

# Almanac

Tuesday, February 9, 1993

Published by the University of Pennsylvania

Volume 39 Number 21

## INSIDE

- Council: Pluralism, Academic Integrity, p. 2
- A-1/A-3 Fair, TIAA-CREF, Speaking Out, p. 2
- Code of Academic Integrity, pp. 3-6
- Death, Bulletins, Update, p. 7
- CrimeStats, Calls for Volunteers, p. 8

**Pullout: Proposed Procedures  
Governing Sanctions  
Taken Against Members  
of the Faculty, pp. I-VIII**

## From the Provost

It is with great sadness and regret that I shall be leaving the University. The sadness comes from having to say good-bye to the many talented people I have come to know during my years here—gifted scholars and teachers, able and hard-working administrators and staff, and live-ly and demanding students. It has been challenging and stimulating—and fun—to work with so many capable people and I have learned a great deal from them in our interactions together.

Penn is a great University that promises to become even stronger. It has a reputation for developing creative and successful solutions to the challenges it faces, and I am confident that it will continue to be one of the great research universities at the frontiers of education, research and scholarship in the 21st century. It has been my privilege to be entrusted with a key leadership role during the last six very challenging years.

Illinois is also one of the great research universities in the nation and has a wonderful reputation. It is a step up for me in terms of responsibility, and I look forward to the new challenges that this move will bring.

— Michael Aiken

## Provost Mike Aiken to Illinois as Chancellor

Dr. Michael Aiken, Penn's Provost since 1987, has been chosen as chancellor of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Dr. Stanley O. Ikenberry, president of the University of Illinois system, will take his name to the Illinois Board of Trustees for approval on February 12. Dr. Aiken's scheduled date for assuming the post is July 1.

At Penn, President Sheldon Hackney has not named an acting provost, in anticipation of completing the search for a new provost to take

office on July 1. The Senate Executive Committee will hold a special meeting on February 17 (see page 2) to name members to the consultative committee for the search.

"Saying good-bye to Michael Aiken will indeed be a bittersweet occasion," Dr. Hackney said. "We are delighted for his opportunity to lead this fine university, though we will miss him greatly. His management and planning abilities have made an invaluable contribution to Penn over the last eight years. It is a compliment to Penn that his accomplishments here made him the resounding choice at Illinois. We have a tradition of growing future college and university presidents here. Mike isn't the first; he won't be the last; but he is one of whom we can be proud."

Among other changes made since Dr. Aiken became Penn's 26th provost are the establishment of the Undergraduate Initiatives Fund to seed new programs, the Council of Graduate Deans and a new vice-provostship to enhance graduate education, the Provost's Council on Research to develop cross-school efforts and University-wide strategies, and the Council on International Programs to coordinate and expand programs overseas. He has also led in the development of the Minority Permanence Development Committee to support recruitment

(continued next page)



Taking Office July 1: Michael Aiken

## Kahn Distinguished Professor: Dr. Narmour of Music

Dr. Eugene Narmour, an international figure in music theory who is also well known for the significant time and energy he puts into leadership of student performing groups, has been named the Edmund J. Kahn Distinguished Professor in the School of Arts and Sciences.

The prestigious chair was endowed in 1986 by Louise Kahn in memory of her husband, a Wharton '25 alumnus who headed the Dallas Cotton Exchange. It was formerly held by Dr. Stephen Nichols of Romance Languages, who is now at Johns Hopkins.

SAS Dean Rosemary Stevens described Dr. Narmour as "an outstanding intellect and scholar who has been a member of our Department of Music for more than 20 years" and "played a leading role in shaping the department's intellectual and pedagogical missions."

In music perception and cognition, Dr. Narmour "is known for his willingness to tackle difficult issues, a reputation he established early in his career," the Dean added. "His first book, *Beyond Schenkerism: The Need for Alternatives in Music Analysis* (1977), boldly challenged the Schenkerian analysis of musical structure that had dominated the field of music theory for half a century. After completing this iconoclastic major work, Dr. Narmour set for himself the task of determining a theory of melody. This project has

most recently resulted in the publication of *The Analysis and Cognition of Melodic Complexity: The Implication-Realization Model* (1992)." Another of his titles is *Explorations in Music, the Arts and Ideas* (edited with Ruth Solie, 1989). "Professor Narmour's research is at the forefront of scholarship and thought concerning the fundamental question of how music is put together—or, viewed from the perspective of the listener, how we hear and understand it," the Dean continued. "His work is of exceptional breadth, consistency and originality, and has earned him international recognition among music theorists and musicologists. A person of innate musicianship and artistic perception, Dr. Narmour is highly regarded by students and peers."

Dr. Narmour took his B.M. from the Eastman School of Music at the University of Rochester in 1961, and his M.A. there the following year. After some five years as a tenured assistant professor at East Carolina University, where he was also music director of the institution's summer theater, he joined the University of Chicago as a lecturer and conductor of the orchestra while pursuing his Ph.D.

Brought to Penn in 1971 as an assistant professor and as conductor of the University Orchestra, University Choir, and Choral Soci-



Kahn Professor: Eugene Narmour

ety, Dr. Narmour completed his Ph.D. in 1974 and was promoted to associate professor in 1976—and also named undergraduate chair of the department. A full professor since 1987, he has chaired the department twice, in 1980-83 and 1990-93.

Twice a Fellow of Wolfson College, Oxford, Dr. Narmour has also been a visiting lecturer at the Sibelius Academy in Helsinki and visiting professor at the Central Conservatory of Music in Beijing. Later this year he will take up residence as a Fellow of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford.

## Provost to Illinois from page 1

and retention of minority faculty, graduate students and staff. The 21st Century Fund and its goal of raising \$35 million for recruiting minority faculty are part of the \$1 billion Campaign for Penn, now passing the \$917 million mark with nearly two years to go. Dr. Aiken is also credited with the emphasis on endowed chairs that has characterized the Campaign.

A sociologist recognized internationally for his analysis of organizations and issues of community power and social change, Dr. Aiken came to Penn in 1984 from the University of Wisconsin, where he had risen from assistant professor in 1963 to professor in 1970 and served as associate dean of the College of Arts and Letters in 1980-82. During that time he held visiting professorships at Columbia, at Washington (St. Louis), and on many occasions at Leuven and Louvain. Joining Penn as chair of sociology, he became Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences a year later, and Provost two years after that.

### Senate: February 17 Meetings

**SEC on Provost Search:** Senate Chair David Hildebrand has called a special meeting of the Senate Executive Committee for Wednesday, February 17, from 3 to 4 p.m. in the Faculty Senate Office for the purpose of selecting faculty members to serve on the Consultative Committee for a Provost.

**Faculty on Just Cause:** Dr. Hildebrand also invites all faculty to an informational meeting on the Proposed Just Cause Procedures (*Almanac Supplement*, this issue) to be held Wednesday, February 17, 4 to 5:30 p.m. in the Faculty Senate Office, 15 College Hall.

### Joining an A-1/A-3 Education Fair

The A-1 and A-3 Assemblies are enrolling presenters for a March Education Fair they will host to provide all employees with information about undergraduate and graduate educational opportunities on campus. The fair will be held March 16 from noon to 2 p.m. in Bodek Lounge, Houston Hall. Schools and programs interested in participating may contact Laurie Cousart at 898-2290 to reserve a table. Each program should provide signs, handout materials, registration forms and cost estimates, as well as an experienced school representative to answer questions.

### Individual TIAA-CREF Counseling

TIAA-CREF individual counseling sessions are held each month on campus, in Houston Hall. All sessions are available on a first come, first serve basis. *Sessions are by appointment only and can be arranged by calling the TIAA-CREF Philadelphia Branch Office at 1-800-842-2010.* The schedule for February-June 1993:

Tuesday, February 16	Room 304, HH
Tuesday, March 16	Room 301, HH
Tuesday, April 10	Room 301, HH
Tuesday, May 11	Room 301, HH
Tuesday, June 8	Room 301, HH

If you are considering retirement, and need an illustration of benefit options, estimated benefit amounts, classification of quarterly statements, investment selection information, or any information regarding your investments in the TIAA-CREF plan, these sessions will be of value to you.

— Human Resources/Benefits

## Council February 10:

### Academic Integrity...Proposed Pluralism Committee

The February 10 meeting of the University Council has two items of new business on its agenda. One is a discussion on enhancing academic integrity (*see reprinted Code of Academic Integrity, starting next page of this issue*). The other is the introduction of a proposed revision of bylaws to create a Council Committee on Pluralism. It reads as follows:

#### *Proposed Amendment to the Bylaws*

The Pluralism Committee shall advise the Office of the President, the Provost, the Executive Vice President and the Vice Provost for University Life on ways to make and maintain a supportive atmosphere on campus for, and promote pluralism between, all members of the University community. The Committee will also address specific diversity issues that may arise on campus. The Committee shall consist of eight faculty members, three graduate/professional students, three undergraduate students, two administrators, and three A-3 staff members. The chairs of the A-1 and A-3 Assemblies, and the directors of the Penn Women's Center, the African-American Resource Center, the Greenfield Intercultural Center, the Office of Fraternity and Sorority Affairs, the Department of Residential Living, and the coordinator of the Program for the Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Community at Penn, shall be non-voting, ex-officio members.

#### *Charge to the Committee*

The areas in which the Committee shall report to the Council include diversity within the educational setting, integration of staff into the larger campus community, and ways to build communities that are non-discriminatory and provide a supportive environment for difference. The Committee will address specific diversity issues that may arise on campus, as well as review existing programs aimed at a more pluralistic campus environment and gather data on problems arising among the various constituencies in the student body. The Committee will make a special effort to be visible to, and communicate with, the campus community.

In its first year, the Committee will look to the report by the President's Committee on University Life (*Almanac Supplement* October 16|1990) to further develop its mission and goals.

Council shall activate this Committee as of September 1993.

## Speaking Out

### Thanks and Applause

*(The author addressed Dr. Hackney and sent the letter to Almanac for publication.)*

I write to thank you and applaud your message to the University community, *On Minority Permanence at Penn* (*Almanac* January 26). I am proud of the progress we've made under your leadership towards achieving a more pluralistic community. But we can and must do more. I believe your message acts as an inspiration and an incentive to sustain our commitment.

— Norton S. Taichman, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs/Dental Medicine

### 'Get On With Our Lives'

It was sad and indeed pitiful to see Dr. [David] Kronfeld continue to academically slander former colleagues at the University of Pennsylvania School of Veterinary Medicine under the guise of addressing "Improper Procedures for Just Cause" (*Almanac* January 26). I am sad because I see first hand the devastating effect such accusations have on colleagues. Unfortunately the mere accusation of plagiarism implies guilt and the accused bear the burden of proving their innocence. It appears that any group or committee which does not agree with Dr. Kronfeld's accusations is flawed or biased. Dr. Clelland's reference to the "faculty warfare" in the Section of Nutrition reminded me of my own unhappy experience during the time I was a resident and student in the section (1982-1986). During this time, Dr. Kronfeld made several attempts to turn me against his faculty colleagues, even urging me to leave. After Dr. Kronfeld left, the conflicts disappeared. The

remaining faculty are a cohesive, productive group whose working relationships are based on mutual respect and trust. As Dr. Roussel stated, it is time for all of us, including Dr. Kronfeld, to get on with our lives.

— David T. Galligan, Associate Professor of Animal Health Economics

### From Dr. Kronfeld

Further correspondence on improper procedures concerning academic freedom and responsibility (*Almanac* January 26 and February 2) testifies to the importance of the subject. I feel obliged to respond.

Dr. D. T. Galligan and Dr. A. J. Roussel plead to let two past cases drop. It is obvious why. Galligan has been a major beneficiary of the state-supported Training and Applied Research Grant in Epidemiology and Animal Health Economics which has provided him with abundant funds and academic opportunities. He is loyal to the individual controlling the Training Grant and less concerned with those who provided the academic basis for obtaining it. Roussel continues to be charitable but misses the point that discussion continues because doubts remain about procedures and outcomes.

The letter from Dr. R. C. Clelland and Dr. J. F. Ross indicated that the complaint of Dr. L. T. Glickman and myself against Dr. C. Johnstone about the Training Grant did not qualify for handling by the *just cause* procedures, which lead up to a formal hearing. We requested such a hearing because it is the best available procedure for determining the truth in matters such as plagiarism (allowing advice by

*(continued on page 7)*

# University of Pennsylvania Code of Academic Integrity

Since the most fundamental value of any academic community is intellectual honesty, all academic communities rely upon the integrity of each and every member. Faculty and students alike, then, are responsible not only for adhering to the highest standards of truth and honesty but also for upholding the principles and spirit of the following Code.

## I. Academic Dishonesty

Any of the following acts shall be considered violations of this Code.

**A. Cheating:** using or attempting to use unauthorized assistance, material or study aids in examinations or any other academic work, or preventing, or attempting to prevent, another from using authorized assistance, material, or study aids.

**B. Plagiarism:** using the ideas, data or language of another without specific and proper acknowledgement.

**C. Fabrication:** submitting contrived or altered information in any academic exercise.

**D. Multiple Submission:** submitting, without prior permission, any work submitted to fulfill another academic requirement.

**E. Misrepresentation of Academic Records:** misrepresenting or tampering with or attempting to tamper with any portion of one's own transcripts or academic record, either before or after coming to the University of Pennsylvania.

**F. Facilitating Academic Dishonesty:** knowingly helping or attempting to help another violate provisions of this Code.

## II. Promoting Academic Honesty

Since the maintenance of academic honesty is crucial to the educational mission of the University, this Code has both educational and judicial goals. These goals are to ensure:

- that the Code and its provisions are known and understood throughout the community,
- that all members of the community are involved in the process of updating and improving the Code,
- that the judicial procedures are carried out by representatives of all members of the community,
- that the judicial and educational processes are closely linked.

### A. Standing Committee on Academic Integrity

A University-wide Standing Committee on Academic Integrity shall be formed which has both educational and judicial duties. The Committee shall consist of three panels of five members each. During any given year two of the three panels will be primarily judicial in nature and one will be primarily educational in nature. The judicial panels shall be known as "Honor Boards".

### B. Educational Duties of the Standing Committee

The educational duties of the Standing Committee on Academic Integrity, which will be primarily the responsibility of the third, nonjudicial, panel, are:

- Develop an education program for both faculty and students. This program shall take place continuously throughout the year but especially in September when new students and faculty first arrive on campus. The programs shall take place in Departmental and School faculty meetings, in classrooms, in the residences, in New Student Week Programs, and anywhere else the SCAI considers appropriate. The SCAI shall enlist the help of all appropriate personnel in this endeavor, eg., Peer Advisors, Residential Advisors, and members of the Faculty and University Administration.
- Promote debate and discussion about the Code. The Code, and most particularly its means of administration, should not be static. The Committee shall serve as the main source of ideas for improvement of the Code and the main catalyst for discussions regarding the Code.
- Publication of the Code. At the beginning of the academic year the SCAI shall have the Code or a synopsis of the Code published in a readily accessible University publication. In the same publication there shall appear a list of Academic Support Services available at Penn to students. The SCAI shall also see that the following statement is printed in all University examination books:

*In the performance of this work I have complied with the Code of Academic Integrity.*

At the instructor's discretion, students shall be asked to sign their names to this statement before submitting their examination books. The SCAI shall also encourage the inclusion of this same statement on all other academic exercises.

4. Education is an important responsibility of all 15 members of SCAI, although the nonjudicial members will take a leadership role in these activities.

### C. Judicial Duties of the Standing Committee

All hearings involving violations of the Code of Academic Integrity shall come before the Honor Boards except when the school in which the respondent is enrolled has its own separate procedures. In cases where violations of both the Code of Academic Integrity and the Charter of the University Student Judicial System are involved, the proceedings under the Code of Academic Integrity shall normally take place before other proceedings.

### D. Composition of the Standing Committee on Academic Integrity (SCAI)

1. The SCAI shall consist of three panels of five members each, three faculty, one undergraduate and one graduate or professional student on each panel.

2. Faculty members shall serve for two-year terms with overlapping appointments. Students shall serve for one-year terms. If any member is unable to serve for any reason, a replacement shall be selected in the same manner as the original member was selected.

3. Student members shall be in good academic and disciplinary standing.

4. The members of judicial and educational panels shall be chosen for the specific panels by the Provost from slates submitted by the Senate Executive Committee (faculty), the Graduate and Professional Students Assembly (graduate/professional), and the Nominations and Elections Committee of the Undergraduate Assembly (undergraduates). The slates submitted to the Provost from each group shall contain twice as many names as there are positions to be filled from that slate. The Provost may appoint a given member to different panels during that member's two-year appointment. The chair of the SCAI shall be chosen by the Provost from the membership of the Committee and may also be the chair of one of the three panels.

5. If a member of a panel is unable to hear a case by reason of death, illness, or any other condition that cannot be accommodated by postponement for a reasonable time, and hearings have not commenced or substantially progressed, the JA shall designate a replacement member from alternates or other panels. If such disability occurs after hearings have substantially progressed, the remaining members of the panel shall proceed to hear the case. In the event the panel cannot reach a decision by the required majority of remaining members, the case shall be reassigned to another panel. Decisions as to whether postponement for a reasonable time is possible and whether hearings have substantially progressed shall be made by agreement of the JIO, the respondent, and remaining members of the panel, and failing agreement, by the JA. The JA's decision shall be final and not subject to appeal.

6. The Council of Undergraduate Deans, the Graduate Dean of the University and the Vice Provost for University Life shall each name a liaison to the Committee. Staff support shall be provided by the Provost.

## III. Procedures Relating to Violations of the Code

In all cases, when an instructor suspects a student may have violated this Code, the instructor should discuss the matter with the student privately before taking any other action. If an informal discussion does not resolve the question then the instructor and the student have the following options. (At any stage of this process before coming before the Honor Board, the complainant and/or the respondent may make use of the office of the Ombudsman, as described in Section III.E.)

### A. Instructor's Options

1. *The Grading Option.* An instructor who concludes that a student has violated the Code may assign the student whatever grade he or she considers appropriate either for the work in question or for the entire course, including a course grade of F. Within thirty days of detecting the alleged violation or



violated the Code may elect to assign no grade at all but rather to make a formal written complaint about the student to the Judicial Inquiry Officer. In this case, within thirty days of the violation or no more than ten days after the due date for grades in the relevant course, the instructor must notify the student in writing of his or her action and the reasons for it.

#### **B. Respondent's Options**

1. *Resolution with the Instructor.* The student may accept the instructor's decision communicated as described in A.1., in which case there shall be no further proceedings.

2. *Appeal to the Honor Board.* If the student does not accept the instructor's decision as communicated according to A.1., then within thirty days of receiving the instructor's notice of a grade, the student may file a petition with the Judicial Inquiry Officer asking that judicial proceedings be initiated. If the Honor Board finds a violation, all sanctions authorized by this Code are available.

3. *Settlement with the Judicial Inquiry Officer.* After judicial proceedings have been initiated, the student may make an informal settlement with the Judicial Inquiry Officer who shall consult with the instructor before making the settlement. All sanctions authorized by this Code are available in informal settlements. If this negotiation fails, the case shall then go to the Honor Board.

#### **C. Complaints of People Other Than the Instructor to the Judicial Administrator**

A person other than the instructor in a course may file a complaint with the Judicial Inquiry Officer alleging that a student has violated the Code. If the complaint involves a course, the Judicial Inquiry Officer shall notify the instructor of it. Unless the Judicial Inquiry Officer can settle the complaint informally, the case shall proceed to a hearing.

#### **D. Consolidation of Cases**

If a student's petition and a complaint against the student concerning the same matter are before the Honor Board at the same time, the Judicial Inquiry Officer shall consolidate both cases into one.

#### **E. Ombudsman**

If both the complainant and respondent agree, the case may be brought to the Ombudsman to achieve reconciliation to the satisfaction of the complainant and respondent. If reconciliation is achieved through the Ombudsman, the Ombudsman shall notify the JIO of the settlement so that records may be kept according to Section VIII of this Code.

### **IV. Judicial Procedures Relating to Violations of the Code**

The Honor Board serves a special function in the Academic Life of the University and is therefore not modelled after adversarial civil or criminal legal systems. It is not a court in the civil or criminal sense, and therefore the rules applicable to those systems do not necessarily apply to the proceedings of an Honor Board. The resolution of a complaint shall take place in separate, distinct stages, as outlined in this section. These stages are: The Complaint and Subsequent Investigation by the JIO, see IV.A.; The Settlement Stage, see IV.B.; and, The Hearing Stage, see IV.C. Since settlement between the JIO and the Respondent without going to a formal hearing is preferred, every attempt should be made to accomplish such a settlement.

#### **A. The Complaint and Investigation**

1. Any student, faculty member or staff member who believes that a student has violated this Code may file a written complaint with the JIO. Complaints made to others may be referred to the JIO. If the complaint is made by a person other than the instructor of the course involved in the complaint, the JIO shall inform the instructor of it. Within a reasonably prompt time after the filing of a complaint, the JIO shall inform the JA, the respondent and the complainant in writing of the complaint. The written notice shall also enclose a copy of this Code, a copy of the regulations, rules, or policies alleged to have been violated, and a summary of the rights and responsibilities of those involved in the process (complainant, respondent, witnesses and advisors), including the right of the respondent to be assisted by an advisor and the means for obtaining such an advisor, as defined in this Code, at each stage of the procedures, and the responsibility to observe confidentiality. Where a respondent is a graduate student the JIO shall verify that individual's current address with her or his department or school before providing written notice.

2. The JIO shall investigate complaints within the jurisdiction of the Honor Board and shall decide if there is reasonable cause to believe that an offense has been committed. The JIO shall make the determination of reasonable cause ordinarily after conducting a preliminary investigation. The JIO may interview any appropriate witness, including a potential respondent, but shall not do so until the witness has been furnished with a summary of

the rights and responsibilities of those involved in the process. All witnesses have the right to consult with an advisor, as defined in this Code, while being interviewed, and the JIO shall inform them that anything they say during this investigatory stage may be introduced as evidence at a formal hearing. During those interviews with the respondent, the JIO shall allow reasonable recesses of short (15 minutes, or so) duration to allow private conversations between the respondent and advisor. If the respondent has no advisor and at some point in the interview decides to obtain one, then the interview shall be recessed for a period not to exceed four working days.

3. In light of evidence uncovered by the investigation, the JIO may add charges beyond the scope of the original complaint, may add additional students as respondents, and may dismiss charges as unfounded. If, having dismissed charges as unfounded, the JIO concludes that there is reasonable cause to believe that the complainant knew the complaint was false, the JIO may initiate a complaint against that individual under this Code or, with respect to those not students, other available procedures.

4. The University may proceed under this Code regardless of possible or pending civil or criminal claims arising out of the same or other events. The JIO, with the concurrence of the VPUL after consulting with the General Counsel, shall determine whether the University shall, in fact, proceed with charges against a respondent who also faces related charges in a civil or criminal tribunal. If the University defers proceeding with charges against a respondent in light of related charges in a civil or criminal tribunal, the University may subsequently proceed under the Code irrespective of the time provisions set forth in the Code.

5. At any time after the filing of a complaint, the JIO, with the written approval of the JA, may place a "Judicial Hold" on the academic records of a respondent for the purpose of preserving the status quo pending the outcome of proceedings under this Code. When reasonably possible a respondent shall be given an opportunity to comment on a proposed Judicial Hold prior to its institution and otherwise shall be given that opportunity promptly thereafter. In addition, at the request of a respondent, the VPUL shall promptly review the propriety of a Judicial Hold. The JIO and the JA shall expedite the hearing of charges against a respondent whose academic records have been placed on Judicial Hold if the respondent so requests. A Judicial Hold may prevent, among other things, registration, the release of transcripts, and the awarding of a diploma.

#### **B. Settlement**

Informal settlement between the JIO and the respondent is the preferred way to resolve a complaint. It is expected that most complaints will be handled in this way. Settlement negotiations shall proceed expeditiously, and if settlement is not reasonably in prospect the case shall go to a hearing.

1. At some point in the investigation the JIO shall inform the respondent that he/she is interested in entering the "settlement phase" of the process.

2. If the respondent agrees, the settlement discussions will then commence. There should be a clear delineation between discussions about "investigation" and discussions about "settlement". If the two discussions are part of the same meeting, a short recess of 15 minutes or so, during which time the respondent has time for private conversations with his/her advisor, may be appropriate.

3. During all settlement discussions with the JIO the respondent has the right to have an advisor present.

4. Statements made by the respondent during settlement discussions shall not be introduced as evidence at any subsequent hearing of any kind, but may provide the basis for further investigation.

5. During a subsequent hearing the JIO shall not reveal any aspects of an unsuccessful settlement conference.

6. The JIO shall make reasonable efforts to consult with a complainant and the instructor about terms of settlement before the proposed terms are made final; however failure to consult with them does not invalidate the settlement.

7. The JA shall approve the terms of all proposed settlements before they take effect.

8. All sanctions allowed under this Code are available to the JIO during settlement.

9. Settlement may occur at any time after a complaint has been filed but prior to the disposition of a final appeal, if any. Settlements shall be recorded in writing, signed by the JIO, the JA and the respondent, who shall waive further proceedings under the Code.

10. Data on the pattern of sanctions imposed in any prior similar cases which were settled or decided within the past three years shall be made available by the JIO to the respondent during the settlement discussions. The identities of the respondents in these prior cases shall be scrupulously protected.

**continued past insert**

## C. Procedures for Hearings

### 1. Preliminary Procedures

- a. The two Honor Boards shall meet regularly, at set times and a set place to hear cases brought before them. It is expected that each Board will meet in alternate months, but additional emergency meetings may be called by the JA.
- b. The JA shall notify the complainant, respondent, and witnesses by hand delivery or certified mail, return-receipt requested, of the hearing place, time and date, at least ten days before the hearing date. This notice shall also contain the names of the panel members assigned to hear the case. If this notice is given by mail, it shall be deemed to be effective when mailed.
- c. Within a reasonable time and in any case not less than two days before the hearing, the JIO, the complainant, and the respondent shall exchange among themselves and with the JA copies of the exhibits to be introduced, the names of witnesses to be called and a brief summary of the testimony expected to be presented on direct examination. In exceptional circumstances, when a witness or exhibit becomes known or available immediately before the hearing, the JA may, at his or her discretion, admit the witness or exhibit or reschedule the hearing. The JA shall promptly provide members of the panel with the names of the complainant, the respondent, and witnesses.
- d. If a party anticipates that a key witness will be unavailable for a hearing, the party may preserve the testimony of the witness on audio tape and introduce it as evidence at the hearing. All interested parties, including the JIO, the JA, the complainant and the respondent, must be notified in advance of the time, place and date of the testimony to be taped. All parties who would be permitted to cross examine such a witness at a hearing may cross examine the witness at the recording session. This, too, shall be recorded.
- e. Upon receiving a written request by any party, the JA may expedite proceedings involving graduating students or students who are about to take a leave of absence or study elsewhere.

### 2. Disqualification of Board Members

- a. Members of an Honor Board panel shall disqualify themselves from hearing a case if they believe in good faith that, as a result of information previously acquired about the case or individuals involved in it, the nature of the alleged violation, or any other cause, their capacity for making an impartial judgment upon the evidence is, or to reasonable members of the community may appear to be, impaired. Members should not disqualify themselves for any other reason. Mere service on another panel involving the same respondent is not grounds for disqualification.
- b. A respondent or complainant may object for specific cause to any Board member scheduled to hear the case; any existing objection must be written and received by the JA at least five days before the hearing. The conduct of a Board member during a case shall not be grounds for disqualification but may be considered on appeal. Upon ruling that a challenge is valid, the JA, after notifying the respondent, complainant, and the JIO, shall replace the challenged member with another from the same category. This replacement member shall come from the third, primarily educational, panel.
- c. A respondent or complainant may object for good cause to the replacement member within a reasonably prompt time of the member's appointment, but no later than the beginning of the hearing. The JA shall rule upon the objection.

### 3. Conduct of Hearings

- a. All hearings shall be held in appropriate University facilities designated by the JA and shall be private unless both the respondent and complainant request an open hearing in writing to the JA. The JA may in any case limit attendance at a hearing to ensure fair and orderly proceedings.
- b. The JA shall preside over all hearings but she or he shall not vote with the panel on either a verdict or appropriate sanctions.
- c. The JIO shall present at the hearing relevant evidence supporting the charges.
- d. All hearings shall be conducted in such a manner as to permit the panel to achieve substantial justice. Participants and observers shall conduct themselves in accordance with these objectives.
- e. Formal rules of evidence shall not apply. Evidence, including hearsay evidence, shall be admitted if it is relevant and not unduly repetitious, and is the sort of evidence on which responsible persons are accustomed to rely in the conduct of serious affairs.

- f. The JIO, the respondent, and the complainant shall have the right to present and cross-examine witnesses.
- g. No evidence other than that received at the hearing shall be considered by the panel.
- h. The panel may proceed to hear evidence against a respondent in her or his absence, upon proof by the JA that the required notice was provided.

### 4. Advisors

- a. At each stage of the procedures provided by this Code, a respondent and complainant may be assisted by an advisor who is a member of the University community (student, faculty or staff). If criminal charges are pending or in the judgment of the JIO are reasonably in prospect against a respondent, she or he may be accompanied by an advisor who is an attorney who is not a member of the University community. Such an advisor may not, however, question witnesses or address a panel except as provided below with respect to advisors generally.
- b. During the hearing, the advisor may consult with her or his advisee, but, unless granted permission to do so by the JA, may not question witnesses or address the panel, except that an advisor may make a summary statement to the panel before it begins private deliberations. The time allowed for such summary shall be set by the JA. Permission to an advisor to question witnesses or to address the panel may be withdrawn.
- c. Any advisor who refuses, or repeatedly fails, to abide by the procedures of this Code or rulings in the case may, after due warning, be disqualified from continuing to serve by vote of a majority of the panel, which decision shall be subject to immediate review by the JA. In the event the disqualification is upheld by the JA, the panel may (but need not) proceed in the absence of a replacement advisor. Any person who is disqualified from serving as an advisor, whether or not a member of the University community, shall be ineligible again to serve as an advisor for a period of two years.

### 5. Decisions of the Board

- a. The Board's deliberations shall be divided into two separate stages:
  - (i) determination of guilt or innocence; and, if guilt is determined,
  - (ii) determination of a sanction.
- b. The Board shall presume a respondent innocent until proven guilty by a preponderance of the evidence.
- c. All decisions shall require a majority vote of the Board.
- d. As soon as possible after conclusion of the hearing, and in all events within ten days, the Board shall present its written opinion, including findings of fact, and the Board's conclusions therefrom, to the respondent, the complainant, the JA and the JIO.

### 6. New Evidence

- a. Upon the discovery of new and material evidence, the respondent, complainant or JIO may petition the Honor Board for a new hearing by filing a written request with the JA stating the evidence to be presented and the reason for the failure to present the evidence initially. The JA shall furnish a copy of the petition to the other parties, who may respond in writing.
- b. If the JA concludes that it is reasonably possible that the new evidence would alter the original Board's judgments, then the original Board, or as many members as are available, shall rule on the petition, considering (among other relevant factors) the reason for the respondent's, complainant's or JIO's failure to discover or present the evidence initially and the likely effect of the omission upon the original decision.
- c. A new hearing, if granted, shall be before the original Board and shall be limited to the new and material evidence.

### 7. Failure to Appear or Cooperate

- a. A fair, conclusive adjudication of a dispute under this Code depends on the cooperation of all involved persons, including complainants, respondents, and witnesses. Therefore, all community members who may be interviewed are obliged to provide honest, complete statements to the JIO and to the Honor Board in order that disputes may be equitably resolved as quickly as possible.
- b. Sanctions
  - (i) The Board may recommend that any sanction authorized by this Code be imposed upon a student who is a complainant, respondent or witness and who fails, without good cause, to appear for

a hearing after receiving notice thereof or fails, without good cause, to cooperate with the investigation of the JIO. However, a witness may not be required to incriminate her or himself.

- (ii) A student who receives a sanction under this section may, within ten days, file a petition with the JA for removal of the sanction or for a hearing under this Code on the propriety of the discipline. The petition shall state the reasons for the student's failure to appear or cooperate. The panel that recommended the sanction, or as many members as are available, shall rule on the petition, considering (among other relevant factors) the reason for the student's failure to appear for the hearing or cooperate with the JIO.

- (iii) A hearing, if granted, shall be conducted in accordance with the procedures contained in this part IV.B.

#### D. Calculation of Time Intervals

For the purpose of calculating days, only the Fall and Spring academic terms shall be considered, except when a complaint is filed against a student enrolled in either of the summer sessions, in which case the summer sessions also shall be considered.

Unless otherwise provided, days shall be counted on a calendar basis, including Saturdays, Sundays, but not University holidays.

#### V. Sanctions

If the Honor Board finds that a student has violated the Code, it shall impose or recommend to the Dean of the student's school an appropriate sanction. Before the Board considers a sanction, the Judicial Inquiry Officer shall inform the Board whether the student has previously violated the Code and the sanctions, if any, that were imposed or recommended in those cases. This includes cases that were decided by Honor Boards, settlements with the instructor, and settlements with the JIO. Data on the pattern of sanctions imposed in any prior similar cases which were settled or decided in the past three years shall also be made available to the Panel at this time.

##### A. Available Sanctions

The sanctions that the Board may impose by its own authority are the following: warning, reprimand, withdrawal of certain privileges, a period of mandatory service to the University community, and probation for a fixed or indefinite period of time. The sanctions that can only be imposed by the Dean of a student's school and therefore must be recommended by the Board to the Dean are the following: suspension for not longer than two years, indefinite suspension without the automatic right to readmission, expulsion, and notation on transcript. If the Dean of the student's school is a complainant, or if there are other kinds of conflict, the Dean shall name a designee for the sanction phase of the case at the beginning of the case, or at such time that the conflict appears.

##### B. Appropriate Sanctions

The sanction for a violation of the Code usually will be a one- or two-semester suspension from the University in the case of a first violation or an expulsion in the case of a second violation. In egregious cases the Board may recommend a disciplinary notation on the student's transcript. The Board, however, may weigh such factors as the extent of the misconduct, the degree to which the student premeditated the misconduct, the student's awareness of the seriousness of the violation, the student's prior disciplinary record, and any special circumstances relating to the case.

##### C. Notation on Transcript

As stated above, in especially serious cases, the Honor Board may recommend that a student's Dean place a notation on a student's transcript, either for a fixed or indefinite term, stating that the Board has found the student guilty of violating the Code and citing the charge and the sanction.

##### D. Instructor's Grade in Cases Involving the Honor Board

After the Honor Board has decided upon a complaint, the Judicial Administrator shall inform the instructor or the person who initiated the complaint of its decision. If the Board has found the student not guilty of violating the Code, the instructor should then assign a grade—which may differ from the grade he or she first assigned—based on the student's academic performance in the course. If the Board has found the student guilty of violating the Code, the instructor may assign any grade he or she wishes. In either case, the instructor should inform the student in writing within ten days of the grade that he or she has assigned.

#### VI. Appeals

A complainant or respondent may file an appeal with the Executive Committee or equivalent of the relevant school.

##### A. Procedures

1. A respondent, complainant or JIO must submit any appeal to the

Executive Committee, in writing, with a copy to the other parties and the JA, within fourteen days of the sending of the Board's or the Dean's decision; the appeal shall state in detail the specific ground upon which it is based, and shall attach a copy of the charge and the decision.

2. Upon receipt of an appeal, the JA shall provide the Executive Committee with any exhibits considered by the Board in reaching its decision.

3. The Executive Committee shall review the appeal within ten working days of their receipt of it. Upon request of the JIO, the complainant or the respondent, or upon their own motion, the Executive Committee may hear oral argument.

4. The Executive Committee shall issue its decision reasonably promptly, but no later than thirty days after receipt of the notice of appeal.

##### B. Scope of Review

1. Appellate review shall be limited to material and prejudicial procedural error, error in the interpretation or application of the Code, and the severity of sanctions. Findings of fact may be reversed only if those findings are unsupported by substantial evidence.

2. Upon finding error, or that the facts were not supported by substantial evidence, the Executive Committee may vacate or reverse the decision, or return the case to the Honor Board which did not originally hear the case for a new hearing.

3. When considering the severity of the sanctions, the Executive Committee may not increase the sanctions as a result of an appeal.

#### VII. Confidentiality of Records and Proceedings

The identity of individuals in particular cases before the JIO, the Honor Board, or the Executive Committee, and all files and testimony, are confidential, in accordance with University guidelines concerning the confidentiality of student records pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, as amended. All members of the University community shall respect the confidentiality of judicial records and proceedings, mindful of the unfairness that can result from selective disclosures, partisan representations, and the inability to respond to such disclosures and representations. Failure to observe the requirement of confidentiality by a member of the University community, other than a respondent, who is involved in a case in whatever capacity, shall constitute a violation of University rules and subject the individual to the appropriate procedures for dealing with such violations. If a respondent discloses, causes to be disclosed, or participates in the disclosure of, information that is otherwise confidential, any person whose character or integrity might reasonably be questioned as a result of such disclosure, shall have a right to respond in an appropriate forum, limited to the subject matter of the initial disclosure.

When guilt is determined, the Dean of the respondent's school shall be informed and the record of the case shall be made available to him or her.

#### VIII. Reports

Subject to the requirements of Part VII above, the JIO, in consultation with the JA, shall make public reports at the beginning of each year and periodic reports as may be appropriate. The purpose of such reports is to inform the University community about the character and extent of the work of the Judicial System, including the nature of the violations of the Code and the sanctions imposed.

The reports of the JIO shall deal both with cases that go to hearing and with cases that are settled before hearing, including cases settled with the instructor and/or with the help of the Ombudsman, and shall include information such as the overall number of cases handled during the preceding year, broken down by cases that were settled and cases heard by Boards, general descriptions of the type of cases handled, the number of cases in each general category, the range of sanctions imposed, the numbers of determinations of guilt and innocence, and so forth. Periodic reports shall inform the University community about recurring or, as determined by the JA, extraordinary violations of the Code and the sanctions imposed for such violations.

##### Addendum: Please note the following partial list of Academic Support Services available to students:

Office of Academic Support Services .....	8-0809
3820 Locust Walk/6134	
Career Planning and Placement Service.....	8-7531
20 McNeil Building/6209	
PENNCAP.....	8-6440
High Rise East/6134	
The Tutoring Office.....	8-8596
3820 Locust Walk/6134	
University Counseling Service.....	8-7021
Mellon Building/3246	
University Reading/Study Improvement Service.....	8-8434
Graduate School of Education/6216	



**Dr. Holden Furber**, emeritus professor of history, died January 19 in Bedford, Mass. He was 89.

A specialist in the history of India and the British Empire, Dr. Furber joined Penn as an associate professor of history in 1948 after teaching at the University of Texas and serving with the Office of Strategic Services in the Research and Analysis Branch (British Empire) during World War II. He was promoted to full professor in 1955 and was chair of the department of history between 1959-61.

He was a 1923 alumnus of Harvard who took a doctorate there in 1929 and also earned bachelor's and master's degrees from Queen's College, Oxford University.

He was a Guggenheim Fellow, a visiting lecturer at the University of Madras and visiting professor at the University of Bombay, and winner of the prestigious Watumull Prize of the American History Association in 1949 for his book *John Company at Work* (Harvard, 1948), one of five he published in his field. Dr. Furber also published several articles in journals such as *American Historical Review*.

Dr. Furber is survived by his wife, Lucy Richardson Furber, and many cousins.

## HIV/AIDS/Safer Sex Awareness Week

**February 8-12** Condom-gram sale; Locust Walk. Delivery on February 12.

**February 9** *Eroticizing Safer Sex Workshop for Men*; Al Vernacchio and Albert Angelo, human sexuality; 8 p.m.; Castle, 36th & Locust Walk.

**February 11** *Eroticizing Safer Sex Workshop for Women*; Susan Vassbinder, training education specialist; 8 p.m.; Room 305, Houston Hall.

**February 16** *Fraternity Brothers Get AIDS Too*; Joel Goldman, former asst. exec. dir., Sigma Alpha Mu and T.J. Sullivan, coordinator, GAMMA; 7 p.m.; McClelland Lounge, Quad.

*Eroticizing Safer Sex for Gay & Bisexual Men*; Ernie Green, human sexuality; 8 p.m.; The Castle, 36th & Locust Walk.

**February 18** *LGAU Monthly Meeting "AIDS Awareness"*; Cindy Patton, Temple, researcher/author of *Sex and Germs—The Politics of AIDS*; 7:30 p.m.; Smith-Penniman Room, Houston Hall.

**February 24** *Eroticizing Safer Sex for Women*; 8 p.m.; High Rise East Roof Top Lounge.

**February 25** *Women and AIDS*; panel discussion; 5 p.m.; Nursing Education Building, Room number available at Ext. 3-3525.

*NAMES Project National AIDS Quilt Slide Show*; Mary Pat Kane, photographer, activist; 6:30-8 p.m.; Room 310, Houston Hall. To verify time: 573-3525.

## Speaking Out *continued from page 2*

counsel, evaluation of the nature and weight of evidence, personal confrontation and cross-examination). Instead, our complaint against Johnstone, like that against Dr. R. H. Whitlock, was subjected to an investigative subcommittee that had misdirected purpose and improper operation (*Almanac* April 19, 1990). In view of the comments of Clelland and Ross, let me suggest that the *Task Force on Revision of Just Cause and Other Personnel Procedures* should consider inclusion of a formal hearing in personnel procedures other than *just cause*.

Dr. J. Ferrer fails to see the connection between the improper CAFR procedure introduced by former Dean R. R. Marshak for the handling of his case and the embarrassing incident of the lambs. Let me explain; bad event A may lead to bad event B. When an improper procedure—and investigation subcommittee reporting to an adjudicating dean—is compounded by the conflict of interest of the dean, and the result is unbalanced (the assignment of all blame to one author, who leaves, and zero blame to the other, who stays), then the underlying weakness may remain active and lead to further untoward consequences. Proper and impartial handling of this case may have identified the need for improved supervision and immunological competence in the Bovine Leukemia Unit, and that result may have prevented the petting of the HTLV-1 inoculated lambs.

The administrative sanctions imposed on Ferrer, as described in the letter from Dr. W. Chalupa and others (*Almanac* February 2), were not previously known to me and, if true, would be deplorable. I would regard such administrative restriction on Ferrer's academic opportunities as bad event C, deriving through bad event B from bad event A, administrative interference with VCAFR.

Dr. C. Johnstone is "the last to defend procedures" even though he takes refuge in the final outcome—failure to follow SCAFR's recommendations, as noted by Ross. (The ball in his case was dropped somewhere, I think, between SCAFR, the Faculty Senate and VCAFR). Johnstone takes comfort in SCAFR's clearing him of plagiarism, even though this involved inventing "another sort of academic dishonesty, falling short of plagiarism, but not less malignant" (*SCAFR report to Faculty Senate* May 11, 1990). He still fails to see the consequences of his removal of Glickman and myself from our Training Grant (about \$2,000,000 of state funds and associated academic opportunities) on the School's academic program and on the Grant's return to animal agriculture in Pennsylvania.

Dean Marshak applauds the performance of our peers, several CAFRs, in handling the Glickman-Kronfeld complaint against Johnstone, despite the 1989-90 SCAFR's comments on his "inappropriate actions, and his lack of leadership in maintaining an environment of academic integrity and responsibility within the Veterinary School" (*SCAFR* May 11, 1990). Marshak's *ad hominem* attack on my popularity does not justify his administrative encroachment on CAFRs, but the distraction does demonstrate his debating skill. Former colleagues tell me that Marshak is actively suggesting that I have been singing to legislators in Harrisburg about productivity of state appropriations for food animal agriculture. This suggestion is not universally believed but has troubled some of my former colleagues. In fact, I have not communicated with any Pennsylvania legislator since leaving Penn, and I believe that the School's record in animal agriculture speaks for itself.

— David S. Kronfeld,  
Elizabeth and William Whitney Clark  
Professor Emeritus of Nutrition/Vet

## Holding Events at the ICA

The Institute of Contemporary Art (ICA) at 36th & Sansom now makes space available for University-sponsored receptions, meetings and lectures, with the bonus that guests at such events can also see a current exhibition. The ICA has 15,000 square feet on multiple levels including the gallery, outdoor terraces, and the Tuttleman Auditorium, which seats 125-150. Contact Beatrice Fulton at Ext. 8-7108 for information on costs and scheduling.

## Update

FEBRUARY AT PENN

### CONFERENCE

**12** *Alter-Italies*; symposium on contemporary modes of Italian studies; 1-6 p.m.; Smith-Penniman Room, Houston Hall. *Also February 13* from 10 a.m.-6 p.m. (Center for Italian Studies, Romance Languages).

### FILMS

**10** *Community Visions*; videos by four Philadelphians concerning neighborhood issues; 7:30 p.m.; International House.

**14** *Out of the Forest*; 2 p.m.; Harrison Auditorium, University Museum.

### FITNESS/LEARNING

**17** *Desktop Publishing Interest Group*; topic: Aldus PageMaker Tips and Techniques; noon-1:30 p.m.; Bits & Pieces Room, Computer Resource Center (Information Systems).

### ON STAGE

**10** *Voloshky Ukrainian Dance Ensemble, Leja Dance Theatre and Pennsylvania Dance Theatre*; 7 p.m.; Movement Theatre International. Tickets: \$15/\$12, students half price. Info: 963-0345. *Also February 11 and 12* at 8 p.m. and *February 13* at 2 and 8 p.m. and *February 14* at 3 p.m. (MTI).

**16** *The Gospel of Luke*; a one-man performance of the King James version by Broadway actor Bruce Kuhn; 8 p.m.; Annenberg School Theater; tickets \$5, \$3/student ID; info: Hamlet Vazquez at 573-8389 or Anna Lee at 573-7473. *Also February 17* at 8 p.m. (Intervarsity Christian Fellowship).

### TALKS

**10** *Gilgamesh's Request and Siduri's Denial: A Literary Analysis*; Tsvi Abusch, Near Eastern and Judaic Studies, Brandeis; 4:45 p.m.; Gates Room, 1st floor Van Pelt Library (Asian and Middle Eastern Studies).

**11** *Problems of the Hand*; Peter Callegari, rheumatology; noon; Surgical Conference Room, White Building (Surgery).

*L'émergence de la littérature africaine francophone*; Kandoura Dramé, University of Virginia; 4:30 p.m.; Amphitheatre, 105 Lauder-Fischer Hall (French Institute for Culture and Technology).

**12** *Renal Transplant Medicine for the Non-Nephrologist*; Robert Grossman, medicine; noon; Agnew-Grice Auditorium, 2nd floor Dulles (Medicine).

(continued on page 8)

## 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 February 1, 1993 and February 7, 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:** Robberies ( & attempts )—1, Simple assault—1, Threats & harassment—5

02/01/93	7:51 AM	Nichols House	Annoying phone calls received
02/01/93	4:30 PM	Steinberg Center	Threats received via phone
02/02/93	3:57 PM	Faculty Club	Dispute between two employees
02/02/93	11:16 PM	3600 Block Chestnut	2 complainants robbed by 2 males with gun
02/03/93	10:35 AM	Clinical Research Building	Student harassed security officer
02/03/93	7:41 PM	Houston Hall	Juvenile male in women's bathroom
02/06/93	11:19 PM	Morris Dorm	2 complainants/obscene calls received

**38th to 41st/Market to Baltimore:** Robberies ( & attempts )—1

02/01/93	8:19 PM	3800 Block Sansom	Wallet taken by unknown suspect
----------	---------	-------------------	---------------------------------

**30th to 34th/Market to University:** Threats & harassment—3

02/05/93	2:08 PM	Hill House	Annoying phone call received
02/05/93	2:08 PM	Hill House	Annoying phone calls received
02/07/93	9:52 AM	Hill House	Obscene calls received
02/05/93	11:17 PM	4617 Pine St.	Complainant received threat on phone

### Crimes Against Property

**34th to 38th/Market to Civic Center:** Burglaries ( & attempts )—1, Total thefts ( & attempts )—16,

Thefts of bicycles & parts—1, Criminal mischief & vandalism—1

02/02/93	7:57 PM	Houston Hall	Unattended backpack taken from 2nd floor
02/02/93	8:03 PM	Houston Hall	Unattended property taken from 2nd floor
02/02/93	11:23 PM	Johnson Pavilion	Unattended wallet taken
02/03/93	12:16 PM	Stouffer Triangle	Items missing from package sent through mail
02/03/93	1:42 PM	Houston Hall	Male attempted to steal merchandise/arrest
02/03/93	2:29 PM	3409 Walnut St.	Male arrested/had knapsack reported stolen
02/03/93	2:21 PM	Phi Kappa Sigma	Secured bike taken
02/03/93	2:23 PM	100 Block 36th	Male arrested after taken merchandise
02/03/93	4:02 PM	Butcher Dorm	Clothing taken from room over Christmas break
02/03/93	8:38 PM	Medical School	Book removed from shelf in room
02/04/93	9:57 AM	College Hall	Lap top computer taken from room
02/04/93	2:18 PM	Stemmler Hall	Purse taken from room
02/04/93	3:25 PM	Vance Hall	Unattended wallet taken
02/04/93	3:27 PM	Johnson Pavilion	Unattended wallet taken from library
02/04/93	3:50 PM	Van Pelt Library	Unattended backpack taken
02/04/93	5:18 PM	Medical School	Unattended wallet removed from desk
02/06/93	2:34 PM	Alpha Chi Rho	Coat taken during party
02/07/93	3:02 PM	Morris Dorm	Broken mirrors in restrooms on 1st floor

**38th to 41st/Market to Baltimore:** Burglaries ( & attempts )—6, Total thefts ( & attempts )—6,

Thefts from autos—2, Criminal mischief & vandalism—3, Trespassing & loitering—1

02/01/93	12:19 AM	3900 Block Sansom	Passenger window broken to vehicle
02/01/93	2:08 AM	Kappa Delta	Basement door damaged/suspect fled area
02/01/93	4:18 PM	Wayne Hall	Property left unattended outside taken
02/02/93	1:27 PM	Penn Police Hdq	511 system tampered with at UPD headquarters
02/02/93	2:26 PM	300 Block 40th	License plate removed from vehicle
02/03/93	11:27 AM	Evans Bldg	Wallet taken from unsecured office area
02/03/93	5:14 PM	41st & Walnut	Passenger window to vehicle broken
02/04/93	1:30 PM	Evans Bldg	Briefcase taken from room
02/05/93	8:31 AM	3913 Baltimore	Window gates pried/property taken
02/05/93	9:52 AM	3951 Baltimore	Window broken/items taken
02/06/93	3:21 AM	3934 Sansom St.	House entered/VCR taken
02/06/93	3:34 PM	3934 Sansom St.	Complainant reported bike taken
02/06/93	8:10 AM	Harrison House	TV and VCR taken from secured room
02/06/93	4:02 PM	300 S. 41st St.	Items removed from vehicle
02/06/93	4:37 PM	Harnwell House	Articles removed from room
02/07/93	1:45 PM	St. Mary's Church	2 persons in closed church/arrested

**41st to 43rd/Market to Baltimore:** Burglaries ( & attempts )—1, Total thefts ( & attempts )—2, Auto thefts—1

02/01/93	8:26 AM	519 Woodland Terrace	Laundry room broken into/nothing taken
02/02/93	9:06 AM	4200 Block Pine	Unattended property taken from unsecured area
02/03/93	1:41 AM	4200 Block Walnut	Driver's window damaged/briefcase taken

**30th to 34th/Market to University:** Total thefts ( & attempts )—3, Possession of stolen property—1

02/04/93	1:46 PM	Blau House	Wallet taken from room
02/04/93	3:13 PM	Rittenhouse Lab	Male attempted to take purse/fled area
02/05/93	7:52 AM	Lot # 45	Male apprehended after breaking into auto
02/06/93	4:37 PM	Hutchinson Gym	Wallet taken from outside squash court

**Outside 30th - 43rd/Market - Baltimore:** Total thefts ( & attempts )—3, Thefts of auto ( & attempts )—1, Thefts of bicycles & parts—1

02/04/93	7:39 PM	519 S. 41st St.	Bike taken from lobby area
02/05/93	2:40 AM	4335 Spruce St.	Unattended jacket with ID taken
02/05/93	10:42 PM	Unit Block S. 31 St.	Two juveniles broke into vehicle/arrested

## 18th District Crimes Against Persons

1/25/93 to 1/31/93

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

Total: 15 incidents, 4 arrests

1/25/93	6:05 PM	4600 Woodland	Aggravated Assault	No
1/27/93	10:50 AM	4500 Larchwood	Robbery	No
1/27/93	6:23 PM	200 S. 46th	Robbery	No
1/27/93	10:14 PM	400 S. 344	Robbery	Yes
1/28/93	2:42 PM	4205 Chestnut	Robbery	No
1/28/93	5:01 PM	4330 Pine	Robbery	No
1/28/93	6:58 PM	4418 Osage	Aggravated Assault	No
1/28/93	9:34 PM	4813 Locust	Robbery	No
1/29/93	4:30 PM	6128 Sansom	Homicide	Yes
1/29/93	4:30 PM	4530 Sansom	Homicide	Yes
1/29/93	4:35 PM	4530 Sansom	Homicide	Yes
1/29/93	5:30 PM	4500 Sansom	Robbery	No
1/30/93	12:00 AM	4300 Spruce	Robbery	No
1/30/93	11:52 AM	3900 Chestnut	Robbery	No
1/31/93	1:20 AM	4000 Walnut	Robbery	No

# Update

(continued from page 7)

**16 Trimethoprim Induced Hypokalemia in AIDS;** Thomas Kleymann, medicine; 8 a.m.; Medical Alumni Hall, 1st floor Maloney (Medicine).

*L'environnement: bilan et perspectives;* Alain Carignon, mayor of Grenoble; 4:30 p.m.; Amphitheatre, 105 Lauder-Fischer Hall (French Institute for Culture and Technology).

**17 NMR Structural Studies of Membrane Proteins;** Stanley Opella, chemistry; 4 p.m.; Grossman Auditorium, Wistar (Wistar Institute).

*The Rise and Fall of the Commonwealth of Independent States;* Martha Brill Olcott, resident scholar, Foreign Policy Research Institute; 4 p.m.; FPRI Library, Ralston House (FPRI).

**Deadlines:** The deadline for the March at Penn pullout calendar is *February 9*. The deadline for the April at Penn pullout calendar is *March 16*. The deadline for the weekly update is a week before the week of publication.

## Volunteers for HUP

Volunteers are needed by the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania for a variety of patient care assignments such as visiting patients. The Department of Social Work and Community Health Services/Hospice at HUP will train. For information: Sara Thiermann at 662-2375.

## Workplace/Disabilities Info

Career Planning and Placement Service is working on a project to assist students with disabilities who are seeking employment. CPPS would like to talk to Penn staff or supervisors who have either requested or provided accommodations in the workplace. To assist by sharing information, call Suzanne Erb at 568-0212.

## Nutrition and Growth Study

The Nutrition and Growth Lab at the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia invites healthy children, ages 2-6, to participate in a growth and nutrition study which will investigate the type and amount of food children eat, how many calories they burn, and how it all relates to growth. To volunteer for the project, or for more information, call Babette Zemel, at 590-1669.



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, 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 Ruttrauff (Librarians); Shirley Purcell (A-3).