Judicial Administrator: Dr. Brobeck

Dr. John R. Brobeck (right), the Herbert C. Rorer Professor Emeritus of Medical Sciences, has been named Judicial Administrator of the University, for a three-year term starting immediately. Provost Michael Aiken made the appointment after consultation with Council Steering Committee Wednesday.

Dr. Brobeck succeeds Dr. Edward Shils, who resigned at the end of the fall term. Constance Goodman continues as Judicial Inquiry Officer and Dr. Daniel Perlmutter, professor of chemical engineering, remains the Appellate Officer in the campus judicial system.

Issues in Safety

Senior administrators and safety officers are looking at new ways to patrol streets on and near campus in the wake of a September 24 gang attack on a graduate student followed by a series of armed holdups in the area.

City and campus patrols increased this past year near 40th and Walnut, but Penn is talking with the City about more still more patrols; the University is considering expansion of staffing for the escort service; and the Undergraduate Assembly is organizing its proposed Town Watch, William Epstein of the President's Office said.

In an unrelated move, Senior Vice President Marna Whittington has released the report of the Public Safety Task Force set up a year ago. (See pages 3 through 6.)

GSAC Resolution on Safety

We, the members of the Graduate Student Associations Council, are disturbed by recent attacks on graduate students.

In particular, the attack on a Chinese graduate student appears to bear a disturbing similarity to the Cyril Lueng incident last fall. It has been suggested by some observers that there is a history of feuding between Black and Vietnamese teenage gangs in the area around the campus, and Asian students sometimes get caught in the middle of these retaliatory exchanges. We urge that this possibility be investigated carefully.

We urge that the University use its full influence to get the Philadelphia Police Dept. to vigorously address this recurring problem, which is a matter of concern not only for Penn students, faculty and staff, but for all members of the University City-Wide Philadelphia community.

We also suggest that a crisis intervention and conflict resolution team, from the Office of the City Managing Director, might be asked to assist with the problem of racial and ethnic inter-group tensions in the University City area.

College House Faculty Masters

On the recommendation of the House system's faculty-and-student selection committee, the Provost has appointed three new College House Faculty Masters—Dr. Risa Lavizzo-Mourey of the W.E.B. DuBois College House, Dr. Michael Zuckerman of Van Pelt College House, and Dr. Peter Steiner for the Modern Languages College House. He also appointed Dr. Solomon Katz as master of Ware College House and Dr. Karl Otto, Jr., as master of Stouffer College House, and named two Senior Faculty Residents for First-Year Houses—Dr. Matthew Santirocco to Butcher-Speakman-Class of '28 House, and Dr. Iraj Zandi to the Upper Quad House.

(The five College House masters are shown at left in the order named. Photographs of Dr. Santirocco and Dr. Zandi were not available.)

Dr. Lavizzo-Mourey, assistant professor of medicine and health care management with joint appointments in Medicine and Wharton, has as her main research interests the financing of long-term health care, prevention of disease and disability for older adults, and health issues related to elderly minority populations. She recently edited a book on Practicing Prevention for the Elderly, and is acting director of Penn Med's program in geriatrics.

Dr. Zuckerman, professor of history, explores the American national character in his research, and is currently working on a collection of biographical essays entitled Almost Chosen People.

Dr. Steiner, associate professor of Slavic Languages and secretary to the American Committee of Slavists, concentrates on comparative literature and theory. He is currently writing a book on modern Czech fiction in its social context.

Dr. Katz, a biomedical anthropologist holding appointments in Anthropology and Orthodontics, also directs the Wm. Krogman Center for Research in Child Growth and Development at the Dental School. His current research includes studies of nutrition, neuropsychological development and environmental lead levels, adolescent hypertension, pregnancy and prematurity, and aging and longevity.

Dr. Otto, professor of Germanics, is the undergraduate chairman of the department of Germanic languages and literature. He is currently researching seventeenth-century Germanic language and literature societies and working on a history entitled Deutschgesinnte Ge nossenschaft, which roughly translates as "German-minded societies."

Dr. Santirocco, professor and department and graduate group chairman in Classical Studies, came to Penn recently from Emory University and earlier was a pioneer in Columbia University's college house program. His scholarship focuses on Greek and Latin literature and thought, and he is completing a monograph on literary patronage in ancient Rome.

Dr. Zandi is a professor of systems and the National Center Professor of Resource Management in SEAS and Wharton. His research focuses on environmental engineering and resource utilization, particularly the application of systems methodology to issues of resource/energy and environmental management.
We Really Must Keep the “House of Our Own” Ours Own

It had been hoped that the situation that arose when the House of Our Own bookstore was notified that the lease was to be terminated next June could have been resolved internally. However, I have been informed that a Daily Pennsylvanian reporter overheard a conversation between a professor and a graduate student regarding the non-renewal of the lease and that this led to the story published on September 14, 1989.

Since then there has been a remarkable outpouring of protest from the University community. I have received phone calls, deputations, letters, and petitions, and have been stopped at several places on campus by people intent on letting me know about the intensity of their feelings that the University must do whatever it takes to keep that unique bookstore functioning here. By now I have sets of petitions with over 1,000 names on them. It is heartening to see that so many senior professors, students and others here care about a place that was founded specifically to have a friendly atmosphere and to bring students and other members of the University together. It has depended on volunteer help for nearly 20 years. An account of this has been published in The Daily Pennsylvanian of September 28, 1989 by my colleague on the Steering Committee of the Bookstore from the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly will be on the agenda of the meeting of the University Council on October 11, 1989.

I have brought the situation before the Steering Committee and have written to, and discussed it with, the Provost and the President. I believe that they have both been made aware of the interest that so many members of Penn and the academic community at large have in ensuring that that bookstore will continue. I also believe that they too wish to keep it here and have been assured that “We have to find a way.” I will be keeping a close eye on future developments.

Robert E. Davies

Speaking Out

Why Admissions Diversity

I am writing to respond to the issues about admissions raised in the articles by Sam Klausner and Bob Regan (Almanac September 19).

When I became Provost in January 1973, admissions was a sensitive issue as it always is. On my desk were several current and past reports of faculty/student committees, representing a broad consensus of opinions. It came down to this: the University’s admission policy should aim for diversity as well as academic quality. Special consideration should be given to academic merit, talent (athletic, musical, artistic), racial and ethnic background, gender, national and international geographic distribution. Affirmative action was a national policy, and, applied to each of these factors, meant that the admission staff should go out of its way to bring in large enough pools of applicants so that a highly qualified, diverse student body could be selected. “Qualified” was not defined by any single criterion. It meant that, in the judgment of the selection committee, the student had to be able to do the work and stay in school, and had to have the promise of enriching the student body. The Benjamin Franklin Scholars and University Scholars Programs looked for the academically talented student and the student capable of original scholarship. The athletic program was bent on recruiting scholar-athletes. The minority program worked to bring in a wide array of Black, Latino, and Oriental applicants. To achieve these goals, it became obvious that going into new geographical areas of the country was necessary not only to enlarge these pool sizes, but also to ward off the effects of demographic projections which said that the population of college-age people in the Northeast and mid-Atlantic were decreasing significantly. That was an economic as well as an academic threat.

When Lee Stetson came aboard as Dean of Admissions, it was his plan to increase the size and richness of the pools from which we would select our freshman class. This meant developing better mechanisms for reaching attractive new pools, and that couldn’t be done overnight. With the threat of declining college-age people projected for the mid-80s, starting in the late 70s was not a bad idea, even though it turned out that the decline in college applicants was not as severe as predicted.

No harm: we had a larger and richer pool of applicants to select from, thanks to the success of Lee Stetson’s efforts. And by all criteria, we have a stronger student body today than ever before, and it is greatly enriched by its diversity. Penn is highly competitive with the top schools of the country and getting moreso.

The issues surrounding admissions are so important that they should be under constant discussion, so we are indebted to the articles by Professors Klausner and Regan. But as long as we have diversity as the goal of our admissions policy, we have to go by multiple criteria in the recruiting and selection processes, and no one factor such as SAT scores or even the Predictive Index should be the sole criterion. Once you make this decision, then students are qualified on a broader or richer cluster of criteria. Once you have this state of affairs, it is easy to say that the system is unfair to particular students who were denied admission when, in fact, they could have matriculated and succeeded in graduating. But, you can’t take that position on geographic or any other ground without giving up diversity in the student body and selection on the basis of multiple criteria.

—Eliot Stellar, University Professor of Physiological Psychology in Anatomy/Med.
Community Policing for a Safer Penn Community

The Report of the Public Safety Task Force

Report and Recommendations

By virtue of the current nationwide concern for safety and security on university campuses, the University of Pennsylvania has a window of opportunity through which we can emerge as a leader throughout the state and the nation. The Penn community is urged by this task force report to accept both the challenge and the opportunity.

An educational institution such as Penn serves both local and global cultures. It has as one of its most serious responsibilities to provide this broad constituent community with the opportunity for academic excellence. However, to achieve this, the students, faculty, staff, and administration must accept their individual and collective responsibilities to make the University a place which is free of fear, and provide a civil and orderly environment which fosters learning, research and creativity. Such a setting is the only environment which can encourage the respect and growth of the individual, to which the University is dedicated. When students, staff and faculty flourish in their pursuits as a result of this setting, the University benefits as a community.

The members of the Public Safety Task Force concur in these expressed shared values of university campus life. It is with this belief that we submit the task force report, in recognition that for the University community to succeed in fulfilling the responsibilities associated with this vision, a wide range of support is required from all.

The Challenge: A Safer Community

As has been the experience of other universities, tragic events in recent years on both University property and in the immediate area have underscored the need to chart a new strategy with regard to the safety and security of Penn's population.

Penn's tragedies, including murder, rape, and other grievous bodily harm, culminated in a feeling of impotency within the community. A general loss of confidence developed in the ability of the University, and in particular the Department of Public Safety, to remedy the situation. As divergent views of the problem fragmented the community, the focus of effort became one of public and private accusation and blame, rendering the community itself less able to provide effective solutions to the problems confronting us. Indifference and apathy bred by cynicism and feelings of helplessness further retarded the development of appropriate solutions.

In June 1987, a report entitled "Recommendation for Residence Hall Security at the University of Pennsylvania" was issued. This report made several recommendations to improve the physical security within and around the residence halls. The Penn administration took immediate steps to implement these recommendations and is continuing to do so.

Subsequent consultant reports concentrated on an evaluation of the Department of Public Safety, including its organization, efficiency and effectiveness. These reports have reflected a need for a new direction and focus in light of contemporary research in policing which can enhance the ability of the Penn community to ultimately resolve the problems confronting us.

The Opportunity: Community Policing

Some of the most successful law enforcement agencies throughout the country have adopted a concept called "Community Policing." At its simplest, it is defined as the creation of a problem-solving partnership between the police and the community.

(continued)
Based on the knowledge that the police capacity to prevent or solve crimes is severely limited without citizen participation, the police, under this concept, take the initiative to create working ties with the community so that together they analyze problems, set operational priorities, and implement strategies appropriate to the resolution of each problem. Active citizen involvement potentially holds out a number of specific benefits:

- greater public awareness of crime problems
- a reduction in passivity and isolation
- increased sense of individual citizen's responsibility for dealing with the causes of crime
- a greater sense of shared responsibility for crime control
- enhanced collective action to prevent crime
- increased cooperation between police and community
- decreased likelihood of the public's singling out the police department and/or its leadership for blame
- expansion of resources in times of budget cutbacks

Closely allied to accountability and involvement of the community in decision-making is the principle that the community be kept informed both of crime and of police activities (subject to requirements of privacy for victims and secrecy for operations in progress). Information is not only essential for the community if it is to fulfill its own role in the partnership, but also leads to a supportive environment for the police.

Tailoring Community Policing to a University Community

Community Policing has some natural affinities with the academic community, where the principles of shared decision-making, accountability, articulation of values, and encouragement of initiative are well established.

At Penn, the community half of the partnership is both structured for involvement and strongly attuned to it. The hallmark of our governance system is diversity of representation on the many consultative and advisory bodies that concern virtually every operation in the University. Open communication is an equally strong tradition, fostered both in the media and in the accessibility of the most senior leadership for public question-and-answer sessions at times of crisis.

Since the beginning of police professionalization at Penn less than 25 years ago, some of the key elements of Community Policing have already been adopted even though the term itself is new, such as:

a) The establishment in 1974 of a personal safety and crime prevention specialist's position exemplifies problem-solving in response to expressed community need, and its structure (reporting to the Provost as well as to the Director of Public Safety) foreshadowed the dual accountability called for in Community Policing.

b) A forerunner of the present Council Committee on Safety and Security began at the same time as the tradition of interaction with the University police; diverse membership of faculty, students and staff was specified at the outset.

c) The Public Safety Department has long been proactive in on-site safety training for residence halls and offices, and in new student orientation. The Department began publishing crime data weekly long before the Commonwealth determined that data should be furnished annually—and presently in a format that not only counts incidents but indicates where and under what circumstances crime occurred.

So much has developed naturally out of Penn's own problem-solving tradition augurs well for a consciously adopted program of Community Policing.

The Police in Community Policing

Community Policing requires very different roles for police executives, officers, and the organizational structure.

By its very nature, Community Policing is a dynamic rather than a static enterprise. It is a model for solving problems rather than a fixed strategy for policing. To implement that model requires several things of police executives. First is a commitment by the chief executive to developing a community-oriented policing system over a period of years. (While short-term benefits do result, the more important principle is long-term change.) Second is the executive's commitment to a style of policing characterized by receptivity to community involvement. This means a continuing search for ways that the community can be involved in attaining police objectives and a continuing reinforcement of community efforts. And third is the executive's openness to change, to new solutions, and to ongoing development of departmental personnel through orientation and training at all levels of staff and command.

To implement a community-oriented policing model also requires substantial changes in the structure of the organization and its operations. Among the most important is a change in the basic reward system of the department so that at least a substantial part of the work force is rewarded for cooperative rather than individual effort and for the promotion of community objectives in policing.

A police department begins by incorporating into its own culture and operations five main elements:

- Shared decision-making with the community
- Accountability to the community as well as to the organization
- Articulation of values as the basis for all police actions
- Decentralization of authority and structure
- Encouragement of officers to initiate creative problem-solving activities.

Accountability and shared decision-making are the outward-looking components of Community Policing. They take their priority from three underlying assumptions: (1) that successful problem solving can best occur when police seek community input at the earliest stages of the problem-solving process; (2) that in diverse communities there will be diverse problems and concerns; and (3) that direct and continuing contact with community populations leads to the ability to address different backgrounds, needs and styles within the framework of the law while according dignity to each individual and respect for the rights of all.

Articulation of values and their internalization by police officers at all ranks are the internal foundation of effective Community Policing. A clear, explicit and visible statement of the department's values and standards, combined with training based on these, makes it possible to decentralize structure and encourage initiative among officers. Officers learn and use the problem-solving skills required to cope with change and diversity in the community. In the context of agreed-upon values, management and supervision within the department rely more on internalization of the standards and policies than on rote discipline and control as the primary management technique. And, individual performance is judged according to the stated values and communicated policies—not only on statistical outcomes (such as ratio of arrests to incidents or arrests per officer per week).

One of the Task Force's preliminary recommendations was that the Department of Public Safety adopt a revised mission and ethics statement to reflect the values of Community Policing. The following statements have the support of the group:

A. Mission Statement

The mission of the Department of Public Safety is to contribute toward the quality of University life by fostering a stable environment in which security is balanced with freedom of movement on an open campus.

The success of this mission depends upon a true partnership between public safety personnel and the diverse population of students, faculty, and visitors that constitute the University community—partnership built upon mutual respect and responsibility.

To that partnership the members of the Public Safety Department pledge their respect for the needs and rights of the community, their diligence and professionalism in the protection of persons and property, and their determination to ever seek new and better ways to reduce the opportunity for crime, to increase safety awareness, and to encourage a sense of communal concern for each other's safety and well-being as well as harmony with our neighbors.

In achieving these goals, the Public Safety Department stands accountable to the University community and open to the ideas and concerns of its members.

B. Ethics Statement

The University of Pennsylvania's police officers are trained professionals who have elected to serve in an academic community—to be part of that community as well as protecting lives and property within it, and to uphold its own policies and procedures as well as those of the public law.
Ethics Statement continued

The Department of Public Safety is committed to the concept of Community Policing, and to the ethical principles and attitudes that characterize such a partnership between community and police. It is the responsibility of the leadership of the Department both to set a high example in adherence to these principles, and to make known to members of the Department the qualities required of all who contribute to community policing efforts—whether as uniformed officers, specialists, and administrators, or support staff.

With his or her membership in the Department of Public Safety, each member of the Department accepts these principles:

A) To honor the University’s commitment to racial and cultural diversity, respecting the dignity and rights of all members of the University community regardless of race, color, religion, national origin, handicap, sex, or sexual preference.

B) To respond impartially to the problems and needs of all members of the University, regardless of rank or influence.

C) To exercise judgment and self-control under pressure, tempering police authority with recognition of human rights and civility.

D) To avoid any real or perceived abuse of office for personal privilege, profit or gain, and to avoid any conduct that might compromise their own integrity or the integrity of those with whom they work.

E) To know and uphold the various policies, procedures and behavioral codes of the University that either guarantee to its members many rights and privileges beyond those of public citizenship, or that limit behaviors in ways not necessarily proscribed by public law. The required body of knowledge includes, but is not limited to, the Guidelines on Open Expression, University Code of Conduct, University policies and procedures, and policies on sexual and racial harassment, alcohol and substance abuse, and confidentiality of records.

F) To respect the roles of other persons or departments of the University involved in providing for the safety and well-being of this community, communicating and cooperating with them fully to promote safety and security at Penn.

Specific Recommendations

The concept of Community Policing should be adopted by the Penn community as an effective way to enhance the safety and security of our citizens. In order to implement this way of policing, a cultural change must be instituted at the University. The community of students, staff, and faculty, and the Department of Public Safety must alter the ways they have functioned in the past.

Open communications, a sense of helping each other, education leading to a new awareness, and a sensitivity to our individual and collective needs are all prerequisites for our plan to succeed.

In order to achieve the goals of Community Policing, we recommend these specific steps for the Department of Public Safety and for the University at large:

Steps by Public Safety

- Develop a closer relationship with the City of Philadelphia, addressing issues such as the 18th District’s reporting of crimes and working to address the issues of crime and reporting, particularly in the 40th Street area.

- Take a leadership role in getting the community to “buy into” the concept of Community Policing. It is recommended that the Department display the mission statement above in a prominent place to serve as a “reminder” for the Department’s staff.

- Encourage its supervisors to adopt the Community Policing concept, to be role models and to provide cooperation and support for their officers. Relations between the University and the police officers must be rebuilt as an outcome of the strike against the University of Pennsylvania by Department of Public Safety unionized personnel. The officers now feel demoralized due to the outcome of this strike. Officer training should be ongoing in the form of meetings, either with specialists or among the officers themselves, and via current publications.

- Develop a new method of evaluation to critique the performance of officers engaged in their new roles of Community Policing. Incentives must be built into the system to include motivators such as: Flextime, rotating weekends off, trips to law enforcement conferences, and various forms of recognition such as: officer of the month, award or merit badges, photographs in newspapers, plaques and certificates.

Also, public recognition could be awarded to community groups doing a good job in Community Policing.

- Provide and publish a list of activities, problems and follow-up actions taken to provide a safety concern to others, as well as develop a newsletter covering Community Policing activities.

- Encourage coverage of safety and security issues through University publications, including Almanac, The Daily Pennsylvanian, and the various school newsletters, etc. Officers should, on a routine basis, report problems being presented to them from the community for resolution. Recording of incidents by officers should be totally honest and accurate. Every effort should be made to ensure the reporting of all crimes, being certain that no crimes “fall between the cracks.” The Department of Public Safety must acknowledge these concerns and respond to the appropriate parties involved. However, the recommendation to appoint an ombudsman exclusively for the department was not supported.

- Adopt the Uniform Crime Reporting system in order to provide a unified system of crime reporting. Crimes occurring both on and off campus should be reported in a single source. If the UCR limits the community’s understanding of the degree and seriousness of criminal activity, some method of qualification must be designed, whether that be a double reporting standard (one for UCR and one for the campus community) or some other method of qualifications to avoid semantic or legal confusion. Also, the reporting method used must be easily understood by the Penn community. The format in which criminal event history is released to The Daily Pennsylvanian and other University publications should be changed to accommodate lay understanding of criminal history. It would also be very useful if the Department of Public Safety used these statistics to suggest precautions to the reader. Statistics that include suggestions of heightened awareness to the community in response to certain criminal history are far more likely to achieve a desired result.

- Expose all members of the Department of Public Safety to a variety of education and training programs under the broad umbrella of Community Policing, including sensitivity training, conflict and crisis management training, and other awareness development skills training. Each of the training programs should be geared to campus police personnel, and should be designed so that the department will be more aware and more skilled in handling the multitude of situations involving our diverse campus community, citizens and visitors.

- Provide orientation for new students, workers, staff and guards from the various security services.

- Have ultimate security leadership, as well as responsibility and authority for the management of actual security-related incidents. Orientations, training and monitoring of guards and tasks should be managed on a timely basis by Public Safety. Additionally, we support centralized standards of security under the auspices of Public Safety in cooperation with Risk Management and Legal Counsel including the setting of training standards and bid specifications which can be expanded upon by client users for security personnel.

- Utilize University resources, including the School of Social Work, the Wharton School, the Women’s Center, the Office of Affirmative Action, faculty, staff, etc., to train Public Safety personnel, and included in this training would be a “managing diversity” type of workshop.

- Utilize the office of Victim Support and Security Services to a greater extent to educate all officers in the Department of Public Safety on issues of victim support. Specifically, Public Safety female officers should be trained so they can function satisfactorily in both offices as needed.

- Equally protect the rights and dignity of the individual, both internally within Public Safety, and externally in the community. Unnecessary use of force has no place on this campus and will not be tolerated.

- Require adherence to the rules for every subgroup of the University community, including students and members of the Department of Public Safety. The integrity of Public Safety should be a model for others in the community to follow. As role models for the rest of the community, the officers should not seek or accept any special considerations or privileges.

- Be proactive in recommending safety measures outside their own purview—not only within the University (lights, signage, etc.), but externally as in the placement of additional MAC machines in secured areas around campus.

- Be perceived as being impartial in its enforcement of the rules,
providing equal treatment for everyone. The penalty for breaking the law must be consistent. Those who violate the rules must face swift and equitable prosecution. Unequal punishment for the same offenses, and a failure by the Judicial Inquiry Office to notify the University community of its decisions reduces credibility for the system.

- Accept that the leadership role of the director of Public Safety will be instrumental to the success of Community Policing. The Department of Public Safety must respond to all complaints either in writing or verbally, even in situations where something is out of the realm of jurisdiction; these complaints should be referred to an appropriate person. People must know that their complaints, suggestions, and opinions are being heard and acted upon in a timely fashion.

**Steps by the Larger Campus Community**

- Emphasize that the concept and programs of Community Policing have the active support of all of the leaders within the University. Without the support of top management, it cannot succeed.

- The community more visibly support the principle that crime, no matter who the perpetrator—student, faculty, staff, visitors, or other citizens of Penn—has no place on this campus, and, therefore, criminal acts will not be tolerated. Criminals should be vigorously pursued and prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. Non-criminal behavior, yet behavior which may not be supported by University policy, should be appropriately addressed by the various administrative systems in place, including grievance panels, the HOD, the University ombudsman, the Department of Human Resources, etc.

- Information on what constitutes violation be spelled out for students, along with the repercussions to be expected for violating the rules. Students must be encouraged to work in partnership with Public Safety.

- The public be educated as to what to expect and what not to expect from Community Policing. It is a cooperative effort requiring the entire community.

- The education and training of supervisors, officers, and staff in Public Safety and the Penn community be recognized as necessary for the success of this program. Therefore, issues of safety must be discussed with new members of the community, particularly incoming international students and faculty, in order to educate them to their new environment and to encourage them to join in taking responsibility for their own safety. This includes making sensible decisions. Information should be mailed to pre-freshmen and transfer students, as well as to the existing student body. A message should be communicated that “you can help to protect yourself.”

- The freshman convocation be utilized as an opportunity to begin to inculcate students with the Community Policing concept.

- The Administration support the Undergraduate Assembly’s town watch program in order to enhance security on campus.

- The Escort Service and the Penn Bus, for both walking and driving, be used more extensively as a safe alternative to walking home alone, especially late at night. We recommend the administration expand these services both in frequency and length of available hours as deemed necessary.

- Students employed to aid in securing people and property have a job description as well as rules concerning conduct on the job as it applies to security and be well supervised in adherence to them.

- Good communications be regarded as a positive result of effective Community Policing. We endorse a proactive approach in structuring communications with the community in an effort to structure interaction between the Department of Public Safety and the various subgroups within the community. Public Safety officers should participate in the various administrative meetings held throughout the campus and initiating this participation where necessary, e.g., with the residential advisors. The officers should be trained to conduct these meetings.

- A needs assessment be made jointly by Public Safety and the building Administrators for all buildings within the University, individually evaluating physical devices, signage, training and occupant awareness. Based on the assessment, each building should implement the appropriate physical improvements and training programs. In residence halls, training programs and seminars would address not only residential advisors but occupants as well.

- The role of media in the success (or failure) of this program be appreciated. Information sharing should be encouraged in order to provide positive reinforcement for the concept. Specific examples of where and how Community Policing is working well within the community would be most effective.

- Group meetings concerning public safety be conducted in order to determine the security needs for each area of the University, e.g., building administrators and residential administrators should hold monthly meetings on safety and security issues. Public Safety officers should meet with these groups, explaining the concept of Community Policing and providing follow-up, where necessary.

**Conclusions**

The Public Safety Task Force is convinced that the total resources of this campus should be used in the creation of programs relating to the safety and security of the Penn community. Specifically, those faculty, students, staff and campus and community organizations having the knowledge and the skills must be mobilized in the development of these recommendations and other programs which will lead to a safe and secure University community.

It is critical that the University Trustees and senior administration publicly support Community Policing, and allocate appropriate resources to allow the recommendations of this report to be implemented. It is equally critical to understand that this report is but the beginning of a continuous planning process to make Penn safe and secure for all who live, work and visit our campus. The essential first step is comprehensive needs assessment, building by building, with prompt follow-up involving the Public Safety Department and building occupants. The Committee proposes that a formal progress report be submitted to the University community on all of the recommendations discussed herein after one year (August 1990). We recommend that the Council Community on Safety and Security lead this review effort on an annual basis in the years to come.

Community Policing is not a fad. It is a way of life that can make living on an urban campus a safer, more secure place if everyone participates in it. The continuation and implementation of this plan depends on the new partnership between the University of Pennsylvania’s community and its Department of Public Safety. Every reader is an equal partner in Penn Community Policing.
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The Research Foundation: Fall and Spring Cycles

Statement of Purpose
The Research Foundation encourages the exploration of new fields across a broad spectrum of disciplines. In doing so, the Foundation expands opportunities for faculty to attract support and resources from external sources while encouraging work in fields that are traditionally under-funded.

The Foundation supports two levels of grants. The first level, Type A grants, provide support in the range of $500 to $5,000. The second level, Type B grants, provide support in the range of $5,000 to $50,000. The standard application for a Type A grant is shorter than that for a Type B grant, reflecting respective funding levels. However, the review criteria for Type A and Type B grants are similar, and several general factors are considered in evaluating an application for either type of grant. They are:

- Its contribution to the development of the applicant’s research potential and progress.
- The quality, importance and impact of the proposed research project.
- Its potential value for enhancing the stature of the University.
- Its budget appropriateness in terms of the project proposed, including consideration of need and availability of external support.

The Application Process
The Research Foundation Board will review both Type A and Type B applications in the fall and spring of each academic year. Applications for the fall cycle are due on or before November 1 of each year, while spring cycle applications are due on or before March 15 of each year. All research projects involving human subjects or animals must receive Institutional Board approval prior to funding. Questions concerning human/animal research should be directed to the Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, 300 Mellon Building/3246.

An original and ten copies of both Type A and Type B proposals should be submitted to the Office of the Vice Provost for Research, 106 College Hall/6381.

Curriculum Grants in Afro-American Studies: January 9
Proposals are due January 9, 1990 for the third round of awards under the Curriculum Development Fund established in 1987-88 by the Afro-American Studies Program.

Faculty (standing or affiliated) and advanced graduate students are eligible for summer awards to develop for 1990-91 new courses centered on the black experience—or to reorganize established courses to include substantial black content. Approval of the department chair is required at the time of proposal. Applications and information are available from Dan Scott Butler in the Afro-American Studies Program, 204 Bennett Hall/6203, Ext. 8-4965.

In the recent round, the faculty selection committee chose six projects for funding at $2500 to $5000. Two in history were for Fall 1989 (Afro-Americans in West Philadelphia, by Dr. Evelyn Brooks-Higginbotham, and Afro-American Slavery and Emancipation: A Hemispheric Perspective, by graduate student Jeffrey Kerr-Ritchie). Those for Spring 1990 are The Sociology of the Black Sociologist, by Dr. Donald Cunnigen of Sociology; Black Literature and Music, by Kristin Hunter-Lattency of English; Urban Cultural Pluralism, by Dr. Peggy Samdy of anthropology; and Managing Racial and Ethnic Diversity in Organizations, by Dr. David A. Thomas of management.

Type A proposals should contain a brief description of the research and the specific needs which the grant will cover. The proposal should include:

I. Cover page(s)
   1. Name, Title, Department, School, Campus Mailing Address, Signatures of Department Chairperson and Dean.
   2. Title of proposal.
   3. Amount requested.
   4. 100-word abstract of need.
   5. 100-word description of the significance of the project for the educated non-specialist.
   6. Amount of current research support.
   7. Other pending proposals for the same project.
   8. List of research support received during the past three years.
   9. A one page biographical sketch of the investigator(s) listing educational background, academic positions held, and five recent publications.

II. A back-up of the 100-word abstract in the form of a 3 or 4 page mini-proposal.

III. A budget that justifies the specific items requested and assigns a priority to each item. Budgets should not exceed a two-year maximum time period.

Categories of Research Foundation support for Type A proposals will focus on:
- Seed money for the initiation of new research.
- Limited equipment requests directly related to research needs.
- Summer Research Fellowships, with preference for applications from Assistant Professors.
- Travel expenses for research only.
- Publication preparation costs.

Type B proposals are limited to ten single- spaced pages in length. The following format is suggested for Type B proposals:

I. Cover Page(s)
   1. Name, Title, Department, School, Campus Mailing Address, Signatures of Department Chairperson and Dean.
   2. Title of proposal.
   3. Amount requested.
   4. 100-word abstract of need.
   5. 100-word description of the significance of the project for the educated non-specialist.
   6. Amount of current research support.
   7. Other pending proposals for the same project.
   8. Listing of publications and research support, including titles, amounts, and grant periods, received during the past five years. Include funds from University sources such as schools, department, BRSG, or Research Foundation.
   9. A brief curriculum vitae for the principal investigator.

II. Introduction (2 to 3 pages)
   Statement of the objectives and scholarly or scientific significance of the proposed work.

III. Methods of Procedure (3 to 4 pages)
   Description of the research plan and methodologies to be employed.

IV. Description of the significance and impact of the project.

V. Description of how a Research Foundation grant will facilitate acquisition of future research funds.

VI. Budget (one page) 2-year maximum Each budget item should be listed in order of priority.

Categories of Research Foundation support for Type B proposals focus on several areas of need. These are:
- Matching funds, vis-a-vis external grant sources.
- Seed money for exploratory research programs.
- Support for interdisciplinary research initiatives.
- Faculty released time.

Requests for student tuition and dissertation fees will not be considered by the Foundation.
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ALMANAC October 3, 1989

Department of Public Safety

This report contains tallies of part 1 crimes, a listing of part 1 crimes against persons, and summaries of part 1 crime in the five busiest sectors on campus where two or more incidents were reported between September 25, 1989 and October 1, 1989.

**Total:** Crimes Against Persons - 1, Thefts - 37, Burglaries - 2, Attempted Thefts of Auto - 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time Reported</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Incident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/28/89</td>
<td>2:22AM</td>
<td>300 Block 39th</td>
<td>2 males robbed 4 students/handgun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/29/89</td>
<td>1:57PM</td>
<td>Van Pelt House</td>
<td>Secured bike taken from rack.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/29/89</td>
<td>3:04PM</td>
<td>Harrisson House</td>
<td>Secured bike taken from main entrance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/29/89</td>
<td>3:54PM</td>
<td>Harrisson House</td>
<td>Camera taken from room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/30/89</td>
<td>9:14PM</td>
<td>Van Pelt House</td>
<td>Secured bike taken from rack.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/30/89</td>
<td>1:47AM</td>
<td>Van Pelt House</td>
<td>Wallet, walkman, CD player taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/01/89</td>
<td>7:45PM</td>
<td>Van Pelt House</td>
<td>10 speed Huffy taken from lamp post.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39th to 40th</td>
<td>10:01PM</td>
<td>Veterinary Hospital</td>
<td>Window broken, money taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/29/89</td>
<td>2:22AM</td>
<td>300 Block 39th</td>
<td>See crimes against persons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/29/89</td>
<td>1:28PM</td>
<td>Alpha Epsilon Pi</td>
<td>Parking lot/radio taken window broken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/29/89</td>
<td>6:54PM</td>
<td>Pi Lambda Phi</td>
<td>Window broken, jacket taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/30/89</td>
<td>12:49PM</td>
<td>Phi Kappa Psi</td>
<td>Red Murray bike taken from gate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/01/89</td>
<td>7:10PM</td>
<td>Veterinary Hospital</td>
<td>Window broken, money taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39th to 40th</td>
<td>9:05PM</td>
<td>High Rise North</td>
<td>Secured bike taken from main entrance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/29/89</td>
<td>10:10PM</td>
<td>High Rise North</td>
<td>Ring taken from unsecured bedroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/29/89</td>
<td>12:52PM</td>
<td>North Service Drive</td>
<td>Window broken, briefcase, tools taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/30/89</td>
<td>10:30PM</td>
<td>High Rise North</td>
<td>Ram 10 speed taken from rack.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32nd to 33rd</td>
<td>3:45PM</td>
<td>Hutchinson Gym</td>
<td>Briefcase and wallet taken from locker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/29/89</td>
<td>8:34PM</td>
<td>Franklin Field</td>
<td>Secured bike taken from office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/29/89</td>
<td>2:57PM</td>
<td>Hutchinson Gym</td>
<td>Wallet taken from secured locker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/27/89</td>
<td>6:06PM</td>
<td>Lott Tennis Courts</td>
<td>Wallet taken from courtside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36th to 38th</td>
<td>4:29PM</td>
<td>Nichols House</td>
<td>Secured bike taken from rack.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/28/89</td>
<td>3:29AM</td>
<td>Nichols House</td>
<td>Rear wheel taken from secured bike.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/01/89</td>
<td>4:14PM</td>
<td>Gimbel Gym</td>
<td>2 backpacks and contents taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/01/89</td>
<td>5:38PM</td>
<td>Gimbel Gym</td>
<td>2 wallets taken from lockers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Safety Tip:** The best advice on hitchhiking: Don't. It's risky business. Never pick anyone up, regardless of appearance and demeanor.

---

**Update**

OCTOBER AT PENN

**CHILDREN'S ACTIVITIES**

7 Penn Mathmagic Club; meets first Saturday of each month for four months, 10 a.m.-noon; for children in grades 6-9. To register, call Ext. 8-6763 (The Discovery Program).

Robotics Workshop at the Franklin Institute; meets five Saturdays, 10 a.m.-noon or 1-3 p.m.; for children in grades 6-9. To register, call Ext. 8-6763 (The Discovery Program).

**EXHIBITS**

On display through December in the Third Floor Gallery, and the Center for the Study of the History of Nursing in the Nursing Education Building; Presbyterian Hospital School of Nursing: A Photographic History; Presbyterian Hospital and The Training Camp for Nurses at Vassar College: Documents from World War I; Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania: Dolls and Artifacts from the Collection; and S. Lillian Clayton, Superintendent of Nurses at Philadelphia General Hospital: Profile.

**FITNESS/LEARNING**

4 Faculty/Staff One-Mile Run, Franklin Field, noon, Wednesdays. For information call Alan Myers, Ext. 8-7078.

6 Forum for Recruitment Advertising; one-hour sessions start 9:30; 11 a.m., 2 p.m., 3-5 p.m., Room 300 Annenberg School. Reservations: Ext. 8-7285 (Office of Human Resources & I&G Associates Advertising).

**TALKS**

3 Overview for "Expressions of Islam in Sub-Saharan Africa"; Azim Nanji, department of religion, University of Florida; 4 p.m., Rainey Auditorium, Museum (Middle East Center).

Algerian Writers and Bilingualism; Farida Hilal, University of Algiers; 4-6 p.m., 8th Floor Lounge, Williams Hall (Middle East Center and Comparative Literature).

4 Literature for Liberation? Indigenous Women's Literature in Africa; Ingrid Bjorkman, University of Gothenburg, Sweden; 4:15 p.m., Room 121, Van Pelt Library (The Women's Studies Program and The African Studies Committee). Molecular Cloning And Characterization of Lymphocyte Surface Antigens; Ivan Slamkovich, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston; 4 p.m., Wistar Auditorium (The Wistar Institute).

5 Paradoxes in Brain Function; Fernando Nottebohm, Field Research Center, Rockefeller University; 4:15 p.m., Neuroscience Conference Room, 140 John Morgan Building (David Mahoney Institute of Neurological Sciences).

6 Control of Apolipoprotein Gene Transcription; Sheldon I. Feinstein, Institute for Environmental Medicine & department of human genetics; 12:15 p.m., Seminar Room-Room 1, John Morgan Building (Institute for Environmental Medicine).

**Deadline:** October 10 is the deadline for the November At Penn pullout calendar.

---

**18th Police District**

Schuylkill River to 49th Stret; Market Street to Woodland Avenue

Reported crimes against persons from 12:01AM 09/18/89 to 11:59PM 09/24/89.

**Total:** 18 Incidents, 6 Arrests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location/Time Reported</th>
<th>Offense/Weapon</th>
<th>Arrest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/18/89</td>
<td>7 S. Farragut, 7:00PM</td>
<td>Robbery/strongarm</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/18/89</td>
<td>4600 Chestnut, 11:12PM</td>
<td>Aggravated Assault/cockpit</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/18/89</td>
<td>3601 Chestnut, 11:20PM</td>
<td>Robbery/gun</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/19/89</td>
<td>4401 Locust, 1:40AM</td>
<td>Robbery/gun</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/20/89</td>
<td>3925 Walnut, 5:32AM</td>
<td>Robbery/strongarm</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/20/89</td>
<td>4000 Sansom, 7:15PM</td>
<td>Robbery/gun</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/21/89</td>
<td>3333 Walnut, 12:20AM</td>
<td>Robbery/gun</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/21/89</td>
<td>418 S. 47th, 3:54AM</td>
<td>Robbery/strongarm</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/21/89</td>
<td>3420 Walnut, 11:45AM</td>
<td>Robbery/gun</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/21/89</td>
<td>700 S. 49th, 2:15PM</td>
<td>Robbery/strongarm</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/21/89</td>
<td>3600 Walnut, 8:33PM</td>
<td>Robbery/strongarm</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/22/89</td>
<td>1233 S. 47th, 6:18PM</td>
<td>Robbery/strongarm</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/22/89</td>
<td>4900 Chester, 8:25PM</td>
<td>Robbery/robbery</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/23/89</td>
<td>4400 Spruce, 7:55AM</td>
<td>Robbery/strongarm</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/23/89</td>
<td>210 S. 34th, 3:30PM</td>
<td>Aggravated Assault/cockpit</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/24/89</td>
<td>4000 Market, 2:45PM</td>
<td>Robbery/strongarm</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/24/89</td>
<td>4000 Chestnut, 8:45PM</td>
<td>Aggravated Assault/cockpit</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**19th Police District**
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