

# Almanac

Tuesday, January 26, 1993

Published by the University of Pennsylvania

Volume 39 Number 19

## INSIDE

- On Minority Permanence, p. 2
- Salary Scales for 1993, p. 3
- Speaking Out: Just Cause & CAFRs (Klide); Improper Procedures & Just Cause (Kronfeld); Responses (Marshak, Johnstone, Ferrer, Ramberg, Ross, Clelland, and Roussel), pp. 4-7
- Deaths, p. 7 • CrimeStats, Update, pp. 7-8

Pullouts: Reports from the Provost, pp. I-IV  
February at Penn (Center)

## New SAS Term Chairs: Dr. Rieber, Dr. Sternberg

Dr. Alfred J. Rieber of history and Dr. Saul Sternberg of psychology have been named to two new term professorships in the School of Arts and Sciences, Dean Rosemary Stevens has announced.

Dr. Sternberg, cited by his peers for fostering "a revolution in the study of perception, memory, attention, and motor control," is the first Paul C. Williams Term Professor. His chair, created last year, is named for its donor, a 1967 alumnus of the Wharton School who is vice president and manager of the Chicago-based brokerage firm of John Nuveen & Company, Inc.

Dr. Rieber, an internationally acclaimed scholar/writer/teacher on Russian and Soviet affairs, is the first to hold the Alfred L. Cass Term Professorship established in 1988 by three members of the late Mr. Cass's family: his widow, Gertrude Cass, and his son-in-law and daughter, Mr. and Mrs. Steven D. Oppenheim. Four members of the Oppenheim family have attended Penn: Steven Oppenheim, Wh '60, a New York City tax law specialist; two Oppenheim children Laura (C '91) Michael (C '93); and Mr. Oppenheim's brother, Richard (Wh '64).

A member of the Penn faculty since 1965, Dr. Rieber is a 1953 alumnus of Colgate who took his Master's and Ph.D. at Columbia in 1959. He taught at Colorado State, Northwestern and Chicago before joining Penn.

His first-hand study of Russia and the Soviet Union began when he joined the first student exchange with Moscow in 1958. He has since made five extended research visits (a sixth is in view, to examine Soviet archives from the 1940's); produced nine books and numerous articles; won the two most distinguished teaching prizes in America—the Lindback Award, and the Danforth Foundation's E. Harris Harbeson Award; and become a household name in America for his public lectures, radio and TV appearances on Soviet affairs. He has served as associate dean of arts and sciences, twice chaired the history department, and won the Henry Allan Moe Prize of the American Philosophical Society.

Dr. Rieber has received Woodrow Wilson, Ford Foundation, Guggenheim, ACLS, and NEH fellowships among others. He is presently at the Woodrow Wilson Center in Washington, D.C., working in conjunction with the Kennan Insti-



Dr. Rieber



Dr. Sternberg

tute. He expects to follow the 1991 *Perestroika at the Crossroads* (with Alvin Z. Rubinstein) with *The Cold War as Civil War: Russia and Its Borderlands, 1937-1950*, and *Russia: The Rise of a Great Power*.

Dr. Sternberg, a 1955 alumnus of Swarthmore and a 1954-55 Woodrow Wilson Fellow, took his M.A. and Ph.D. at Harvard and a Diploma in Mathematical Statistics at Cambridge before  
(continued next page)

## Graduate Education: Time Limits for Ph.D. Matriculants After July 1993

The Graduate Council of the Faculties, a Council elected by the faculty in the nine schools that offer the degrees of Ph.D., A.M., and M.S., sets the minimum requirements for those degrees. The degree requirements set by the Graduate Council are published in the *Graduate Academic Bulletin: Rules and Regulations* and are also available electronically on PennInfo. The Graduate Council has made an important amendment to the published rules.

The amendment (full text at right) requires that students who enter Ph.D. programs after Spring 1993, and who register for dissertation tuition for more than five years, must retake either their preliminary exam or their final exam, or satisfy another procedure devised by the graduate group and approved by the Graduate Council of the Faculties, in order to remain degree candidates.

Because current students are governed by the rules in effect at the time of their matriculation as Ph.D. students, the amendment applies only to students entering graduate programs after July of 1993. *Current students are not subject to this new rule*, unless they choose not to graduate under the rules in force at the time of their matriculation.

The purpose of the amendment is to assure that students who take a longer time to complete their Ph.D. theses have kept both their skills and research agendas at the frontier of knowledge. While both personal circumstances and *unanticipated* problems in conducting the proposed research may provide compelling reasons why a dissertation cannot be completed within a five-year time frame, a dissertation must meet the standard of expanding the knowledge base that exists *at the time the degree is awarded*, regardless of the reason for the timing of its submission. Students must be strongly cautioned that research acceptable for a dissertation at an earlier time period may no longer be acceptable in later years. In turn, dissertation advisors bear the responsibility of assisting students in developing a realistic dissertation research agenda that can be accomplished on a timely basis. While many interesting and important research questions require a longer time to address, those questions form the basis for an academic career (in a paid position), not the first step in that career, which is the preparation of the dissertation.

Students entering in Fall 1993 who take courses for their first three years will be affected by this rule when they enter their ninth year of enrollment in a graduate group. Therefore, eight to nine years will pass before the research skills of any students will be re-evaluated under the terms of this amendment. Currently, about 10% of our Ph.D.s are awarded to students who were enrolled for more than eight years. It is the hope of the Graduate Council that the recent success of our students and faculty in reducing this percentage will continue and that fewer Ph.D. students will run the risk that their research becomes outdated.

— Janice F. Madden, Vice Provost for Graduate Education

## OF RECORD

### Limitations of Time Rule

*The following rule applies to all students matriculating into Ph.D. programs after July 1, 1993.*

Amendment to *Graduate Academic Bulletin: Rules and Regulations, 1992-94* by adding on page 10, column 3, at conclusion of section entitled: "Limitations of Time"

Students who have not completed all requirements for the Ph.D., including the deposit of the dissertation, within five years of their first registration for dissertation tuition, face the ever increasing risk that their dissertation research is no longer at the frontier of current research in their field. Such students cease to be candidates for the Ph.D. unless they satisfy the re-evaluation criteria designed by their graduate group and approved by the Graduate Council of the Faculties or, in the absence of an approved re-evaluation procedure, they retake and pass either the preliminary or the final examination.

*Approved by the Graduate Council of the Faculties  
December 10, 1992*

## On Minority Permanence at Penn

Last Wednesday, just at the time when President Clinton was announcing the beginning of a new era of change and renewal for our nation, Provost Michael Aiken, Acting Executive Vice President John Gould, several other senior administrators, and I met in the Faculty Club with a group of Penn faculty and staff of color who told us that we had not yet achieved the kind of caring community that we want to be. We were told that students, faculty and staff members of the University of Pennsylvania community still feel frustrated and oppressed by what they experience as a hostile environment, where demeaning incidents continue to occur—in our classrooms by faculty, in transactions with University staff, on our campus by public safety officers, and in our residences by fellow students.

I believe that this situation is a sign neither of failure nor, certainly, of success, but rather of incomplete progress. For progress *has* been made, in the United States and at the University of Pennsylvania, in increasing diversity and equality of opportunity. 1993 is not 1863, 1963, or even 1983. Much has been achieved in establishing and securing minority permanence at Penn. Many formal mechanisms and resources are in place to sustain and support that presence.

Such national and institutional progress has been won in large part because of the vigilance and sacrifice of Penn students, faculty, and staff members who have tirelessly dedicated themselves to breaking down the barriers of a society undergoing a transition of historic proportions.

This struggle has enabled Penn to attract one of the most extraordinarily talented, pluralistic communities of scholars in the United States. Penn faculty, staff, and administrators are called on daily to suggest how other institutions might begin to take the painful steps towards the curative celebration of all peoples. We are seen, rightly, as a model, for however much additional work must be done, we have persevered, sometimes in the face of willful, harmful acts, at this important task.

I believe that we cannot allow these hard-won victories to be diminished, and that we must salute those who, through their own strong, eloquent voices, have spoken the truth and changed our collective future. Yet, it is also clear that our community is not yet at ease with our continuing transition.

I was deeply saddened because I was told, in no uncertain terms, that regardless of all that the Penn community has achieved, that work has not been enough to make *everyone* feel “at home” at Penn. I am also concerned because many of the staff and faculty who filled the Faculty Club have fought long and hard, and they are visibly weary of carrying on. But most of all, I felt frustration, because the problem is not an easy or simple one to solve.

As Bill Clinton takes office, it is evident that valuable members of American society continue to endure a stark, brutal existence on the periphery of full membership in this society that purports to include them. However one chooses to frame the goal, there can be no doubt about the real verdict: the Civil Rights movement of the 1960’s never completed its task. To have torn down many of the visible barriers to equal participation in our society is not the same as having created a path along which everyone has secure footing.

We have agreed to do more to smooth that path, to prove—both to those who have joyfully dedicated their lives to change, and to those who believe that people who do not look like them cannot contribute to our common progress and prosperity—that a university can successfully push itself to examine closely its successes and failures, to reconsider the perceived limits of institutional commitment and resources, and above all, to be courageous and creative in finding resources, particularly in stringent fiscal times, to meet urgent and unlimited needs. This is the time for such immediate reexamination.

In addition, this is the time to tell all members of our community again, but this time in a way that must be heard, that we will not tolerate acts that demean students, faculty, and staff—not in the classroom, not in support offices, not on the campus, and not in our residences. We will find means to ensure that such acts have important consequences.

Pursuant to this commitment, I have asked Provost Michael Aiken and Acting Executive Vice President John Gould to jointly lead our continuing effort to end racial harassment, inhumane treatment, and hostile behavior as an everyday fact of life for people of color on this campus. I have also asked them to incorporate this objective into the larger framework of ensuring that *all* groups and individuals in the Penn community are accorded the respect, politeness, and care that they deserve regardless of race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, religion, disability, or veteran status. A joint statement will appear in next week’s *Almanac* which expresses that commitment and outlines specific steps that they will be undertaking.

On an increasingly plural university campus—one which enjoys an ever richer diversity of students, faculty, staff, and community outreach efforts, and celebrates them all—those who believe they can, with impunity, damage important members of our community have no place.

*Sheldon Hackney*

---

### Term Chairs *from page 1*

joining Penn in 1960. After a year as instructor, and three years as assistant professor here, he spent the next 15 based at Bell Labs where he was supervisor of the Perception and Memory Group and head of the Human Information-Processing Research Department.

Continuing his ties with academia throughout his Bell Labs career (at University College London, as Regents Professor at Berkeley and on the graduate faculty of Rutgers), he was a Guggenheim Fellow in 1972 and the Sir Frederic Bartlett Lecturer of the Experimental Psychology Society in London in 1973. He was elected to the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1975 and the National Academy of Sciences in 1982.

In 1985 Dr. Sternberg returned to Penn as full professor. Two years later he received the Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award of the American Psychological Association, “For his uniquely powerful, creative, and elegant research on human information processing. He has contributed immensely influential experimental procedures, analytical techniques, and

theoretical models. These include the Sternberg memory-scanning paradigm, the additive-factor method for analyzing reaction-time data, and the serial exhaustive search model. Their impact has fostered a revolution in the study of perception, memory, attention, and motor control, while setting new standards of scientific rigor....” the citation reads.

Dr. Sternberg has also been elected a William James Fellow of the American Psychological Society, and won the Howard Crosby Warren Medal of the Society of Experimental Psychologists “For his fundamental investigations of how people store and retrieve information in short-term memory, and of how they prepare and execute skilled motor sequences; and for the meticulous care of his theorizing and theory testing.” In teaching, he is noted particularly for his development of a computer-based laboratory course in human information processing, in which students repeat several classic experiments. As of 1990, articles by Dr. Sternberg in three major psychological journals were the first or second most highly cited articles ever published in those journals.

### February HIV/Aids Education

As part of ongoing HIV/AIDS and Safer Sex Awareness and education, we are promoting a series of exciting activities in February. Please check the *D.P.* and notice-boards around campus throughout the month of February for updates on scheduled programs. Information on upcoming events is also available through the Student Health Office of Health Education at Ext. 3-3525.

We are willing to help plan, organize or offer program support to any group that wants to do a program or sponsor a speaker. Suggestions for campus-wide events are also welcome. To have your event posted with other listings, please call the the above number.

— Kate Webster, Chair,  
Education Subcommittee of the  
HIV Task Force at Penn

## Salary Scales for 1993

The table at right reflects the Staff (A1 and A3) salary scales effective February 1, 1993. Market research completed by Human Resources/Compensation and the Office of Resource Planning and Budget indicates that a 3.75% increase to these salary scales is warranted. This practice of adjusting staff salary scales on a calendar year basis rather than at the start of the fiscal year was instituted in 1992 in order to: 1) keep this change separate and distinct from the merit increase program; and 2) keep our hiring rates competitive with those of other employers in the Delaware Valley area, most of which adjust their salary scales at the beginning of the calendar year.

Copies of the new salary scales will be mailed to Deans, Department Heads and Business Administrators this week. It will only be necessary to adjust the salaries of those few employees whose salaries are below the new minimums.

There will be no adjustment to the salary scales on July 1, 1993. Future adjustments, if needed, will also be made mid-fiscal year. Please direct questions to Human Resources/Compensation (Ext. 8-3503).

— Adrienne Riley,  
Assistant Vice President,  
Human Resources  
— J. Bradley Williams,  
Manager, Compensation

### Notes:

**Quintile:** A salary range can be segmented in a number of ways. At Penn, salary ranges are divided into five segments to facilitate analysis of salary range utilization and to assist in salary setting. Managers are urged to contact the Compensation Office at Ext. 8-3503 to discuss specific salary management concerns. Note: pay grades P11 and P12 have no range maximums and thus no quintiles, since these are senior positions.

**Hiring Maximum:** Individuals are generally hired at rates which fall between the salary Range Minimum and the Hiring Maximum. Salary offers above the Hiring Maximum require advance consultation with the Compensation Office.

## OF RECORD

### University of Pennsylvania Human Resources/Compensation Monthly-Paid Salary Scales by Quintile, Effective February 1, 1993

Next Scheduled Salary Structure Review: January 1994

Quintile:	1st		2nd		3rd		4th		5th	
Grade	Range Minimum				Hiring Maximum				Range Maximum	
P01 Annual	19,700	22,060	24,420	25,700	26,780	29,140	31,500			
Monthly	1,641.67	1,838.33	2,035.00	2,141.67	2,231.67	2,428.33	2,625.00			
P02 Annual	21,700	24,320	26,940	28,200	29,560	32,180	34,800			
Monthly	1,808.33	2,026.67	2,245.00	2,350.00	2,463.33	2,681.67	2,900.00			
P03 Annual	23,900	26,760	29,620	31,000	32,480	35,340	38,200			
Monthly	1,991.67	2,230.00	2,468.33	2,583.33	2,706.67	2,945.00	3,183.33			
P04 Annual	26,200	29,360	32,520	34,100	35,680	38,840	42,000			
Monthly	2,183.33	2,446.67	2,710.00	2,841.67	2,973.33	3,236.67	3,500.00			
P05 Annual	28,800	32,300	35,800	37,600	39,300	42,800	46,300			
Monthly	2,400.00	2,691.67	2,983.33	3,133.33	3,275.00	3,566.67	3,858.33			
P06 Annual	31,900	35,336	38,773	40,600	42,209	45,645	50,800			
Monthly	2,658.33	2,944.70	3,231.06	3,383.33	3,517.42	3,803.79	4,233.33			
P07 Annual	35,000	38,603	42,207	43,700	45,810	49,414	55,900			
Monthly	2,916.67	3,216.95	3,517.24	3,641.67	3,817.53	4,117.82	4,658.33			
P08 Annual	38,500	42,371	46,242	48,100	50,113	53,984	62,500			
Monthly	3,208.33	3,530.91	3,853.49	4,008.33	4,176.08	4,498.66	5,208.33			
P09 Annual	42,300	46,540	50,780	52,900	55,020	59,260	68,800			
Monthly	3,525.00	3,878.33	4,231.67	4,408.33	4,585.00	4,938.33	5,733.33			
P10 Annual	47,400	52,136	56,872	59,200	61,608	66,344	77,000			
Monthly	3,950.00	4,344.67	4,739.33	4,933.33	5,134.00	5,528.67	6,416.67			
P11 Annual	54,500	-----	-----	68,200	-----	-----	-----			
Monthly	4,541.67	-----	-----	5,683.33	-----	-----	-----			
P12 Annual	63,700	-----	-----	77,700	-----	-----	-----			
Monthly	5,308.33	-----	-----	6,475.00	-----	-----	-----			

### University of Pennsylvania Human Resources/Compensation 35-Hour\* Weekly-Paid Salary Scale by Quintile, Effective February 1, 1993

Next Scheduled Salary Structure Review: January 1994

Quintile:	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th		
Grade	Range Minimum		Hiring Maximum		Range Maximum		
G04 Annual	11,400	12,460	13,520	14,000	14,580	15,640	16,700
Weekly	219.23	239.62	260.00	269.23	280.38	300.77	321.15
Hourly	6.264	6.846	7.429	7.692	8.011	8.593	9.176
G05 Annual	12,500	13,640	14,780	15,300	15,920	17,060	18,200
Weekly	240.38	262.31	284.23	294.23	306.15	328.08	350.00
Hourly	6.868	7.495	8.121	8.407	8.747	9.374	10.000
G06 Annual	13,600	14,840	16,080	16,700	17,320	18,560	19,800
Weekly	261.54	285.38	309.23	321.15	333.08	356.92	380.77
Hourly	7.473	8.154	8.835	9.176	9.516	10.198	10.879
G07 Annual	14,500	15,920	17,340	18,100	18,760	20,180	21,600
Weekly	278.85	306.15	333.46	348.08	360.77	388.08	415.38
Hourly	7.967	8.747	9.527	9.945	10.308	11.088	11.868
G08 Annual	15,700	17,280	18,860	19,600	20,440	22,020	23,600
Weekly	301.92	332.31	362.69	376.92	393.08	423.46	453.85
Hourly	8.626	9.495	10.363	10.769	11.231	12.099	12.967
G09 Annual	17,100	18,800	20,500	21,400	22,200	23,900	25,600
Weekly	328.85	361.54	394.23	411.54	426.92	459.62	492.31
Hourly	9.396	10.330	11.264	11.758	12.198	13.132	14.066
G10 Annual	18,700	20,540	22,380	23,300	24,220	26,060	27,900
Weekly	359.62	395.00	430.38	448.08	465.77	501.15	536.54
Hourly	10.275	11.286	12.297	12.802	13.308	14.319	15.330
G11 Annual	19,900	22,040	24,180	25,300	26,320	28,460	30,600
Weekly	382.69	423.85	465.00	486.54	506.15	547.31	588.46
Hourly	10.934	12.110	13.286	13.901	14.462	15.637	16.813
G12 Annual	22,200	24,780	27,360	28,600	29,940	32,520	35,100
Weekly	426.92	476.54	526.15	550.00	575.77	625.38	675.00
Hourly	12.198	13.615	15.033	15.714	16.451	17.868	19.286
G13 Annual	24,400	27,560	30,720	31,400	33,880	37,040	40,200
Weekly	469.23	530.00	590.77	603.85	651.54	712.31	773.08
Hourly	13.407	15.143	16.879	17.253	18.615	20.352	22.088

\* Identical hourly rates by grade are applied to the 37.5-hour week and 40-hour week. Tables on these variations are available on request at Ext. 8-3503 or may be called up on PennInfo under the keyword "Salary."



# Speaking Out

## On Just Cause and CAFRs

In *Almanac* 11/17/92, the Senate Chair, Dr. David K. Hildebrand, presented a report, "Chronology of a Plagiarism Case," at the end of which he stated some opinions; I agree with some and am concerned about some others.

The first of my concerns is related to the use of the phrase "unsatisfactory case." If he thinks some things about the case were unsatisfactory, they should be stated.

My second concern is implying, even in passing, that the judging of a faculty member might be by "an administrator." The purpose of CAFR is to make investigations, reports and recommendations on any matter relating to academic freedom and responsibility within the school that may affect one or more faculty members. Administrators at any level, including the President, are not to be involved in the process other than when submitting a case for consideration or when asked for information (factual, not procedural).

My third concern is the suggestion that the faculty of a particular school may have such difficulties of judging a close professional acquaintance that it needs to be done by someone else. I do not think this is true. The committee is made up of duly elected members from the standing faculty and reflects a broad representation of the faculty most of whom probably would not "know" a faculty member who comes before them, however they should know conditions in the school which would help understand the facts around a case.

I agree with the statement that members of CAFR "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."

I agree that "when one considers the career-threatening gravity of the charges...[there is a] need for scrupulous fairness."

I agree that "we need good ideas."

I think that the experience of previous CAFRs could point the way to improving their function.

I am glad that there is the Task Force on Revision of Just Cause and other Personnel Procedures looking to achieve that.

Some suggestions for issues and changes are:

Clarification of issues of confidentiality. Clear and unambiguous regulations that can be understood by faculty members.

Clear sources of information and recommendations for when CAFRs should get legal counsel.

Clear information on the source of funding for legal counsel for CAFRs.

The term of service in a CAFR should be longer than one year and there should be overlap of terms of members. This is not presently the case for VCAFR; all the members have one year terms with no overlap.

— Alan M. Klide, Associate Professor of Veterinary Anesthesia and Chief Chair VCAFR

## On Improper Procedures and Just Cause

A plagiarism case involving my former close colleague, Dr. R. H. Whitlock, has been discussed in *Almanac* (July 14, September 22 and November 17, 1992). The Senate chair commented (November 17): "Let's not be too hasty. One unsatisfactory case, by itself, does not justify junking a procedure." This comment prompts me to summarize my experiences with these procedures in the School of Veterinary Medicine (SVM), where I was four times a member of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (VCAFR), twice elected chair, once resigned, once recused by myself, and once disqualified by a dean. My letter supports the needs for revision of Procedures and correct handling of cases.

**VCAFR-1.** In 1965, Provost David Goddard hired an external lawyer to counsel myself and VCAFR in the handling of a complaint and counter complaint arising from the summary dismissal of a member of the academic staff. According to Goddard, University Counsel was responsible to the Administration, VCAFR to the faculty, hence he provided an external lawyer for VCAFR. Just prior to a formal hearing for just cause (Procedures 10.4.j.), University Counsel told me that a settlement had concluded VCAFR's role.

The lawyers now pointed out that my VCAFR had failed to sequester a group of members that could hold a hearing for just cause without bias. They explained that a CAFR performs two functions, investigation in each case and adjudication in selected cases (formal hearings for just cause). These functions have different objectives, have different methods, and should not overlap. Thus every CAFR should divide itself into two groups, one for each function, before accepting a complaint.

**VCAFR-2.** In 1984, Dean R. R. Marshak complained to VCAFR that a 1982 paper in *Science*, written by veterinary faculty about the bovine leukemia virus (BLV), presented selected and misleading data. He recommended to the chair, Dr. C. F. Ramberg, that his complaint should be handled by a Subcommittee of Inquiry that would review some of the evidence, such as laboratory books, then report to himself, the dean.

I cautioned Ramberg that this procedure was an invention of Marshak, and that it would exceed the investigative role of such a subcommittee, which is only to determine that the grounds of a complaint, if true, warrant a hearing for just cause (Procedures 10.4.e.). Instead, Marshak was suggesting that the procedures of this investigative sub-committee should include a partial review of evidence that supported his attribution of the blame to only one of the authors. Moreover, I reminded Ramberg that Marshak was the former head of the BLV project, hence liable to conflict of interest. (My appointment as acting-chair of my department, Clinical Studies at New Bolton Center, prompted my resignation from VCAFR, December 1985, and I lost close contact with the proceeding.)

Neither VCAFR-2 nor Marshak reported to the faculty or took public action, except for a belated retraction in *Science* (1989). One of the two authors left Penn. The other remained

and injected an AIDS-like virus, HTLV-1, into lambs, which were petted by children. Humans infected with this virus take up to 10 years before having symptoms.

**VCAFR-3A.** On November 25, 1987, Dr. L. T. Glickman, a professor of epidemiology, and myself, the Clark Professor of Nutrition, complained to VCAFR about certain actions of Dr. C. Johnstone. We requested a formal hearing for just cause (Procedures 10.4.j.), a process designed to determine the truth, allowing assistance from counsel, evaluation of the nature and weight of evidence, personal confrontation and cross-examination.

As chair of the 1987-88 VCAFR, I recused myself from further proceedings. Before leaving, I warned VCAFR against using the Marshak procedure, especially since Marshak was indebted to Johnstone as a fund-raiser. (In 1986, Johnstone presented his fellow professors with a computer printout which detailed that his efforts had brought in over \$37,000,000 more than the amount the SVM would have obtained at the same rate as Temple and Penn State.) I also warned against accepting advice from the Administration, suggesting instead that VCAFR should seek procedural advice from its Senate counterpart, SCAFR.

VCAFR elected Dr. V. J. Cristofalo as acting chair. He used the Marshak procedure, following advice from the Administration. A Subcommittee of Inquiry held a story telling contest to evaluate evidence, thereby subsuming a function but not the methods of a formal hearing. The subcommittee reported that it "did not feel that convincing evidence of deceit had been provided" (July 27, 1988). The report was given to the dean but not the faculty. The procedures used in VCAFR-3A were repeated in VCAFR-3B and later found invalid in several ways by SCAFR (*Almanac* April 17, 1990).

Glickman and I left Penn on September 30, 1988. On October 25, Dean E. J. Andrews wrote to us that VCAFR had "exonerated" Johnstone, an adjudication of sorts. He requested that we should write Johnstone "an acceptable letter retracting your allegations...and apologizing for the distress and harm...caused." We declined this request and sent our complaint to SCAFR, as described below.

**VCAFR-3B.** Dean Andrews wrote a letter (January 11, 1988) to me as VCAFR chair. He would bring a complaint against Whitlock before VCAFR and requested my "disqualification, for prejudice, from hearing this complaint." My recommendation was to delay a decision on disqualification until later in the proceedings, but VCAFR complied with Andrews' request and extended Cristofalo's role as acting chair. Cristofalo again implemented the Marshak procedure, which I'd warned against and which was later regarded as invalid by SCAFR-3 (*Almanac* April 17, 1990).

**Plagiarism.** Both complaints handled by the 1987-88 VCAFR, 3A and 3B, proposed that taking for oneself alone the writings and concepts of others that had been offered to be shared constitutes plagiarism. They differed in degree of seriousness, such as destructive

**continued past inserts**

effects on the SVM's academic program. Let me suggest a need for scoring plagiarism with a view to determining penalties: 1-3, verbal reprimand; 4-6, written reprimand; 7-8, suspension; and 9-10, termination. Here are four examples that portray the atmosphere of plagiarism in the SVM.

*Score 1.* An associate professor took over my lectures on gastrointestinal physiology. He used my mimeographed notes, only replacing my name with his. He asserted that there is no such thing as plagiarism in teaching.

*Score 4.* An assistant professor was due for promotion to tenure in the mid-70s. The candidate had plagiarized a review on a human disease when writing a chapter on the canine counterpart for a textbook of current veterinary therapy. Comparison showed that over 20 passages (ranging from phrases to sequences of sentences) were copied from the review to the chapter, which failed to cite the review. The candidate admitted extensive use of the review in his chapter but requested forgiveness on the following grounds: (i) instructions to authors limited the number of references and urged emphasis on available papers with clinical relevance (his few were to the disease in dogs), and (ii) the chapter was an exercise in continuing education, that is, teaching. The candidate was reprimanded verbally and promoted.

*Score 6 or 7.* In April of 1988, Dr. Allen J. Roussel told me in person that he had sent the draft of a review on chronic diarrhea in cattle to Whitlock, offering co-authorship. Whitlock then published the substance of this review in two places without Roussel as an author. Roussel was deeply disappointed in Whitlock but as a Christian had forgiven him. He regarded Whitlock as his teacher and could not tell how much of the innovative thinking was his own or Whitlock's.

In my reading of the paper(s), the only creative part was the combination of individual clinical presentations with epidemiological patterns in a herd in the differential diagnosis of chronic diarrheas. I had heard this approach presented by Whitlock in clinical rounds many times and for many years. By leaving off Roussel's name, Whitlock had taken his writing but not necessarily his concepts, which followed Whitlock's own. I would need to hear a discussion of this point between Whitlock and Roussel before deciding on the degree of this plagiarism.

*Score 10.* Johnstone was offered co-authorship of a document originally developed by myself, 1973-83, and expanded by Glickman, 1982-83. Johnstone was enlisted to seek funding. He left my name off the proposal and Glickman's off the first renewal of our joint Training and Applied Research Grant in Epidemiology and Animal Health Economics (TARG), which was initially funded at \$300,000 a year for six years by the state Department of Agriculture. In the TARG's second year, Johnstone informed Glickman and myself that he had deleted our names, mine from the proposal and Glickman's from the renewal, and assumed sole charge of the TARG.

*The Provost.* In response to our written and verbal complaints against Johnstone, Marshak urged us to please his fundraiser, who could hurt the SVM in Harrisburg as much as he had helped in the past. Later Marshak took actions against me personally that drove me to seek

help. Accompanied by Dr. R. E. Davies, I described these aggravations to Provost T. Ehrlich and Deputy Provost R. C. Clelland, October 1986. Following this discussion, I submitted a grievance against Marshak to the Faculty Grievance Commission (FGC) and a complaint against Johnstone to SCAFR, and tried in vain to keep the two actions separate.

*SCAFR-1.* During preliminary discussions, the chair of the 1986-87 SCAFR, Dr. R. Austin, an associate professor of law, suggested that the actions alleged by me to have been committed by Johnstone constituted theft of my writings and concepts, plagiarism, the first use of this word in this case. My written complaint, January 14, 1987, requested a formal hearing for just cause.

SCAFR-1 chided Marshak on "his use of salary to chill dissent and stifle candor of a faculty member" (April 30, 1987). SCAFR-1 surrendered my complaint against Johnstone to the FGC, with assurance that if my claim was not handled to SCAFR's satisfaction, SCAFR itself "might be prepared to go forward" (March 24, 1987).

*Grievance.* My grievance against Marshak was submitted to Dr. L. Gross, FGC chair, January 28, 1987. Gross favored merging my grievance against Marshak with my complaint against Johnstone. Upon finding the compounded problem unsuitable for customary FGC procedures, Gross recommended to Ehrlich that it should be submitted instead to a "mediator" for resolution. My lawyer advised me to decline mediation and continue to seek a formal hearing for just cause (Procedures 10.4.j), the adjudicative process that provides ways and means for determining truth. Upon my rejection of mediation, Clelland declared my grievance to have been withdrawn.

*SCAFR-2.* The new chair, Dr. I. Zandi, suggested in preliminary discussions with Glickman and myself, August 1987, that SCAFR would promptly tackle the complaint against Johnstone. Instead, the 1987-88 SCAFR decided to refer the complaint to VCAFR, one reason being that "it would allow for a test of the validity of your fear of outside influence" (November 13, 1987). VCAFR-3A used the Marshak procedure, as described above.

*SCAFR-3.* Following VCAFR-3A's improper action, Glickman and I returned our complaint to the 1988-89 SCAFR. We had left Penn and abjured any personal redress but remained concerned about Penn's integrity and honor. With Dr. J. R. Ross as chair, SCAFR-3 issued an opinion that procedures used by VCAFR-3 in the Whitlock and Johnstone cases were seriously flawed. If Dean Andrews declined to take further action in these matters, SCAFR would inquire into their substance. Andrews did nothing. Marshak divulged the Whitlock particulars to the professors in his department, prompting activities that culminated in VCAFR finding plagiarism.

*SCAFR-4.* After Andrews did nothing, the 1989-90 SCAFR resumed the Johnstone case. The chair, Dr. L. Shoemaker, reviewed our documents and held separate telephone discussions with Glickman and myself. Johnstone and Marshak, I'm told, were interviewed in person.

SCAFR-4 reported to Dr. A. Phillips, chair of the Faculty Senate, that "Dr. Kronfeld had the original idea of research and training in Epidemiology and Food Animal Economics,

having written several proposals that were not funded. Dr. Johnstone had the political contacts in Harrisburg to obtain funding, but needed a project. And Dr. Glickman had the background in epidemiology needed to strengthen the proposal" (May 11, 1990).

SCAFR-4 found that "there was no plagiarism because this project began as a 'shared' training proposal. However, Dr. Johnstone aggressively took control...after its initial joint development." Further, "there was an atmosphere of academic dishonesty...surrounding this research and training program...Marshak's inability to maintain an academic environment...resulted in the loss of two senior scholars."

SCAFR-4 recommended that (i) the SVM dean should make clear to his faculty that "deliberate attempts to force one's colleagues out of a grant will not be supported by the administration," (ii) that deans and faculties in all schools should be made "aware of what constitutes plagiarism in grant writing as well as what constitutes *other forms of malignant academic dishonesty, including taking credit for the work/writing of others with or without their consent*" (my italics), and (iii) a full copy of SCAFR-4's report should be sent by the Senate to VCAFR and "an edited version without names" to the SVM faculty.

To my knowledge, none of SCAFR-4's recommendations were implemented. The 1990-91 VCAFR, according to its chair, Dr. J. Melbin, received a redacted report without names, and the SVM faculty received nothing. The Johnstone case petered out when an essential feature of Procedures was not followed—no report was submitted to the faculty.

*Conclusion.* The above events and experiences were described to focus attention on points that should be addressed in the writing and implementation of Procedures. The first is an obvious need to ensure the competence of CAFRs. I had expected the incompetence of VCAFR but was dismayed to find SCAFR so unable or unwilling to assume a compensatory role.

The different functions of investigation and adjudication need to be clearly delineated in the Procedures. Investigative groups should be aware of their limited purpose, which is, at least in my reading, to determine whether the grounds for a complaint, if true, would warrant a hearing for just cause (Procedures 10.4.e.). They should not trespass into deciding the truth, for they have not the means. For example, they should not receive or evaluate evidence, because the proper ways and means for these activities are relegated to a formal hearing. The "burden of proving by a preponderance of evidence" (Procedures 10.4.j.) is reserved for a formal hearing. Its use as a guideline by the Subcommittee of Inquiry in VCAFR-3(A) was inconsistent with that group's investigative methods and indicative of its misguided purpose.

The respective roles and occasionally rival interests of the Administration and the faculty need to be clearly differentiated. In my experience, VCAFR has been consistently and improperly influenced by the SVM's deans. In contrast, the provosts, Goddard and Ehrlich, were impartial, constructive and knew their place.

Concepts of misconduct should be defined and consistent. The taking for oneself alone the writings and concepts of others that were



offered to be shared, and the proceeds therefrom (such as publications, grant funds and academic opportunities), has been generally regarded as plagiarism. *Yes*, it was plagiarism, according to the 1987-88 VCAFR, when done by an ordinary faculty member. *No*, it was not plagiarism, according to the 1989-90 SCAFR, when done by a fundraiser and approved by a dean. This last principle should be struck down rather than be left as a precedent in the University of Pennsylvania.

— David S. Kronfeld, Elizabeth and William Whitney Clark Professor

### From Dr. Marshak

Unreconciled to the fact that on a number of occasions his peers have found his charge of plagiarism against Dr. Colin Johnstone to be groundless, Dr. Kronfeld, under the guise of discussing "Improper Procedures for Just Cause", has once again dredged up his discredited catalog of gripes and accusations. During his tenure at Penn, Dr. Kronfeld's pattern of destructive behavior permanently alienated virtually all of his closest colleagues.

— Robert Marshak  
Professor of Medicine

### From Dr. Johnstone

It is disappointing that *Almanac* has chosen to allow Dr. David Kronfeld to wash, in public, years of "dirty linen" under the guise of criticizing "just cause procedures."

David Kronfeld is well known for his propensity to harass colleagues and former friends who opposed his candidacy for chairman of the department of clinical studies at New Bolton Center. He first turned his attention to me in December, 1985. In a meeting with our colleague, Professor William Chalupa, he expressed his displeasure on my refusal to support him for the vacant chairmanship and stated, in a specific reference to me, "I know how to deal with him and I will." In January 1986, Kronfeld began a campaign which has not yet ended. It has included a long list of complaints, rumors, and allegations, including plagiarism.

Dr. Kronfeld's article gives the appearance, at first glance, of authorship by a concerned critic of procedures used to investigate allegations of misconduct in the School of Veterinary Medicine. Since Kronfeld was involved in some of the complaints he cites as examples, his opinions should be seen as self-serving as well as being tainted by conflicts of interest. In addition, his article includes statements that are plain wrong or quoted out of context.

Four examples illustrate some of these points.

1. Kronfeld claims that "...no report was submitted to the faculty." In fact, Drs. Ross and Shoemaker submitted reports to the Faculty Senate, at least one of which was published.

2. In his paragraph beginning "Score 10," Kronfeld reiterates his charge of plagiarism as though it had been proved and merited a score of 10 (termination). However, not only does he omit that he failed to provide convincing evidence to support his charge (VCAFR-3A), but he also waits a further nine paragraphs before informing your readers of SCAFR-4's conclusion that "there was no plagiarism."

3. I am flattered that Dr. Kronfeld would give me sole credit for the splendid state appro-

priation results during Bob Marshak's tenure as Dean of the School of Veterinary Medicine (see VCAFR-3A). However, I must assure your readers that I hold no such illusion and neither should they. The architect and leader of our successful efforts in Harrisburg was Dean Marshak. He was helped by a wonderfully dedicated array of individuals and groups including Jim Shada (retired Associate Vice President for Commonwealth Relations), faculty, alumni, the Pennsylvania Farmers' Association, the State Grange, legislators, and many other "friends of the School."

4. Kronfeld states, "I had expected the incompetence of VCAFR but was dismayed to find SCAFR so unable or unwilling to assume a compensatory role." Since Kronfeld failed to get what he wanted he blames it on VCAFR's "incompetence" and SCAFR-4's unwillingness to play the role he demanded of it. This is a classic example of "killing the messenger because you don't like the message."

I would be the last to defend procedures used in this University to investigate allegations of misconduct. My own career was put on hold for five years while I defended myself in a process that was abominably slow, tortuous and unresponsive. That alone is a serious indictment of the process used in adjudicating the issues.

However, Kronfeld's complaint about procedures does not alter the central fact that he has had countless opportunities, during the last seven years, to air his grievances and prove his allegations before seven different University groups (VCAFR, four different SCAFRs, a Faculty Grievance Commission and the Veterinary School's Committee of Chairmen, in 1986). That he failed to prove his allegation of plagiarism, despite repeated attempts, should be enough to convince anyone that he had no case.

— Colin Johnstone, Associate Professor of Parasitology in Epidemiology and Health Economics/Vet

### From Dr. Ferrer

In his letter to *Almanac*, Kronfeld states that an article published in *Science* by Veterinary faculty contained inaccurate and misleading data. Kronfeld adds that one of the authors of the paper remained at Penn and injected an AIDS-like virus, HTLV-1 into lambs. Since, as Kronfeld is well aware, several articles published in *Almanac* and elsewhere have mentioned that I inoculated these lambs, he obviously does not need to mention my name to identify me as one of the authors of the *Science* paper.

By omitting facts of which he was fully informed, Kronfeld implies that I was guilty of misrepresenting the data reported in this paper. This implication is false and libelous. As Kronfeld knows, and as had been verified by a thorough investigation, immediately after I discovered that some of the data included by the first author of the paper were inconsistent, I informed the National Institutes of Health (NIH), Dean Marshak, Kronfeld (then acting Chair of my Department), and, soon afterwards, Deputy Provost Richard Clelland, and Vice Provost for Research Barry Cooperman. Contrary to Kronfeld's statement, it was I, not Marshak, who brought the matter to the Veterinary Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility. I expressed to Marshak,

Clelland and Cooperman my desire to publish a rectification or retraction as soon as the matter was investigated. The investigation, conducted in accordance with University procedures and with the agreement of NIH, concluded that the inconsistencies in the data reported were attributable to certain flaws in the assay used by the first author and commended me for taking the necessary steps to rectify the problem as soon as I discovered it.

Kronfeld's reference to the inoculation of HTLV-1 into lambs also contains seriously distorted implications. His assertions that HTLV-1 is an "AIDS-like virus", that the injected lambs were "petted by children," and that "humans infected with this virus (HTLV-1) take up to 10 years to develop symptoms" are clearly irrelevant to what he claims is the purpose of his letter, namely to point out the need to improve University procedures. Thus, the above assertions can only be interpreted as another of Kronfeld's characteristic attempts to harass his colleagues.

Aside from this, Kronfeld's assertions distort the facts that HTLV-1 is unrelated to the AIDS virus and has a different pathology, and that, as agreed by all experts in the field, HTLV-1 is not transmitted by contact, *i.e.*, by petting or touching an infected person or animal.

The use of misinformation, distortions, and innuendos undermines the credibility of Kronfeld's purported attempt to contribute to the improvement of Penn's Just Cause Procedures.

— Jorge Ferrer,  
Professor of Microbiology/Vet

### From Dr. Ramberg

Contrary to Dr. Kronfeld's statement, I was not chair of VCAFR in 1984. The incident he cited concerning the *Science* paper (VCAFR-2) was presented to VCAFR in 1986 by one of the authors of the paper and not by the Dean. The individual whose conduct was brought into question had already left the university. The issue did not involve procedures for just cause because there was no faculty member to consider for suspension or termination. The Dean asked us how he should proceed in handling what was essentially an inter-institutional matter beyond the purview of VCAFR. The problem was resolved through other channels without requiring further action by VCAFR.

Publicizing the confidential workings of CAFRs has the potential for doing harm to innocent parties and may dissuade faculty with legitimate complaints from coming forward to have them resolved. Responsibility for maintaining the confidentiality of privileged information goes beyond the term of membership on CAFRs.

— Charles F. Ramberg,  
Professor of Nutrition/Vet

### From Dr. Ross

Dr. Kronfeld's article is based on a fundamental mistake. His case was not a matter to be dealt with under the "just cause" procedures. Those procedures do not allow for a complaint to be brought by anyone other than the Dean, the President or Provost, or a duly elected Group for Complaint. There is no provision for individual faculty-versus-faculty complaints. SCAFR found in its formal opinion that VCAFR mistakenly treated the matter as falling under the "Just Cause" procedures

and then failed to follow the procedures by conducting a factual inquiry at a point where it was explicitly forbidden by the procedures; VCAFR then compounded its error by reporting to the Dean instead of to the faculty. There were lots of things that went wrong in the processing of Dr. Kronfeld's complaint, but none of them have any bearing on what revisions of the "just cause" procedures would be appropriate. I do agree with Dr. Kronfeld that it is a pity, indeed I say a sign of great trouble to come, that none of SCAFR's recommendations in the matter were followed. That failure is just one of a number of failures to respond effectively and responsibly to the opinions of the faculty committee elected under the Statutes of the Trustees to inquire into and make recommendations (even to the Trustees) on any matter affecting academic freedom and responsibility anywhere in the University. I will offer a survey of the outcomes of SCAFR's efforts during the last five or six years in a separate article for *Almanac* very soon.

— James F. Ross, Professor of Philosophy; former member and twice chair of SCAFR

### From Dr. Clelland

Acting on the advice of the Chair of the Faculty Grievance Commission and the Chair of the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (SCAFR), Provost Ehrlich did offer Dr. Kronfeld an opportunity to have his allegations investigated by a neutral party. Both chairs felt that his numerous and varied charges did not fall easily within the scope of either committee. We had arranged for a distinguished local lawyer to conduct this investigation. However,

Dr. Kronfeld chose not to accept this offer; instead, he applied again to SCAFR and wound up in the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility of the School of Veterinary Medicine with a more focused agenda.

I certainly did not declare Dr. Kronfeld's grievance to be withdrawn. For one thing, the Grievance Commission had never accepted his grievance. For another, I had no authority to take any such action. What was withdrawn was the offer of an investigation by a neutral party after Dr. Kronfeld had refused that offer.

I am tempted to launch into a lengthy commentary on Dr. Kronfeld's letter, but I shall not do so. Let me only say that much of the material that he discusses has nothing to do with the "Just Cause Process" but rather deals with other parts of our procedures for handling complaints against faculty. The faculty warfare that raged for several years within the Section on Nutrition of the Department of Clinical Studies at New Bolton Center was a most unhappy episode and one that did not show this institution in a favorable light.

— Richard C. Clelland, Deputy Provost Emeritus

### From Dr. Roussel

I would like to comment on Dr. David Kronfeld's account and interpretation of a conversation we had many years ago. He states that I regarded Dr. Robert Whitlock as my "teacher" and later states that he had heard the concepts that appeared in the contested paper "presented by Whitlock in clinical rounds many times and for many years." I regarded Dr. Whitlock as a revered colleague

and role model, but he was never my "teacher" in the classical sense since we were never at the same institution at any stages of my training or professional career. Later, Kronfeld states that I "...could not tell how much of the innovative thinking was his own or Whitlock's." This is not accurate. The first part of the paper in question was simply a review. Although it is written in my own words and completely referenced, I am certain that Dr. Whitlock could have written a similar review (possibly a superior review) from memory. The second part was of my own creation. If Dr. Whitlock presented a similar approach in clinical rounds, I was never privy to that presentation. No one ever argued that Dr. Whitlock was not *capable* of penning the paper that I wrote and he published. Surely he was. The simple fact is that he published my work in his name.

If I may, I would like to make another comment. When will the seemingly endless postmortem of this case that is being carried out in Penn publications and newspapers cease? I do not understand the intricacies of the University's mechanism for investigating cases of academic dishonesty, but it is clear that there was ample time to ensure that proper procedure was carried out. Dr. Whitlock endured a long and painful investigation, was found to be at fault and was punished. If the process by which cases like this are handled is flawed, fix it— but please let this case drop. Please let Dr. Whitlock and all of the parties involved get on with their lives. Far too much intellectual energy has been wasted dissecting the past.

— Allen J. Roussel, Jr., Associate Professor of Large Animal Medicine, Texas A&M University

## DEATHS

**Michael A. Lambert**, inventory coordinator at Wharton Reprographics, died January 20 at his home from complications arising from recent surgery to remove a brain tumor. He was 44.

Mr. Lambert came to Penn in 1981 and held several positions of increasing responsibility at Wharton Reprographics. In his most recent post he was responsible for purchasing paper and supplies.

He is survived by his wife, Patricia, and two sons, David and Robert.

**Feng Ling**, a Ph.D. candidate in differential geometry in the Department of Mathematics, died January 7 at the age of 28. A graduate of Fudan University in Shanghai, China, Mr. Ling took a master's degree there in 1990 and joined Penn the same year. Completing his Penn master's degree in May 1991, he became a teaching assistant that fall.

He is survived by his wife, Helen, and his parents, Jizhong Ling and Ma Xinge, from the Republic of China.

A memorial service for Feng Ling will be held on Wednesday, February 3, at 4 p.m. in Room 4C8 on the fourth floor of David Rittenhouse Labs.

**CrimeStats:** The report starting at right covers campus incidents over two weeks. For lack of space, details of the 18th District Report (9 incidents—7 robberies with 2 arrests, and 2 aggravated assaults with one arrest) have been held for a week. — Ed.

### 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 January 11, 1993 and January 24, 1993. 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:** Sexual assault—1, Simple assault—1, Threats & harassment—4, Indecent Exposure & Lewdness—1

01/11/93	10:54 AM	Lot # 44	Woman fondled by two suspects who fled area
01/13/93	11:47 AM	Van Pelt Library	Male exposing self
01/17/93	5:36 PM	Ward Dorm	Harassing phone calls received
01/17/93	8:32 PM	Houston Hall	Student struck by unknown male
01/20/93	11:42 AM	Steinberg/Dietrich	Threatening letter received
01/21/93	1:56 PM	Steinberg Center	Calls received both at home and work.
01/23/93	10:45 AM	Franklin Dorm	Unwanted calls received

**38th to 41st / Market to Baltimore:** Robberies (& attempts)—3, Aggravated Assaults—1, Threats & harassment—2

01/12/93	9:50 PM	3800 Block Sansom	Male attempted to rob 3 complainants
01/13/93	10:26 PM	4000 Block Irving	Male attempted to rob complainant/fled area
01/14/93	1:07 AM	Superblock	Report of males yelling racial slurs
01/16/93	10:56 PM	3911 Walnut Street	Male with gun took complainants mac card
01/20/93	10:29 AM	4033 Spruce Street	Unwanted phone calls received
01/23/93	2:24 AM	40th & Spruce	Male struck in face by passerby/arrest

#### Crimes Against Persons

**Outside 30th - 43rd / Market - Baltimore:** Threats & harassment—1

01/20/93	10:33 AM	425 S. 46th	Unwanted phone calls received
----------	----------	-------------	-------------------------------

#### Crimes Against Property

**34th to 38th / Market to Civic Center:** Burglaries (& attempts)—7, Total Thefts (& attempts)—45, Thefts of auto (& attempts)—1, Thefts from autos—3, Thefts of bicycles & parts—5, Criminal mischief & vandalism—3

01/11/93	2:14 AM	Franklin Dorm	Room broken into/various items taken
01/11/93	10:29 AM	Nichols House	Room entered/property removed
01/11/93	1:12 PM	3409 Walnut Street	Unattended purse taken from back of chair
01/11/93	3:34 PM	Lower Quad	Secured bike taken from railing
01/12/93	12:55 PM	Van Pelt Library	Unattended wallet taken
01/12/93	1:11 PM	Vance Hall	VCR removed from room
01/13/93	11:10 AM	Meyerson Hall	Unattended property taken from room
01/13/93	12:39 PM	Van Pelt Library	Credit card removed from wallet
01/13/93	2:32 PM	Houston Hall	Unattended wallet taken from counter
01/13/93	3:04 PM	Medical School	Gift taken from secured office
01/13/93	2:58 PM	Bookstore	Backpack removed from unsecured locker
01/13/93	3:04 PM	Lot # 3	Rear window broken to vehicle
01/13/93	4:05 PM	Quad	Check cashed when sent in mail
01/13/93	4:47 PM	Wilson dorm	Unattended wallet taken from unsecured room
01/14/93	1:17 PM	Furness Building	2 males attempted to snatch purse/fled scene
01/14/93	5:11 PM	Van Pelt Library	Unattended wallet taken
01/15/93	12:59 PM	3600 Block Locust	Secured bicycle taken from rack
01/15/93	1:21 PM	Vance Hall	Secured bike taken from rack
01/15/93	2:40 PM	Bookstore	Bookbag removed from unsecured locker
01/15/93	3:32 PM	Johnson Pavilion	Wallet taken from unattended backpack
01/16/93	12:56 AM	Hillel Foundation	Coat and contents taken
01/16/93	4:07 AM	Wistar Institute	Window broken/entry not gained

continued next page



# University Police Report continued from previous page

01/16/93	3:58 PM	Houston Hall	Unattended beeper taken by unknown juvenile
01/18/93	10:53 AM	Houston Hall	Unattended bag taken from outside room
01/16/93	4:59 PM	Provost Tower Dorm	Water thrown from 2nd floor at complainant
01/16/93	5:19 PM	Phi Sigma Kappa	Bike removed from 1st floor of residence
01/16/93	6:13 PM	Intercultural Center	North side window broken, entry not made
01/16/93	7:01 PM	Gimbel Gym	Property removed from unsecured locker
01/16/93	10:24 PM	Lot # 13	Van taken from lot
01/17/93	1:24 PM	Hillel Foundation	Guitar taken from basement area
01/17/93	4:49 PM	Alpha Chi Rho	Basement window broken/property taken
01/18/93	7:36 AM	Mcneil Building	Vending machine broken into/money taken
01/18/93	1:06 PM	Hillel Foundation	Unattended wallet taken
01/18/93	2:18 PM	3430 Sansom Street	Wallet removed from unattended jacket pocket
01/18/93	3:59 PM	100 Block 37th	Briefcase taken from unsecured vehicle
01/18/93	4:07 PM	Houston Hall	Wallet taken from jacket
01/18/93	4:57 PM	36th & Walnut	Checkbook left unattended in Mellon bank.
01/19/93	7:00 AM	3600 Block Spruce	Property taken from vehicle/arrest
01/19/93	11:09 AM	Hillel Foundation	Forced entry to rear door/stock room
01/19/93	3:31 PM	Goddard Labs	Computer taken from unsecured area
01/19/93	3:43 PM	Van Pelt Library	Jacket removed from 3rd floor
01/20/93	11:17 AM	Caster Building	Answering machine taken from room
01/20/93	2:42 PM	Bookstore	Merchandise taken from store/arrest
01/20/93	3:52 PM	Stouffer Dining	VCR taken from security booth
01/20/93	3:59 PM	Stiteler Building	Items removed from room
01/20/93	3:55 PM	Mcneil Building	Wallet taken from unattended backpack
01/20/93	5:34 PM	Duhring Wing	Camera equiPment taken from room
01/21/93	3:43 PM	Houston Hall	Wallet taken from unattended backpack
01/21/93	4:59 PM	Johnson Pavilion	Unattended bag with contents taken
01/21/93	9:40 PM	Stouffer Triangle	Camera removed from office
01/22/93	3:33 PM	Steinbrg/Dietrich	Unattended keys taken
01/23/93	5:06 AM	3420 Moravian Street	Establishment entered/unknown anything taken
01/23/93	9:50 AM	Anat-Chem Wing	Rooms had doors kicked in/unkn what taken
01/24/93	2:09 PM	University Hospital	Secured bike taken from rack
01/24/93	4:13 PM	3400 Block Sansom	Window broken/stereo removed from vehicle
<b>38th to 41st / Market to Baltimore:</b> Burglaries ( & attempts )—16, Total Thefts ( & attempts )—15, Thefts of auto ( & attempts )—1, Thefts from autos—5, Thefts of Bicycles & Parts—6, Criminal mischief & vandalism—7			
01/11/93	12:59 AM	Hamilton Court	Secured bike taken from bike rack
01/11/93	1:05 AM	126 S. 39 Street	Property removed from 1st floor
01/11/93	6:23 PM	Acacia	Unsecured room entered/items removed
01/11/93	9:05 PM	225 S. 41st St.	Entry through basement window/items removed
01/12/93	11:48 AM	Sigma Alpha Mu	Secured removed from residence
01/12/93	12:40 PM	3800 Block Walnut	Bike taken from 1st floor
01/13/93	5:35 AM	Sigma Alpha Mu	Male with bike/dropped sAme and fled
01/13/93	4:05 PM	4044 Walnut Street	Juvenile threw rock through window
01/13/93	7:02 PM	39th & Chestnut	Wallet removed from purse
01/15/93	12:23 AM	Tau Epsilon Phi	Basement entered/two jackets taken
01/15/93	2:40 AM	3917 Pine St.	Window broken by unknown
01/15/93	12:08 PM	Hamilton Court	Secured bike taken from courtyard
01/15/93	1:54 PM	4000 Block Walnut	Window broken to vehicle/nothing taken
01/15/93	4:13 PM	223 S. 41st Street	Property removed from residence
01/16/93	7:06 AM	St. Marys Church	Fop tag removed from vehicle
01/16/93	9:45 AM	3935 Walnut Street	Male refused to pay for food/warned
01/16/93	12:29 PM	4000 Block Irving	Front right tire slashed to
01/16/93	1:37 PM	41st & Locust	Both right side tires slashed to vehicle
01/16/93	1:53 PM	Sigma Nu	Left rear passenger window broken
01/16/93	9:04 PM	Tau Epsilon Phi	Bike removed from residence
01/17/93	1:20 AM	4051 Locust St.	Residence entered/nothing reported stolen
01/17/93	3:53 AM	High Rise North	Fire extinguisher discharged/no smoke or fire
01/17/93	4:02 PM	3800 Block Spruce	Motorcycle taken from area/after recovered
01/17/93	7:55 PM	3800 Block Sansom	Items removed from vehicle
01/18/93	4:27 PM	239 S. 41st St.	Residence entered/property removed
01/18/93	4:50 PM	Sigma Alpha Mu	Residence entered/bike taken
01/19/93	9:42 AM	3960 Pine Street	Residence entered/items removed
01/19/93	6:32 PM	4035 Walnut Street	Window broken/radio taken
01/20/93	2:39 PM	210 S. 41st	Secured bike taken from residence
01/21/93	1:44 AM	Beta Theta Pi	Suspect apprehended in house
01/21/93	10:30 AM	Harrison House	Currency removed from desk
01/21/93	12:45 PM	North Serv Drive	Tag taken from vehicle
01/21/93	3:58 PM	3900 Block Pine	Secured bicycle taken from rack
01/21/93	9:48 PM	3924 Spruce Street	Residence entered/items taken
01/22/93	8:30 AM	4000 Block Locust	Items removed from vehicle
01/22/93	11:05 AM	200 Block 40th	Car stereo taken from auto
01/22/93	1:26 PM	4034 Spruce Street	Apartment entered/items removed
01/24/93	10:15 PM	3916 Pine Street	VCR taken from residence
<b>41st to 43rd / Market to Baltimore:</b> Burglaries ( & attempts )—5, Total Thefts ( & attempts )—4, Thefts of auto ( & attempts )—1, Thefts from Autos—2			
01/12/93	3:20 PM	200 Block 43rd	Complainant flim flamed by two actors
01/14/93	2:37 PM	43rd & Spruce	Property removed from vehicle
01/15/93	4:47 PM	300 Block 43rd	Radio removed from vehicle
01/17/93	3:30 AM	238 S. 44th Street	VCR taken from residence
01/17/93	8:43 PM	4400 Spruce Street	Window broken/ignition taken from vehicle
01/18/93	12:57 AM	4220 Walnut Street	Residence entered through window/property taken
01/19/93	2:37 PM	4400 Spruce Street	Room entered/items taken
01/23/93	1:18 AM	4201 Pine Street	Entry front window/stereo receiver taken
01/24/93	3:29 AM	4105 Locust Street	Residence entered/various items taken
<b>30th to 34th / Market to University:</b> Total thefts ( & attempts )—20, Thefts of Auto ( & attempts )—3, Thefts from Autos—5, Thefts of Bicycles & parts—1, Criminal Mischief & Vandalism—5			
01/11/93	9:18 PM	Tennis Pavilion	Unsecured vehicle entered/items removed
01/11/93	7:23 PM	Lot # 29	Steering column damaged to vehicle
01/12/93	6:47 PM	Lot # 29	Vehicle taken from lot
01/12/93	9:48 PM	Hill House	Doors with scratch and pry marks/no entry
01/13/93	8:37 AM	Towne Building	VCR taken from secured cabinet in room
01/13/93	11:36 AM	3100 Chestnut	Vehicle broken into/juvenile apprehended
01/14/93	2:25 PM	Weightman Hall	Property removed from room
01/14/93	4:25 PM	Morgan Building	Bike taken from 2nd floor
01/14/93	4:55 PM	Morgan Building	Radio taken from 2nd floor
01/15/93	12:09 AM	Lot # 1	License taken removed from vehicle
01/16/93	7:41 PM	Moore School	Vending machine glass broken
01/19/93	10:30 AM	Bennett Hall	Headphones taken from secured room
01/19/93	4:32 PM	Hutchinson Gym	Wallet removed from locker
01/19/93	6:01 PM	Lot # 45	Window broken/car phone removed
01/20/93	8:44 AM	Tandem Lab	Coffee maker removed from room
01/20/93	11:03 AM	Hill House	Items removed from room
01/21/93	11:53 AM	Moore School	Computer taken from room
01/22/93	10:01 AM	Hutchinson Gym	Contents removed from locker
01/22/93	10:31 AM	Hutchinson Gym	Contents removed from locker
01/22/93	12:05 PM	Lot # 37	Stereo speakers taken from auto
01/22/93	1:10 PM	Hutchinson Gym	Contents taken from locker
01/23/93	6:54 PM	Lot # 33	Vent window broken to auto/radio taken
01/24/93	12:11 AM	Lot # 5	Window damaged to parked auto
01/24/93	3:57 PM	Lot # 5	Vehicle taken from lot
01/24/93	4:46 PM	Lot # 29	Trunk damaged to vehicle
<b>Crimes Against Society</b>			
<b>38th to 41st /Market to Baltimore:</b> Alcohol & drug offenses—1			
01/22/93	1:21 AM	3900 Block Irving	Male apprehended after leaving scene of accident

# Update

JANUARY AT PENN

## CONFERENCE

**28** *Seminar Series for Landscape Professionals;* James van Sweden, Washington, D.C.; J.C. Raulston, North Carolina State; Henry W. Art, Williams College; Neil Diboll, Westfield, WI; Morris Arboretum. Cost/details: 836-1051 or Morris Arboretum 247-5777, Ext. 156. Also February 2-3.

## EXHIBIT

**27** *The Liberal Arts: The New York Circle of Carl Zigrosser, 1913-1940;* prints, letters, and diaries; 9 a.m.-4:45 p.m., Monday-Friday; Rosenwald, Van Pelt-Dietrich Library Center. *Through April 9.*  
*Photography in Honor of Black History Month;* reception 5-7 p.m.; Klein Art Gallery.

## FILM

**29** *8 1/2* (Fellini, 1963); anniversary screenings 7 & 9 p.m.; International House. Call 895-6542 for other dates. *Through February 7.* (Neighborhood Film/Video Project).

## FITNESS/LEARNING

**28** *Caregivers Support Group;* noon-1 p.m.; Room 301, Houston Hall. Info: Ext. 8-0313 (CCRN).  
**30** *Regional Open Forum on Media Arts;* 10 a.m.-4 p.m.; International House (Neighborhood Film/Video Project).  
**31** *Pennsylvania Council on the Arts Open Forum and Workshops;* noon-4 p.m.; International House (Neighborhood Film/Video Project).

## TALKS

**27** *APP Processing in a Human Neuronal Cell Line;* Virginia Lee, pathology; 4 p.m.; Grossman Auditorium, Wistar (Wistar).  
*Creating Protagonism: Trade Unionism in Guatemala City During the Post-1954 Era;* Deborah Levenson-Estrada, history, Columbia; 4:30 p.m.; History Lounge, College Hall (History, Latin American Cultures).  
**28** *Generalization of Euler's Principal Axes;* Harvey Lipkin, Georgia Institute of Tech.; 2 p.m.; 337 Towne Bldg. (Mechanical Engineering).  
*U.N. Hiring;* Director of a U.S. State Department office; 5 p.m.; 285 McNeil Building (CPPS).  
*The Visual Image of the Jew in Early Modern Europe: From Symbolism to Realism;* Richard Cohen, Yale, Hebrew University; 5:30 p.m.; Gates Room, Van Pelt Library (Jewish Studies Program).  
*Suspended Sentences: Playing Dead in the Works of J.M.R. Lenz;* Patricia Anne Simpson, Michigan; 8:15 p.m.; Max Kade Center (Germanic Languages and Literatures/Germanic Association).



**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).