

Almanac

Tuesday, November 17, 1992

Published by the University of Pennsylvania

Volume 39 Number 12

INSIDE

- Senate Chair: Chronology of a Plagiarism Case, pp. 2-3
- Penn's Way: Why Do We Do It?, p. 3
- Council: Motions on Non-Identification, p. 4
- Center for Community Partnerships, pp. 4-6
- Speaking Out: Technology/Crime, pp. 6-7
- CrimeStats, pp. 7-8
- Update, p. 8

Trustee Professor: Peter Felsburg, Vet Medicine

Dr. Peter J. Felsburg, an alumnus who was on the faculty here until 1988—and remained an adjunct member while teaching at Illinois and then at Purdue—has rejoined Penn as the Trustee Professor of Clinical Immunology and chairman of the Department of Clinical Studies at the Veterinary School.

A 1965 graduate of Penn State, Dr. Felsburg earned two advanced degrees at Penn—the V.M.D. in 1969 and the Ph.D. in microbiology in 1973. During his first stint at the University he held several teaching and clinical posts—among them assistant professor of epidemiology, assistant professor of laboratory medicine, and chief of the section of laboratory medicine at the Vet School. He was also chairman of the Small Animal Hospital Board in the vet school and a member of the graduate group in comparative medicine. In 1983 he left to become associate professor of immunology in the vet school of the University of Illinois at Urbana, and in 1989 he moved to Purdue University as professor of immunology in veterinary pathobiology. He was also a member of the Purdue Cancer Center and its Center for AIDS Research.

Author of over a hundred papers, articles, abstracts and book chapters, Dr. Felsburg serves on the World Health Organization (WHO) Expert Committee on Primary Immunodeficiency Diseases and is a member of the Veterinary Immunology Committee of the American Society of Immunologists.

His current research, funded primarily by NIH and the American Heart Association, includes studies of immunodeficiency, genetic disease, and canine necrotizing vasculitis.



Almanac Photo by Leda Sawchak

Returned from the Midwest: Dr. Felsburg



From the Community: Mr. Bryan

Director of Community Relations: Glenn Bryan

A West Philadelphian who is an alumnus of Penn is the University's new Director of Community Relations, President Sheldon Hackney announced Wednesday at Council.

He is Glenn Douglas Bryan, currently assistant director of the Philadelphia Corporation for Aging. Mr. Bryan will take office in December in the post that is now part of the Center for Community Partnerships headed by Dr. Ira Harkavy. "Mr. Bryan has the strong support of community leaders and members of the University community, with whom he has worked in community affairs as both a student and alumnus," President Hackney said. While holding several professional posts in community service agencies, Mr. Bryan has also been active as a volunteer consultant for numerous local organizations.

After taking his B.A. in social psychology at Penn in 1974 and his M.S.W. here in 1976, Mr. Bryan served as director of psychiatric social work at Hahnemann for two years, with responsibility for liaison between the mental health center and the community as well as coordination of clinical services and staff development. In 1978 he joined the Corporation of Veritas, an innovative nonprofit agency conducting research, treatment, rehabilitation and job and housing development in West Philadelphia for those recovering from alcoholism and substance abuse. After two years as program director he was made executive director of Veritas. From 1980-82 Mr. Bryan was chief social worker for the West Philadelphia Consortium.

He joined the Philadelphia Corporation for Aging as supervisor of its Community Care Option Program in 1984, and in 1987 he became assistant director, with responsibility for a network of services and community involvement in the in-home care program. At Penn, Mr. Bryan succeeds Steve Carey, who had been acting director of community relations since Cheryl Hopkins left office last year. "As director, he will undertake to create an ongoing dialogue between the University and the community," Dr. Hackney said at Council. "He will also be responsible for strengthening the coordination of our many, many projects in the community and improving communication and collaboration among them." (For an overview of the Center for Community Partnerships, see pages 4-6. An invitation to contribute to a directory of service activities appears on page 5.)

Council: Action on Undergraduate Admissions Committee Charge . . . Decibel Levels

At its meeting November 11, the University Council approved a bylaws change which revises the name and charge of the Council committee formerly known as Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid and formerly authorized to make policy recommendations. Now called the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid, the committee can consider matters involving graduate/professional (as well as undergraduate) recruitment, admissions and financial aid, but its charge now emphasizes a role of study and information-sharing rather than policy recommendation on such matters. (Full text showing changes appeared in *Almanac* October 13.)

Two proposed changes in the Guidelines on Open Expression were debated, and action was taken on one. Council passed the motion to define "reasonable" sound levels by specifying a norm of 85 decibels measured 10 feet from the speaker (see *Almanac* September 15).

But after intense debate Council voted to return to committee two opposing resolutions on what to do if demonstrators refuse to identify themselves. The opposing motions were presented in a report (published on page 4 of this issue) by a subcommittee of Steering, consisting of Dr. David Hildebrand of Senate; Dr. Robert E. Davies of Open Expression; David Rose of

the UUA and Allen Orsi of the GAPSA. Present guidelines allow for Open Expression monitors, but not University police, to photograph persons at the scene who are cited but refuse to identify themselves. Last year a proposal was made that campus police be allowed to shoot photographs, but not keep them. A substitute motion is that no photographs be allowed, and violators who refuse self-identification be subject to arrest.

The chief information item at Wednesday's meeting was a report on the new Center for Community Partnership, presented by its director, Dr. Ira Harkavy. A summary of the Center's role and activities begins on page 4 of this issue.

Chronology of a Plagiarism Case

This is a report to the Penn community about the process of judging an allegation of plagiarism by a faculty member. The judgment has been made; I do not intend to second-guess the difficult decisions made by the actors. Instead, I hope that this document will lead to reflective consideration of how Penn deals with such serious problems.

In 1987, an allegation of plagiarism was made against Professor Robert Whitlock of the School of Veterinary Medicine. In 1992, the Board of Trustees demoted Professor Whitlock from a chaired professorship to an associate professorship. What happened? Why did the process take so long? Does the history of this case yield compelling evidence that we lack an adequate process for dealing with assertions of faculty misdeeds? I offer my sense of the history of the case for the assessment of the community.

This report is based on documents made available to the Faculty Senate, in particular on the January 22, 1992, report of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility of the School of Veterinary Medicine (VCAFR) to the Board of Trustees, which contains the report of a Group for Complaint of that school dated November 12, 1990, and the VCAFR report on the case dated November 27, 1991. In addition, I have used previously published comments and reports published in *Almanac*. Except where indicated, the documents are confidential, as is necessary by rules previously adopted. I have asked most of the people involved in the case to comment on my report, but they have not endorsed it. Should more direct participants in the process differ with my statements of fact or with my opinions, I urge them to state their views in *Almanac*.

Readers need to be aware that the *Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators*, a compilation of the basic procedure of the University, contains a procedure for dealing with allegations of faculty impropriety. In particular, the "just cause" procedure states how the faculty should decide whether a faculty member should be suspended or terminated. The guiding principle has been this: The faculty of each school should judge the qualifications for its own membership, subject to procedural rules. The University-wide Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (SCAFR) has oversight of all academic freedom and responsibility issues, including procedural disputes, but the fundamental decisions of fact and culpability, according to the *Handbook*, belong to the school CAFR.

My understanding of the sequence of events follows.

July, 1985: Whitlock agrees to address the 14th World Congress on Diseases of Cattle, to be held in Ireland in 1986.

March, 1986: Dr. Allan Roussel, then of Virginia Tech and shortly to be Assistant Professor at Texas A&M, calls Whitlock to ask for review of a manuscript and offer co-authorship. Roussel and Whitlock agree by mail. Roussel sends Whitlock a draft copy.

June, 1986: Whitlock presents a plenary address to the World Congress and submits a manuscript for publication, under his name alone, in the proceedings of that congress. He also agrees to reprint this manuscript in the February, 1987, issue of the Irish Veterinary Journal (IVJ). These publications are to become the subject of the plagiarism allegation.

September, 1986: Whitlock, lacking time and opportunity for revision, asks the editor of the IVJ to republish the congress address as submitted, again under his name alone.

October, 1986: Whitlock participates in a continuing education program at Texas A&M with Roussel. Whitlock does not mention the planned publications.

Early 1987: Roussel informs Whitlock of his intention to publish his article by himself.

November, 1987: Roussel writes to Whitlock, informing him that he has discovered the congress proceedings and IVJ papers. Roussel's department chairman notifies the former dean of the Veterinary School of the matter.

[Note that this is the first time that any official notification of a problem has been made.]

February, 1988: Dean Andrews, the then-new Dean of the Veterinary School, after investigation and consultation, lodges a com-

plaint with VCAFR. This action is one possible initiation of an action against a faculty member, as described in the Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators.

Spring, 1988: VCAFR considers the dean's complaint. At this time, VCAFR was also considering a second, unrelated case. VCAFR attempts to secure outside counsel for assistance in procedure, but is unable to do so. VCAFR consults with the office of the University Counsel on procedure for both cases.

VCAFR forms a subcommittee to investigate the factual basis of the complaint against Whitlock.

[With hindsight, I am convinced that the delays in procedure began here. Later, SCAFR would find that the approach used by VCAFR was not in conformance with Handbook stipulations, and the process would bog down. It is certainly possible that VCAFR would have come to the same conclusion even had it followed Handbook procedure to everyone's satisfaction. There are provisions for appeal in the Handbook, and such appeals might also have led to protracted consideration. However, as the case played out, the VCAFR procedure led to substantial delay.]

May, 1988: Dean Andrews agrees to impose sanctions on Whitlock, and requests that VCAFR cease its investigation. VCAFR agrees.

[The Handbook requires a report to the complainant. Later, SCAFR found that VCAFR should have reported to the faculty. There is no evidence that the school faculty had an opportunity at this time to reach its own conclusions.]

Fall, 1988: A series of letters are exchanged among those concerned with the contested manuscript, attempting to establish proper authorship. During this time, there is no record of any official actions at Penn.

January, 1989: Full professors at the New Bolton Center branch of the Veterinary School write to SCAFR requesting its opinion on the validity of the procedure used in hearing the dean's complaint.

April, 1989: SCAFR finds that the procedure used was invalid. According to *Almanac* April 17, 1990, SCAFR found that VCAFR erred by "improperly using a Subcommittee to consider facts in the matter, and by a factual inquiry at a stage where factual information is explicitly prohibited by the just cause procedure, which, instead, require the CAFR, as a whole, to make a finding as to whether the offenses as stated, if true, amount to a just cause for dismissal or suspension." Additionally, SCAFR found that VCAFR erred "by reporting with a recommendation to the dean to withdraw the charges and failed to report, instead, to the faculty, as such Committees are required to do." SCAFR concludes that the process was fatally flawed and that no prosecution has occurred.

[At this point, a year and a half has elapsed since the original letter asserting plagiarism was received. Assuming that SCAFR's finding is correct, the matter is back at the beginning. There is a problem as to who can initiate any further proceedings, and how; the dean, having requested that VCAFR cease its investigation, presumably cannot reinstate proceedings.]

Fall, 1989: The record indicates no official actions taken.

March, 1990: A special meeting of the faculty of the Veterinary School is held. Members of VCAFR absent themselves. The matter is considered by the faculty, who vote to form a Group for Complaint, one vehicle for initiating a complaint against a faculty member, as specified in the Handbook.

[This action began the procedure that finally led to resolution of the case. Two years have elapsed since the dean's original complaint.]

November, 1990: The Group for Complaint reports to VCAFR, asserting that Whitlock's actions constitute plagiarism.

May, 1991: Letter from Whitlock received by SCAFR, asserting that the new inquiry constitutes double jeopardy, that a new inquiry would require a formal action appealing the dean's decision, and that the presentation of evidence at the Veterinary School faculty meeting was prejudicial.

June, 1991: SCAFR rejects Whitlock's assertions.

SENATE

From the Chair

June, 1991: Trustees amend the “just cause” procedure, including new mention of the possibility of lesser sanctions than suspension or termination.

December, 1991: VCAFR reports to the Group for Complaint and to Dr. Whitlock, recommending the sanctions that were eventually adopted.

January, 1992: Whitlock (through his counsel) and the Group for Complaint exchange letters indicating that each party will not appeal the findings and sanctions.

January, 1992: The Penn chapter of the AAUP writes to the provost, asserting that reduction in rank is not a permissible sanction. The provost responds, noting that he has no decision-making power in the process other than forwarding the case to the trustees.

Spring, 1992: SCAFR considers the admissibility of the rank reduction sanction. It finds that the trustees may not impose more severe sanctions, but may, according to Handbook procedure, remand the case to VCAFR for specific recommendations regarding possible suspension.

March, 1992: VCAFR and the Group for Complaint report in general terms to the faculty of the Veterinary School, outlining the current status of the case.

May, 1992: The trustees accept the report of VCAFR. The recommended sanctions are imposed.

[Note that the procedure from the forming of the Group for Complaint until final trustee action required slightly more than two years.]

This concludes my reading of the chronology of the case. What follows is my own opinion.

First, much of the lost time was caused by failure to heed established procedure, rather than by the process itself. Slightly more than two years elapsed from the formation of the Group for Complaint until the final resolution of the matter. Two years is, to be sure, a long time for a case to last. When one considers the career-threatening gravity of the charges, the dif-

ficulties and ambiguities of some assertions of plagiarism, and the need for scrupulous fairness, two years does not seem outrageous.

Second, the Handbook’s statement of the just cause procedure is quite remarkably difficult to comprehend. You might want to imagine that you were the chair of a school committee on academic freedom and responsibility, charged with handling a charge against a professor; try reading the Handbook once and then describing what you should do. Charges against faculty are, fortunately, rare; it is rather unlikely that members of a school CAFR will have personal experience applying the procedure. These members will need the clearest, least ambiguous definitions of procedure possible. If the task force currently examining the just cause procedure were to do nothing more than rewrite the current procedure lucidly, they would still perform a valuable service.

Third, let’s not be too hasty. One unsatisfactory case, by itself, does not justify junking a procedure. There have been other cases, less publicized, over the years that have been handled better. The procedure needs to be examined; it may or may not need major overhaul.

Should we decide that substantial change is needed, we may wish to examine the premise that the faculty of a particular school should be the sole judge of its members. It may be that the difficulties of judging a close professional acquaintance are so substantial and so inherent, or that the need for common standards across the University is so compelling, that wisdom dictates turning the task over to someone else. That “someone else” need not necessarily be an administrator. It might be, for example, that an all-University faculty body, or a group of scholars from other institutions, could offer less biased judgment.

These are important issues for the integrity of this and other universities. We need good ideas.



Penn’s Way: Why Do We Do It?

As we are entering our second full week of the Penn’s Way Campaign, we must keep in mind the goal upon which we should all be focused, namely, helping others. Our slogan, “Penn’s Energy at Work for Others,” is more than just a clever use of the Ben Franklin kite-flying metaphor—it is a true commitment on our part to help those less fortunate neighbors in our region.

Despite our day-to-day problems and concerns which, admittedly, can be overwhelming at times, we are all blessed to have jobs, good benefits and a steady paycheck. In most of our cases we are facing a rosy future filled with hope and opportunity, yet we don’t have to look very far to see that our bright horizons are not shared by all. Many individuals have given up dreaming, they have given up hope for a future. To them, the challenge is to survive until the next day. The disabled, the disenfranchised, the children, the elderly, the oppressed, the battered and countless other categories are all deserving of our help in order that they, too, can look forward to a better tomorrow, let alone get through today.

Please take a few minutes to, once again, look through your Penn’s Way book in order to reacquaint yourselves with the breadth of assistance our partners provide to the area. Look also at the pictures to remind yourself that these are *real people in real need*. Your Penn’s Way coordinators and facilitators stand ready to assist you. Please feel free to contact them should you have any questions, require additional materials or need any other assistance. Our slide show is now available for unit presentations and our partner speakers bureau, encompassing most of the agencies, has been established to assist your unit in learning more about any particular agency.

Remember our achievement in this campaign is directly related to your commitment and enthusiasm. With your help and assistance we can once again make Penn’s Way a resounding success by demonstrating to our fellow citizens how much we care!

— John Kehoe, Member of the Penn’s Way Operating Committee

Seventh Annual Memorial Service For Meera, Cyril and Tyrone

A memorial service will be held in honor of Penn students Meera Ananthakrishnan, Cyril Leung, and Tyrone Anthony Robertson, who were victims of violent deaths in recent years. The service will be held on November 19 from 4 to 7 p.m. in the Bowl Room in Houston Hall.

Ms. Ananthakrishnan was a 24-year old graduate student in physics who came to Penn in 1985 from India. During that year’s Thanksgiving break she was killed by an intruder in her dorm room.

Mr. Leung, a graduate student in economics from Hong Kong, died following an assault in Clark Park on October 7, 1988. He was 25.

Mr. Robertson, a freshman in engineering, was shot and killed December 30, 1990, as a bystander in an incident in a fast-food restaurant in Chester, Pa.

After the service there will be an open community forum to address the issues of violence against women, violence against Asians and Asian Americans, violence against African Americans, the needs of international students, and safety and security on and around campus. A reception with Chinese and Indian food will follow the forum. All members of the University are invited.

Following is the text of the Steering Committee report debated at Council November 11 (see page 1) and returned to committee for reconsideration.

Open Expression: Motions on Refusing Self-Identification

At the last 1991-92 meeting of University Council, on May 6, the Committee on Open Expression mentioned a possible modification of the identification procedure. As you recall, there was controversy, and Steering was asked to formulate the question clearly for Council.

The scenario:

A person (or persons) may be told by an Open Expression monitor that a certain action violates the Guidelines (in the judgment of the monitor in consultation with available members of the Committee on Open Expression). The following sequence can occur:

1. The monitor tells the person to cease the action.
2. The person refuses.
3. The person is told that the refusal is itself a violation of the Guidelines.
4. The person is requested to show University identification.
5. The person refuses.

The problem:

The scenario has triggered the need for a future judicial procedure under the guidelines. In that procedure, it is necessary to identify that the person charged was indeed the person performing the action and refusing self-identification.

This is not a purely hypothetical problem. Several years ago, a number of people stormed a closed hearing. They were not all identified; lacking identification of all, the JIO refused to prosecute any. This refusal led to the current procedure, as approved by Council.

The current procedure as accepted by Council in 1991:

6. The person is warned that (s)he will be photographed if (s)he does not show identification.
7. The person still refuses.
8. The person is photographed, by someone other than a University police officer.
9. The photographs are immediately turned over to the VPUL or delegate.
10. Once definite identification has been made, the photographs are destroyed.

Note: The current procedure is very explicit in requiring the destruction of the photos.

The proposal:

Remove the restriction on who takes the picture. Some of the monitors fear physical violence at this stage, because the situation will be tense. Additionally, many of the monitors have University positions that require them to be student advocates. Requiring them to perform the physical act of taking the picture places them in a physically and symbolically confrontational position.

Options:

Steering was able to identify two distinct approaches to the issue. They are presented below as motions. The original proposal, with modification, is presented as the main motion; an alternative proposal is presented as a substitute motion.

Main motion:

University Council urges that the enforcement portion of the Guidelines on Open Expression be modified as follows:

1. In the event that any persons are deemed by an Open Expression monitor, in consultation with available members of the Committee on Open Expression, to have violated the Guidelines, and such persons refuse to show University or other identification, the monitor shall inquire of other individuals present as to the identity of the claimed violators. Identification by two other individuals shall suffice to establish identity.
2. Should it not be possible to establish identity in this way, a monitor should again warn anyone deemed in violation of the Guidelines that, unless identification is presented, the individual(s) may be photographed.
3. If identification is still not made, a monitor may direct that photographs be taken of participants in the claimed violation. Any individual present other than the monitor may take the photographs; as soon as safely practicable, all photographs shall be turned over to the monitor.
4. Any photographs taken shall be used solely for the purpose of identification of claimed violators of the Guidelines. Once this purpose is fulfilled, the photographs shall be destroyed.

Substitute motion:

University Council urges that the enforcement portion of the Guidelines on Open Expression be modified as follows:

1. In the event that any persons are deemed by an Open Expression monitor, in consultation with available members of the Committee on Open Expression, to have violated the Guidelines, and such persons refuse to show University or other identification, the monitor shall inquire of other individuals present as to the identity of the claimed violators. Identification by two other individuals shall suffice to establish identity.
2. Should any individual not be identifiable in this manner, and refuse to show identification, the absence of evidence that the individual is a member of the University community shall subject the individual to normal police procedure, including arrest and fingerprinting.

The Mission of the Center

The Center for Community Partnerships is one vehicle for helping Penn to function as a world-class, international university. It is a component of an overall strategy to emphasize service and to integrate and strengthen each component of the research, teaching and service triad. The Center attempts to contribute to that overall strategy by helping Penn to take advantage of its physical location and to solve the myriad problems of its local environment. The rationale for the Center's assuming those missions was stated in the University's *Annual Report for 1987-1988, Penn and Philadelphia: Common Ground*. In that report President Hackney recognized that Penn's future and the future of Philadelphia were inextricably tied together:

The picture that emerges is one of a relationship in which the University and the City are important to one another. We stand on common ground, our futures very much intertwined.

For a variety of reasons, effective involvement with the City and the community has become, as Dr. Hackney remarked in an address at the Bank Street College of Education (*Almanac* May 12, 1992), "part of our institutional development strategy" to maintain and advance our standing as a world-class university. Those reasons may be summarized in four categories.

The one that most easily comes to mind I have labeled as direct, *institutional self-interest*. Under this heading we would consider components such as safety, the cleanliness of the area, attractiveness of the physical setting, etc. All of these contribute mightily to a general campus ambience and to the recruitment and retention of faculty, students and staff.

The second category involves a more indirect impact on institutional self-interest. Dr. Hackney has summarized that category with the phrase "new age of scrutiny." It involves both the costs (financial, public relations and political) to the institution that result from a retreat from the community, as well as the benefits that accrue from active, effective engagement. Lee Benson and I described the "new age of scrutiny" as follows in an article in *Education Week*:

...as conditions in society continue to deteriorate, universities will face increased public scrutiny (witness the Congressional hearings chaired by Representative John Dingell of Michigan last year). The scrutiny is bound to intensify as America focuses on resolving its deep and pervasive societal problems amid continuously expanding global competition. Institutions of higher education will increasingly be held to new and demanding standards that evaluate performance on the basis of direct and short-run societal benefit. In addition, public, private and foundation support will be more than ever based on that standard, and it will become increasingly clear to colleges and universities that "altruism pays"—in fact, that altruism is practically an imperative for institutional development and improvement.

The third category is the one that Penn faculty and students have been discussing and developing since a 1985 undergraduate seminar on "Urban

* Edited from Dr. Harkavy's presentation at Council November 11 and material presented on other occasions. Any errors are mine. —K.C.G.

r for Community Partnerships *by Ira Harkavy**

Universities—Community Relationships.” It involves the advancement of knowledge, teaching and the improvement of human welfare through engagement in *academically-based public service* focused on improving the quality of life in the local community. The benefits that can emerge from this approach are the integration of research, teaching and service, the interaction of faculty members and graduate and undergraduate students from across the campus, the connection of projects involving participatory action research with student and staff volunteer activities, and the promotion of civic consciousness, value-oriented thinking and a moral approach to issues of public concern among undergraduates.

Promoting civic consciousness, I believe, is a core component of the fourth concrete reason for significant University involvement with the community. In Dr. Hackney’s Bank Street address he described this as the “institution’s obligation to be a good citizen, and its *pedagogic duty to provide models of responsible citizenship* for its students.” This civic character-building role, of course, is at the very center

of the American college. However, the didactic approach to citizenship education and morality employed by our predecessors would today be both off-putting and at odds with the openness of the modern university. As also noted at Bank Street, Franklin urged us “to hold up examples of ‘true merit’ for our students to emulate.” Franklin clarifies this central reason for involvement with the community. Universities and colleges have (along with schools and religious institutions) a special responsibility to be moral institutions, exemplifying the highest character-building values of society. At the heart of civic responsibility is the concept of neighborliness, the caring about and assisting of those living near to you. As an institution, our actions and interactions express morality, our indifference or engagement with our community teach lessons to our students and society. To fulfill our character-building and civic education responsibilities, in short, means that Penn should strive to be a role model of responsible citizenship.

How should we work with the City and West Philadelphia? There is no road map to follow, no institutional leader to emulate. The Center

should help Penn be that leadership institution by functioning as a learning organization that embeds research and institutional self-examination into its operation. Working in our community, we would then be able to provide answers to the general question of how a world-class research university should serve its community.

Based on work that Penn has already done, and on some pioneering efforts at other institutions, we do have ideas as to appropriate directions for the Center to take. Those directions are designed to enable Penn to be both an international and a Philadelphia institution, serving our community while enhancing our status as a leading research university. To do that the Center needs to help ensure that Penn’s service to the City is appropriate to its mission...The Center should work to encourage the effective engagement of students, faculty and staff with the community. The skills and abilities of members of the Penn community represent our greatest resources, and strengthening these skills and abilities through service is part of our role as an educational institution.

Penn also has an institutional role to play in serving its neighbors. We can and should utilize

Mapping Community Service/Public Service Activities at Penn

A directory of community service and public service programs at Penn is being compiled for release in January by Todd Waller, director of the Program for Student-Community Involvement, and Bonnie Ragsdale of the Office of the Executive Vice President, who heads the Penn VIPS program. If an activity has not already been reported to any of the units listed at right, it can be brought to the attention of Mr. Waller at 898-4831 or Ms. Ragsdale at 898-2020.

The directory already includes listings of some 300 organizations in which Penn students, faculty and staff provide volunteer services; some 40 student organizations performing such volunteer services; and about 20 projects of individual faculty and staff or of University-funded offices including those listed here.

During the 1991-1992 academic year, 6060 Penn students participated in community service projects. Of those 6060, some 2100 volunteered in the community on a weekly basis. The total hours served by student volunteers for the academic year was 93,248, and when calculated according to minimum wage, these volunteers saved local service agencies nearly \$375,769. In addition, the Office of Fraternity and Sorority Affairs reported that these organizations raised a total of \$32,605 for local and National non-profit agencies.

Besides funding the University offices listed at right, Penn gives various forms of in-kind support to programs closely affiliated with the University, such as:

- West Philadelphia Partnership
- West Philadelphia Improvement Corps (WEPIC)
- University City Hospitality Coalition
- Newman Center Outreach Programs
- Hospital of the U. of P.
- Hillel
- The Christian Association.

A brief description of all known projects involving Penn people will appear in the new directory. Listed here are University-supported offices devoted to community service:

Center for Community Partnerships was recently established to provide advocacy and support for all service programs evolving from the University. (*Dr. Ira Harkavy*)

Penn Program for Public Service (PPPS) encourages and sponsors academically-based public service and creative volunteer activities designed to improve the quality of life in the West Philadelphia community. PPPS seeks to integrate the research, teaching and service missions of the University, while also spurring intellectual connections across disciplines. (*Dr. Harkavy*)

Penn VIPS (Volunteers in Public Service), a network of faculty and staff volunteering as individuals to assist West Philadelphia schools and community organizations through such projects as gathering school supplies for local youngsters, collecting food and clothing for shelters and meal programs in the area, and sending University volunteer tutors to two schools—Turner Middle School and West Philadelphia High School—to tutor adults on Wednesday evenings and Saturdays. (*Bonnie Ragsdale*)

Program for Student-Community Involvement (PSCI), the University’s student volunteer administrative office, coordinates community service projects and serves to help Penn students become an integral part of the West Philadelphia community. The PSCI provides student advocacy and support, community service projects, service-learning options and resources to students and the University community. The PSCI runs a variety of service programs throughout the year, the largest of which is the West Philadelphia Tutoring Project (WPTP), co-sponsored by the Collaborative for West Philadelphia Public Schools. The WPTP places approximately 300 Penn student volunteers as tutors in 20 West Philadelphia schools. (*Todd Waller*)

Law School Public Service Program requires law students to provide public service assistance in legal and law related sites. An example of one project: law students answer questions and make referrals for homeless individuals at area shelters. (*Judith Bernstein-Baker*)

PENNlincs is affiliated with the Institute for Research in Cognitive Science and the Morris Arboretum of the University of Pennsylvania. The main focus of the PENNlincs project is to adapt theoretical research to formal and informal educational settings while using those settings as sites for new cognitive research. (*Dr. Pamela Freyd*)

Say Yes to Education provides tutoring and family counseling to students participating in this program, which was started by George and Diane Weiss in 1987. They offered to pay the college tuition for 112 sixth grade graduates of Belmont Elementary School, if they graduate from high school and gain acceptance to the school of their choice. In the fall of 1990, a second class was adopted. (*Dr. Norman Newberg*)

Wharton West Philadelphia Project (WWPP) bridges the Wharton School and the West Philadelphia community through community service programs. The Project channels the strengths of the Wharton School to help meet some of the educational and economic development needs of West Philadelphia. The following programs operate out of the WWPP: Wharton Small Business Development Center, STEP Program, Christmas in April, Project Plenty USA, Red Cross Blood Drive, Rock Around the Clock, Very Special Arts, Wharton Community Outreach, Wharton Olympics and the Whitney Young Conference. (*Alia Walker Rashied*)

Dental School recently enacted a mandatory public service requirement for all its students, where they will provide free dental services to West Philadelphia residents.

our institutional position and leverage to help improve Philadelphia and West Philadelphia. The Center could help encourage, for example, Penn's serving as an institutional anchor for effective community development efforts that involve other institutions and community groups in West Philadelphia.

The function of helping to encourage Penn's institutional engagement in partnership community development activities involving housing, job training, hiring and purchasing, is a recent addition in the conceptualization of what the Center is to do. That function provides the Center with three major areas of responsibility. Each of these areas is to some extent unique to the Penn Center (the configuration certainly is), placing us in a leadership position among higher educational institutions. Specifically, the Center will encompass three kinds of service activities.

1) Direct, traditional service (volunteer activities of students, faculty, staff and alumni). The introduction to "Mapping Community Service/Public Service Activities" on the previous page summarizes the present scope of this.

2) Academically-based public service (rooted in and intrinsically tied to teaching and research). This encompasses problem-oriented research and teaching as well as service learning, emphasizing student and faculty reflection on the service experience. Just two of many current projects:

Work on learned optimism and coping skills is being done at the Turner School by Ph.D. candidate Karen Reivich with Dr. Martin Seligman of psychology; and...

... a large-scale project comparing racial and ethnic differences in morbidity and mortality, is being done by Thomas McElrath, a Ph.D. candidate in demography, with Dr. Samuel Preston and others.

3) Institutionally-related service (indirect service utilizing the University's prestige, influence and position to provide community organizations access to a wide range of financial and institutional resources). For example, WEPIC's access to government and foundation funds was largely a product of its link to Penn. In this form of service there is more direct Penn involvement as a partner in community development-related activities—such as, in a consortium of institutions to develop health-related job training programs to respond to the staffing needs of the community.

I believe that no other university has made the development of institutionally-related service part of its service-related center or institute. Moreover, although service learning has become the province of Stanford's Haas Center among others, we are perceived of as a (if not the) national leader in linking the research and teaching resources of a university to help local communities and schools solve their problems. Finally, placing the development of staff and alumni volunteer efforts as a responsibility of the Center is another unique aspect of our work.

Staff and alumni volunteer efforts* have

* An example of such participation is Turner School's Saturday Community School where not only pupils but their parents are enrolled for tutorials. In this ongoing project 15 undergraduates, mostly from SAS, and 14 PennVIPS (staff volunteers) assist in every course of the Saturday School and are entirely responsible for cooking, martial arts, computer, GED prep, and two creative writing courses.

already become part of the Center with the assignment of Bonnie Ragsdale, an information specialist for the Executive Vice President, to the Center on a half-time basis in her capacity as coordinator for the Penn Volunteers in Public Service (VIPS).

This development not only fits marvelously with working to generate genuine coordination among Penn's service activities, but it also extends

the concept of total quality management to include the quality of the environment in which Penn employees live and work. For staff members living in West Philadelphia, it illustrates, as do initiatives such as mortgage guarantees and community improvement activities in neighborhoods where staff members reside, that Penn is concerned about the total quality of life of its employees—in both the workplace and the homeplace.

Speaking Out

The following responds to Dr. Saul Sternberg's Speaking Out letter, Almanac November 3, on Technology vs. Crime.

Vs. Technology vs. Crime

I would first like to express my appreciation to Professor Sternberg for providing the opportunity for members of the Penn community to participate in planning process, which by his account, is already rather advanced in terms of discussions and expressions of support from various corners.

My first response was, of course, to check the date, to see if this was a special April Fool's issue, and this was a creative spoof—a tweaking of the noses of us who are concerned about privacy and the nature of community. As I reread the piece, and shared it with colleagues and students, it became clear that the proposal was indeed real, and represented a kind of frustrated response to chaos and powerlessness. In my view, this is the kind of response that begins a system-wrenching deviation-amplifying loop that guarantees a worsening rather than an improvement in the safety of us all.

Several aspects of the presentation strike me as curious; not the least of which is the fact that the presenter/advocate is a professor of psychology, and not a professor of engineering or computer science, or even of marketing. We are told about "its commercial status"—that it is available from a company involving SEAS and Wharton alumni, although it is a firm with which professor Sternberg "has no financial connection." Ah, but he is certainly sold on the idea! We are told that the device is inexpensive, presumably durable ("ten-year life"); and better still, funders are waiting in the wings to get the technology implemented. Unfortunately, the issues we are encouraged to discuss have more to do with strategies for deployment than concerns about the potential harm or tradeoffs which such a technology might represent. Indeed, the first item in the list is a public relations response...a concern about "how to encourage use and educate users." Further technocentric concerns are related to the best way to extend the technology to the communities near us, and then to other urban areas troubled by high crime and limited police budgets.

Things are never that simple. Crime does not disappear because police arrive more quickly. More arrests are made, more convictions result, yet the criminal justice system just seems to slow down from

overload. Prisons cannot be built quickly enough. People refuse to serve on juries. Yet, crime continues. Crime takes on a new form, and moves to a new site and circumstance. Note the recent concerns expressed about the dramatic rise in a novel form of automotive theft—carjacking. Many analysts identify a contributing, if not causal influence in the rise of this especially violent marriage of assault and thievery to the effectiveness of steering wheel bar locks. Because thieves cannot steal the parked car, they steal one which is running, and usually occupied. Loss of property escalates to loss of life and limb. The more things change...

Increasingly we have heard of purse snatchings and other street crimes which have been accomplished with the aid of cruising motor vehicles, bicycles, or three party teams who practice a tightly choreographed bump and run. Does an increase in the response time of campus police increase the pressure on thieves to shorten the time they need to pull off an assault?

Of course, not all crimes, especially crimes of violence, are perpetrated by desperate people in search of money for food or drugs. Hate crimes are crimes of violence. So are the crimes of youthful bravado; a senseless assault against a stranger. Some assaults on members of the Penn community are of this kind, and knowledge about those crazy rich kids at Penn with Dick Tracy watches is likely to hasten the arrival of our own Clockwork Orange. If these badges triggered local alarms, the arrival of this dystopic scene would be hastened as the sirens would feed a distorted sense of power. How much of a "threat" would be needed to trigger an alarm? Rather than convincing potential faculty and students that the electronic womb of University City is the place to be, stories about the madness in West Philadelphia would turn them away in droves.

As one who is especially sensitive to matters of privacy, surveillance, and the discrimination that results from it, I immediately wondered about present and future uses of a technology which identified user and location. Presumably, at roll-out, the device would identify itself only upon initiation by the user. After all, only the wearer could determine at which point he or she was under attack, or at risk. Yet, we have seen increasing corporate interest in devices which allow managers to know the location of both workers and vehicles. It is

easy to imagine any number of scenarios that would lead the University and its partners to implement always-open as the default option in the circuitry, in the same way that the telcos preferred to have automatic caller-identification as the default option for the technology which the Commonwealth declared an unconstitutional invasion of privacy. Why bother with the PennCard? With identification as the default, transactions take place more efficiently, only those not wired in need stop by the guard desk to negotiate admission. Indeed, with such a system, the police, like telecommunications network controllers, could deploy their still large force around the campus so as to maintain a constant ratio of community member to public safety officer within the targeted two-minute arrival. Of course, as the number of crimes increases (as all other indications suggest it must if we pursue punishment/deterrence rather than alternatives), the risk management and efficiency experts will have to modify the formulas to reflect differential risk histories of individuals, or types of individuals. Obviously, according to the model, tall, black males can survive assaultive conditions longer than small white or Asian females, thus the ratio and the response time could be adjusted. Certain areas could be identified as high risk, and people would know that response times would be slower; of course, coverage would vary at different times of the day (pretty much as it does now, I guess).

If the technology never moved to an identification default mode, it is still likely that assessments of the circumstance will have to be based on some kind of model, experience-based or purely theoretical. Police dispatchers currently make decisions about whether alarms are legitimate (whether the motion detector was triggered by a thunderstorm or an unauthorized entry), about whether life is at risk, whether the criminal is at the scene, etc. This signal-only device will not provide that kind of information, and since limited resources will surely require choices and queues, what information about the victim (age, gender, race, position with the university, location, past involvement with police/crime/assault/calls for assistance, etc.) will come into play? Does an alarm from a white male in the vicinity of the basketball courts mean a fall, or an assault? Can we assure even-handedness? Does the reference to "legitimate transmission" apply only to devices which have not been reported stolen, or will it apply only to those of persons whose bills are paid in full, or who have completed medical examinations, turned in forms, completed surveys, or met the countless other administrative requirements that users of PARIS have been recently reminded of? There are a great many things for us to talk about with regard to crime and the quality of life on campus. I do hope we will talk more about this technology in the context of a frank and open discussion that recognizes that a fortress is more than bricks and mortar, and a fortress mentality is more varied still.

— Oscar H. Gandy, Jr.
Professor of Communication

Subjects for Lithium/Thyroid Study

For one of the studies announced in *Almanac* October 20, the Bipolar Disorders Unit in the Department of Psychiatry needs nine more healthy volunteers. Females between the ages of 33-60, free of current or past mental health, medical, drug, or alcohol problems, are sought for the study which examines the effects of lithium on the thyroid gland. Subjects will receive a free physical examination and laboratory studies as well as \$250.

For more information: Lisa at 349-5896.

IACUC Training: December 7

The Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee's next Investigator Training Seminar will be held Monday, December 7, from 3:30-5 p.m. in Alumni Hall at HUP. Training is mandated for all investigators who are involved in animal research. No registration is required and no supplies are needed. For further information please call 898-2432.

The University of Pennsylvania Police Department Community Crime Report

This summary is prepared by the Division of Public Safety and includes all criminal incidents reported and made known to the University Police Department between the dates of November 9, 1992 and November 15, 1992. The University police actively patrol from Market Street to Baltimore Avenue and from the Schuylkill River to 43rd Street in conjunction with the Philadelphia Police. In this effort to provide you with a thorough and accurate report on Public Safety concerns, we hope that your increased awareness will lessen the opportunity for crime. For any concerns or suggestions regarding this report, please call the Division of Public Safety at Ext. 8-4482.

Crimes Against Persons

34th to 38th/Market to Civic Center: Simple Assaults—1, Threats & Harassment—5

11/10/92	5:55 PM	3600 block Walnut	Panhandler made remarks to vendor
11/11/92	3:33 AM	University Hospital	Compl. reported unwanted remarks made
11/11/92	10:00 AM	Butcher Dorm	Harassing calls received from Sep. to now
11/11/92	11:06 AM	3600 block Market	Compl. received harassing phone calls
11/13/92	1:14 AM	Morris Dorm	Compl. received annoying calls
11/15/92	1:54 AM	38th & Chestnut	Compl. reported being pushed and punched

38th to 41st/Market to Baltimore: Simple Assaults —1, Threats & Harassment—1

11/09/92	11:50 PM	Harrison House	Unwanted message put on room door
11/13/92	2:08 AM	200 block 40th	Complainant reported being grabbed by unknown male who fled

30th to 34th/Market to University: Simple Assault—1

11/14/92	2:36 PM	Hill House	Parent and roommate had dispute
----------	---------	------------	---------------------------------

Outside 30th - 43rd/Market - Baltimore: Robberies (& attempts) —1

11/11/92	1:01 AM	Boathouse	Complainant stabbed in arm/bike taken by juveniles
----------	---------	-----------	--

Crimes Against Property

34th to 38th/Market to Civic Center: Burglaries (& attempts)—3, Total Thefts (& attempts)—25, Thefts from Autos—1, Thefts of Bicycles & Parts—5

11/09/92	9:00 AM	Furness Building	Panasonic phone taken from office
11/09/92	1:35 PM	Stiteler Building	Wallet taken from office
11/09/92	2:52 PM	3600 block Locust	Front wheel of bike taken
11/09/92	2:55 PM	Law School	Unattended watch taken
11/09/92	6:31 PM	Gimbel Gym	4 incidents/property removed from lockers/basketball court
11/10/92	6:55 PM	3409 Walnut St	2 incidents/Wallets taken at Food Court
11/10/92	4:24 PM	Houston Hall	Wallet removed from backpack
11/10/92	4:44 PM	3400 block Walnut	2 incidents/Bikes taken from rack
11/10/92	5:30 PM	Vance Hall	Purse removed from filing cabinet
11/11/92	2:02 PM	Annenberg School	Secured bike taken from rack
11/11/92	5:09 PM	Bookstore	2 incidents/bags taken from lockers
11/11/92	6:50 PM	Steinberg/Dietrich	Unattended wallet taken from lounge
11/11/92	7:15 PM	Annenberg Center	2 unattended wallets taken from room
11/13/92	9:17 AM	Franklin Building	Machines broken into/cash taken
11/13/92	12:42 PM	Hillel Foundation	Unattended wallet taken
11/13/92	3:34 PM	3400 block Chestnut	Window to auto broken/car phone taken
11/13/92	9:21 PM	Mudd Building	Door window to office broken
11/14/92	7:34 AM	Franklin Annex	Key cabinet forced open/keys taken
11/14/92	1:03 PM	Nichols House	Secured bike taken from railing
11/14/92	3:20 PM	Johnson Pavilion	Unattended wallet taken from desk
11/14/92	5:19 PM	Leidy Lab	Items taken from unsecured room
11/14/92	9:05 PM	3405 Walnut St.	Cash removed from safe

38th to 41st/Market to Baltimore: Burglaries (& attempts)—5, Total Thefts (& attempts)—17, Thefts of Auto (& attempts)—1, Thefts from Autos—3, Theft of Bicycles & Parts—1, Possession of Stolen Property—1, Criminal Mischief & Vandalism—4

11/09/92	4:38 AM	4015 Walnut St.	Glass shattered to door
11/09/92	10:15 AM	3900 block Locust	4 Incidents/bikes taken from railing
11/09/92	3:08 PM	Evans Building	2 Jackets and wallet taken from locker
11/10/92	8:36 AM	3900 block Delancy	2 incidents/windows broken to vehicles
11/10/92	1:43 PM	3900 block Spruce	Front wheel removed from secured bike/vent window to auto broken

continued next page

Update

NOVEMBER AT PENN

EXHIBIT

21 *MFA Exhibition*; art by graduate students of the Fine Arts Dept.; Opening reception 7-10 p.m.; Meyerson Hall Gallery; gallery hours Monday-Friday 10 a.m.-5 p.m.; call Ext. 8-8257 for more information. *Through December 4.*

FILMS

20 *I Is a Long-Memorialized Woman*; video chronicling through dance, monologue, and poetry, the history of slavery through the eyes of Caribbean women; noon; Bowl Room, Houston Hall (Greenfield Intercultural Center).

21 *Daughters of the Dust*; Directed by Julie Dash; 2 p.m.; International House (Neighborhood Film/Video Project).

FITNESS/LEARNING

18 *Acting Workshop*; The O'Casey Theater Company; 2 p.m.; Room 511, Annenberg Center.

MEETING

19 *CGS Alumni Association General Membership Meeting*; committee reports; 5:30 p.m.; 3440 Market, Suite 100; call Ext. 8-9999 and press CGSAL for more information.

MUSIC

20 *Penny Loafers Fall Show: Like Buttah*; 8 p.m.; Dunlop Auditorium. Tickets: \$5.

22 *Penn Contemporary Players*; James Primosch; award-winning pianist; 8 p.m.; Curtis Institute of Music (Music Department).

ONSTAGE

17 *Three One Act Comedies*; O'Casey Theater Company; 8 p.m.; Zellerbach Theatre, Annenberg Center. Call Ext. 8-6701 for ticket and price information. *Also performances November 19 at 1 p.m.; and November 21 at 2 p.m.*

TALKS

18 *Expression and Regulation of a Mamalian Potassium Channel Gene*; Teresa Perney, pharmacology, Yale University School of Medicine; noon; Mezzanine, John Morgan Building (Pharmacology).

Voltage-Sensitive Dyes and the Visualization of Circuit Activity in the Olfactory Pathway; John Kauer, neurosurgery, Tufts-New England Medical Center; 4 p.m.; Surgical Seminar Room, White Building (Otorhinolaryngology).

19 *Researching the Turco-Sephardic Liturgy in Istanbul and the Turkish Diaspora*; Edwin Seroussi, musicology, Bar Ilan University, Israel; 12:30 p.m.; Room 420, Williams Hall (Middle East Center).

Entgrenzung. Goethe Im Gespräch Mit "Laokoon"; Peter J. Burgard, Harvard; 8:15 p.m.; Max Kade Center (Germanic Languages and Literatures, Germanic Association)

20 *Sterol Carrier Protein-2: What Is It and What Does It Do?*; Jerome F. Strauss, obstetrics and gynecology; 1 p.m.; Physiology Library, Richards Building (Physiology).

Shivaun O'Casey, founder, O'Casey Theater Company; 5 p.m.; Annenberg Center Studio Lobby (Penn Irish Club).

23 *Regulation of NMDA Receptor Expression During Development*; Keith Williams, pharmacology; noon; Mezzanine, John Morgan Building (Pharmacology).

24 *Proteolysis Mediates Regression of Vascular Remodeling*; David J. Riley, University of Medicine & Dentistry of N.J.; 1 p.m.; Physiology Library, Richards Building (Physiology).

Isolation and Physiological Significance of Endogenous Ouabain; John Hamlyn, physiology, University of Maryland School of Medicine; 4 p.m.; Physiology Library, Richards Building (Physiology).

The Autonomous Aesthetic: Is a Post-Modern Arabic Literary Criticism Possible?; R.A.T. Judy, comparative literature and literary and cultural theory, Carnegie-Mellon University; 4:30 p.m.; eighth floor lounge, Williams Hall (Middle East Center).

MCL-1 and Other Early-Induction Genes in Myeloid Leukemia Cell Differentiation; Ruth Craig, physiology, John Hopkins; noon; Mezzanine, John Morgan Building (Pharmacology).

continued from previous page

11/10/92	5:12 PM	Sigma Alpha Epsilon	Window broken to vehicle/cash removed
11/10/92	7:46 PM	Sigma Chi	2 incidents/items removed from residence
11/11/92	2:21 AM	220 S. 40th St	Lettering taken from sign
11/11/92	11:11 AM	400 block Spruce	Male attempting to take bike
11/11/92	4:54 PM	3920 Spruce	Books taken without payment
11/11/92	5:31 PM	High Rise North	2 incidents/secured bikes taken
11/11/92	5:31 PM	Lot # 40	Vehicle taken from lot
11/11/92	10:04 PM	3900 block Pine	Juvenile arrested after operating stolen auto
11/12/92	12:36 AM	40th & Spruce	Leather jacket taken by unknown juvenile
11/12/92	2:23 PM	Harrison House	Eggs/Tomato-paste can thrown from window
11/12/92	4:26 PM	Lot # 42	Vehicle spray-painted while in lot
11/13/92	10:14 PM	4016 Pine St.	1st floor window forced/TV taken
11/14/92	11:03 AM	Sigma Phi Epsilon	Various items taken from residence

30th to 34th/Market to University: Burglaries (& attempts)—1, Total Thefts (& attempts)—2, Thefts from Autos—1, Thefts of Bicycles & Parts—2, Criminal Mischief & Vandalism—3, Trespassing & Loitering—1

11/9/92	9:05 AM	Franklin Field	Padlock cut on concession stand
11/9/92	1:24 PM	Moore School	5 computer chairs taken
11/9/92	3:21 PM	Lot # 33	2 incidents/driver's side door locks tampered
11/9/92	11:33 PM	Lot # 7	Three light bulbs taken from vehicle
11/10/92	1:36 PM	3300 block Spruce	Frame & rear wheel removed from bike
11/10/92	4:33 PM	Lot # 37	Two males loitering inside gate/arrested
11/11/92	8:40 AM	University Museum	2 incidents/window broken/jacket taken
11/11/92	12:00 PM	Lot # 5	Unattended backpack gone through
11/14/92	8:37 PM	Towne Building	Wallet taken from back pocket
11/15/92	7:45 PM	Weightman Hall	Unsecured bike taken from hallway

Outside 30th - 43rd/Market - Baltimore: Total Thefts (& attempts)—4, Thefts of Auto (& attempts)—1, Thefts of Bicycles & Parts—1, Criminal Mischief & Vandalism—1

11/11/92	1:39 AM	New Bolton Center	Stethoscopes taken from cabinet
11/12/92	12:07 AM	Unit block S. 38th	Secured auto taken from unit block
11/12/92	1:40 PM	4037 Spruce St.	Clothing taken from room over summer
11/14/92	10:03 AM	300 S. 45th St	Window broken/steering column damaged
11/14/92	1:14 PM	130 S. 39th St	Secured bike taken from porch railing

18th District Crimes Against Persons

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

11/2/92 to 11/8/92

Totals: 14 Incidents, 5 Arrests

Date	Time	Location	Offense	Arrest
11/2/92	2:11 AM	4400 Spruce	Robbery	No
11/2/92	8:05 AM	1201 S. 47th	Homicide	Yes
11/2/92	10:50 AM	3401 Walnut	Robbery	No
11/2/92	10:44 PM	4603 Kingsessing	Robbery	No
11/4/92	4:35 PM	4800 Woodland	Aggravated Assault	Yes
11/5/92	3:39 AM	100 S. 37th	Robbery	Yes
11/5/92	6:52 AM	4200 Pine	Robbery	No
11/5/92	9:22 PM	3700 Spruce	Robbery	No
11/6/92	1:50 PM	4000 Market	Robbery	No
11/6/92	6:45 PM	1200 S. Hanson	Robbery	Yes
11/6/92	9:20 PM	3700 Spruce	Robbery	No
11/7/92	6:15 PM	1008 S. 48th	Aggravated Assault	Yes
11/8/92	1:05 PM	200 S. 41st	Robbery	No
11/8/92	9:15 PM	4400 Locust	Robbery	No



Almanac

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

The University of Pennsylvania's journal of record, opinion and news is published Tuesdays during the academic year, and as needed during summer and holiday breaks. Guidelines for readers and contributors are available on request.

EDITOR Karen C. Gaines
ASSOCIATE EDITOR Marguerite F. Miller
EDITORIAL ASSISTANT Leda C. Sawchak
STUDENT AIDES Shari Bart, Shiron Bell,
Melanie Chang, Bill King, Craig Reynolds, Stephen Sanford
ALMANAC ADVISORY BOARD: *For the Faculty Senate*, June Axinn (Chair), David K. Hildebrand, Phoebe S. Leboy, Gerald J. Porter, Lorraine R. Tulman, Roger Walmsley; *for the Administration*, Stephen Steinberg; *for the Staff Assemblies*, Laurie Cousart (A-1), Lynn Ruthrauff (Librarians); Shirley Purcell (A-3).