Entry; Ivan Hirsch, Unite de Recherches Inserm Retrovirus and Maladies Associees, Marseille, France; noon, Wistar Auditorium (The Wistar Institute and Clonetech Labs).

A Molecular Approach to Neurotransmitter Release; Gilbert J. Chin, Institute of Child Health and Human Development, NIH; 1 p.m., Department of Physiology Library, Richards Building (Department of Physiology).

Reflections on the Haggadah in History; David Stern, Jewish studies program and *Who Knows One? Exploring the Musical Traditions of the Haggadah*; Marsha Bryan Edelman, Gratz College; 3-5 p.m., Van Pelt Library, Gates Room (Association of Jewish Libraries).

African Ark: The Peoples and Ancient Cultures of Ethiopia and the Horn of Africa; Carol Beckwith, author, illustrator and photographer; 4-6 p.m., Rainey Auditorium, University Museum (Afro-American Studies Program).

7 *Modulation of Ionic Currents at Membranes of Isolated Myometrial Cells by Steroids*; Sol Erulkar, physiology; 4 p.m., Department of Physiology Library, Richards Building (Department of Physiology).

11 *Effects of Market Factors and Competition on the Adoption of MRI Units by Hospitals*; Jill Teplensky, senior fellow, Leonard Davis Institute of Health Economics; noon-1 p.m., Second Floor Conference Room, Ralston-Penn Center (General Internal Medicine).

13 *Talking to Kids about the War*; Karen Pollack, coordinator, Child Care Resource Network; noon-1 p.m., Smith-Penniman Room, Houston Hall (Child Care Resource Network).

18 *Faustian Antibodies: Antibodies That Modify The Flow of Molecular Transitions in HIV and β -Galactosidase*; Franco Celada, department of immunology, University of Genoa, Italy and Hospital for Joint Disease, New York University School of Medicine; 4 p.m., Wistar Auditorium, Wistar Institute (Wistar Institute).

19 *Protocol for the Study of Outcomes of Gallbladder Disease*; J. Sanford Schwartz, M.D., executive director, LDI; noon-1 p.m., Second Floor Conference Room, Ralston-Penn Center (Section of General Internal Medicine).

What Your Babysitter Should Know; Heidi Liebman, health educator, Wellness Center, Frankford Hospital; noon-1 p.m., Room C-2, Caster Building, School of Social Work (Child Care Resource Network).

Recognition of HIV Env Glycoprotein: Role of Antigen Presenting Cells; Fabrizio Manca, department of immunology, University of Genoa, San Martino Hospital, Italy; 4 p.m., Wistar Auditorium, Wistar Institute (Wistar Institute).

Deadline: March 12 is the deadline for the *April at Penn* pullout calendar.

The University of Pennsylvania Police Department

This report contains tallies of part 1 crimes, a listing of part 1 crimes against persons, and summaries of part 1 crime in the five busiest sectors on campus where two or more incidents were reported between **February 25, 1991 and March 3, 1991**.

Totals: Crimes Against Persons-1, Thefts-19, Burglaries-1, Thefts of Auto-1, Attempted Thefts of Auto-0

Date	Time	Location	Incident
Crimes Against Persons:			
03/02/91	7:38 AM	200 block 36th	Female sexually assaulted by male/injuries
34th to 36th; Spruce to Locust			
02/25/91	8:48 AM	College Hall	University-owned picture taken from wall
02/28/91	10:20 PM	Houston Hall	Bike taken
02/28/91	11:43 PM	Houston Hall	Unattended backpack taken
03/02/91	7:38 AM	200 block 36th	See entry under crimes against person
03/02/91	3:12 PM	Furness Building	Unattended purse taken
03/02/91	9:54 AM	Williams Hall	Camera taken from case
37th to 38th; Locust to Walnut			
02/25/91	6:38 PM	Bookstore	Knapsack & contents taken
02/28/91	2:06 AM	Stiteler Hall	Secured bike taken from pole
03/01/91	4:25 PM	Bookstore	4 rings taken from ring display
34th to 36th; Locust to Walnut			
02/27/91	9:58 AM	Van Pelt Library	Purse & contents taken
03/02/91	5:53 PM	Van Pelt Library	Cash taken from wallet
03/03/91	7:36 PM	Meyerson Hall	Unattended coat taken from room
36th to 37th; Locust to Walnut			
02/25/91	11:29 AM	Annenberg Center	Purse taken from unattended office desk
02/28/91	10:54 AM	Christian Association	Attempted burglary/window broken
33rd to 34th; Spruce to Walnut			
02/25/91	1:34 PM	Hayden Hall	Rain downspouts taken from building exterior
02/25/91	6:54 PM	Moore School	Snack machine broken

Safety Tip: Recognizing con games: *The pigeon drop*: Two con artists approach you excitedly and say they have found a huge sum of money. After much animated discussion the flim-flammers offer to share the loot with you if you show "good faith" by putting in some money of your own in cash. Once you've put up your cash they are gone.

18th District Crimes Against Persons

Schuylkill River to 49th Street, Market Street to Woodland Ave.
12:01 AM February 18, 1991 to 11:59 PM February 24, 1991.

Totals: Incidents-7, Arrests-0

Date	Time	Location	Offense/Weapon	Arrest
2/18/91	9:22 PM	4202 Baltimore	Robbery/gun	No
2/19/91	10:20 PM	4300 Chester	Robbery/gun	No
2/20/91	4:21 PM	4800 Chester	Robbery/strong-arm	No
2/21/91	4:33 PM	4000 Market	Robbery/strong-arm	No
2/21/91	2:44 PM	4625 Woodland	Aggravated assault/unknown	No
2/22/91	7:26 PM	4600 Chestnut	Robbery/strong-arm	No
2/24/91	7:15 AM	3900 Walnut	Robbery/strong-arm	No

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 Sely, Amy Sykes, Lynn L. 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.