Death of Dr. Attie

Monday the campus learned of the sudden death of Dr. Maurice Attie of the School of Medicine, who was struck by a vehicle Sunday night while bicycling on West River Drive. A motorist has been arrested on drunk driving and related charges. See page 10.

The New French Institute

A new French Institute for Culture and Technology was inaugurated at Penn yesterday with a visit from Jacques Andreani, French Ambassador to the U.S. Formation of the new unit was announced jointly by M. Andreani and Provost Michael Aiken, with SAS’s Dean Rosemary Stevens responding on behalf of the several schools and centers involved.

The French government gave start-up funds for the new institute, which will eventually become self-supporting. It will be the umbrella for projects such as a new summer program in conjunction with the Lauder Institute, and two new study-abroad projects in Lyon with SAS and the Wharton School. A special start-up project is the addition of a French language coordinator and new teaching positions in the romance languages department here.

The Institute will not engage in teaching or research itself but will foster fund-raising, academic initiatives and research contracts; sponsor fellowships for undergraduate and graduate study in France; and provide funding for visiting professors and special colloquia.

The Doctor’s Doctor is In-at Penn

In a recent survey of physicians to name The Best Doctors in America in their own specializations, peers picked 103 clinicians from Penn Med. Only Harvard, Johns Hopkins and the Mayo Clinic had more. For more numbers, and the names of the Penn faculty named best, see page 8.

Drive, They Said

To see what Escort Service is all about, four guest drivers will take the wheels of escort vans from 4:30 to 5:30 p.m. Wednesday, April 8: Lucy Hackney; Executive Vice President Marna Whittington; Police Commissioner John Kuprevich, and Harold Haskins, director of academic support services.

The volunteer driving is part of Penn’s intensive spring safety campaign, with April designated as Safe Passage Month.” During the first week, campus posters, placemats and media featured the PennBus; this week highlights Escort (see p.11), and in coming weeks the spotlight will be on walking escorts, the study shuttle and other means of safer movement on and near the campus.
The following statement is published in accordance with the Senate Rules. Among other purposes, the publication of SEC actions is intended to stimulate discussion between the constituencies and their representatives. We would be pleased to hear suggestions from members of the Faculty Senate. Please communicate your comments to Senate Chair Louise Shoemaker or Executive Assistant to the Faculty Senate Chair Carolyn Burdon, 15 College Hall/6303, Ext. 8-6943.

**Actions Taken by the Senate Executive Committee**

**Wednesday, April 1, 1992**

1. **Academic Planning and Budget Committee.** One meeting dealt with the Revlon Campus Center for which plans are moving ahead. Another meeting dealt with plans for expansion of the Medical Center.

2. **Faculty Senate Participation in University Council.** After extended discussion, the following two motions were adopted and placed on the agenda of the annual meeting of the Faculty Senate April 15, 1992:
   - That the Senate Executive Committee shall continue monitoring the implementation of the revised Council Bylaws for 1991-92 and vote no earlier than March 1993 and no later than the end of the academic year 1992-93 whether to continue its participation in University Council.
   - Resolved: That the Faculty Senate urges the Steering Committee of the University Council promptly to initiate a study of the organization and procedures of the University Council. The Faculty Senate strongly suggests that this study consider, among other things, a reorganization that includes:
     - retaining the monthly meetings of the Steering Committee
     - adding to the Steering Committee the chairs of the A-1, A-3, and Librarians Assemblies and two faculty members
     - changing the duties of the Steering Committee
     - retaining the present membership of University Council and adding thereto three members each from the A-1, A-3 and Librarians Assemblies (the latter to include the chairs of those assemblies)
     - changing the number of meetings of the University Council from once a month (during the fall and spring semesters) to once in the fall semester and once in the spring semester
     - having each constituency select its own representatives to Council committees.

   The Faculty Senate notes that careful consideration needs to be given to whether in such a revised structure the meetings of the Steering Committee should be open to the University community and the press. The procedures required to call “special” meetings of the University Council will require thoughtful scrutiny. In addition, the bylaws governing the standing and ad hoc committees of Council should be studied.

   The Steering Committee Chair is asked to report to the Senate Executive Committee Steering Committee actions on this request no later than November 30, 1992.

3. **Faculty Liaisons to Trustee Committees.** SEC continued last month’s discussion with other faculty liaisons regarding their role and experience reiterating many of the previous comments (Almanac March 17, 1992). A faculty liaison suggested that liaisons he brought into discussion of proposals at an earlier stage to have genuine input for the decision-making. Another faculty liaison cited need for clarification of a liaison’s role as well as need for a mechanism to close the feedback loop. There was consensus among those faculty liaisons present that decisions are made outside of trustee committees and that faculty ought to have input there particularly on philosophical issues. A SEC member expressed concern that all available information given to trustees also be provided to the faculty liaisons. It was suggested that liaison concerns could be brought to the Senate Chair who could take them to the President and Provost. Guidelines for faculty liaisons and mechanisms for reporting to SEC will be developed.

**Addition to the April 15 Agenda**

Senate Chair Louise Shoemaker notes that the two resolutions on Senate participation in the University Council [in item #2 above] have been added to the agenda of the Faculty Senate Annual Meeting, to be held Wednesday, April 15, from 3 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. in Room 200 College Hall. For the remainder of the agenda, see Almanac March 31, 1992 page 2.

---

**Steering Committee: Bicycles on Campus**

**Discussion Points for University Council Meeting April 8, 1992**

The issue of bicycles on campus has been batted around for many years, largely in terms of mutual antagonisms. We hope (possibly wishfully) to frame the issues to aid in a search for tolerable partial solutions to some problems.

1. Quite evidently, many members of the Penn community find bicycles a convenient form of transportation. If negligible numbers of people chose to ride bikes, there would be a negligible issue. All indications are that bike riding has become increasingly popular over recent years. In particular, Penn people who live off-campus often desire to ride bicycles to campus. Many of those who arrive on campus or leave campus at nonstandard hours regard bike travel as useful security against criminal attack.

2. Many other members of the Penn community, while recognizing the usefulness of this form of transportation, are concerned about bicycle riding on pedestrian walkways. Given the relatively compact nature of the Penn campus, these people argue that walking a short distance should not be a hardship.

Conversely, many bicyclists note that there are no bike lanes on streets around the campus, and that bicycle-automobile collisions are often much more serious than bike-pedestrian collisions. Safety concerns apply as well to bicyclists as to pedestrians, and there are no safe bike paths on the campus other than the Walks. Further, they argue that all bicyclists should not suffer for the misbehavior of a relatively small number of unsafe bikers.

3. Some people have complained about the prevalence of bicycles chained to stair railings, handicap access ramps, and other inappropriate or downright illegal places. These bikes interfere with access to buildings, cause hazards, and add an element of clutter to the campus.

Conversely, bicyclists feel that there are far too few legal places to secure a bike within reasonable distance of popular campus points. Securing bikes at inappropriate points is the only available alternative.

4. There does not seem to be a systematic registration of bicycles, that would allow for identification in case of theft or improper/unsafe riding or parking.

Undoubtedly, there are other issues that might be raised. These are the concerns of which we are made aware.

Council suggest that University Council consider the following series of motions. In drafting them, we have tried to do two things. First, we have attempted to separate issues, so that Council can vote on several components of a general approach to bicycles on campus, rather than on one omnibus bill. Second, we have tried to phrase the motions so that substantial changes can be made simply by deleting sections of a motion. Inevitably, there are loose ends; for example, who is to decide what “an adequate number” is, in motion? We propose these motions as a framework for Council’s discussion and action; we do not all agree that every element of every motion is desirable. We hope that the motions will be a useful framework for debate and decision.

**Possible Motions for University Council: On Bicycle Policy**

1. University Council urges that planning for the future Penn campus include development of separate bicycle paths within the campus and, in cooperation with the city of Philadelphia, bicycle lanes on nearby streets.

2. University Council urges that additional bicycle racks be provided at multiple points around the campus. These racks should be in safe, visible locations, as convenient as practicable to major campus buildings. Council also urges that, once additional racks are provided, vigorous enforcement of regulations against chaining bicycles to stair railings, along handicap access ways, and in other prohibited areas.

3. University Council urges that all bicycles using University bicycle parking facilities must be registered with the University Police Department.

4. University Council urges that, once an adequate number of additional bicycle racks is provided, the riding of bicycles be prohibited on Locust Walk, John Adams Walk, Smith Walk, and all cross walks leading to these pedestrian walkways, between the hours of 8 am, and 6 p.m., and that sanctions be established for riding bicyclers in prohibited areas or in a manner that endangers others.
The Insurance Components in the Pennflex Package

Dear Penn Colleague:

This, our third letter to the community, comes during the Open Enrollment period and focuses on Life Insurance, Dependent Life Insurance, and the Dependent Care Expense Account. We encourage everyone to think about these programs and the decisions to be made using the Pennflex materials you all should have received by now.

The flexible benefits type of plan that the University adopted five years ago was put in place to enable faculty and staff to choose from among various forms of benefits, with certain limitations and legal and tax requirements.

Life Insurance is a good illustration of a benefit with different levels among which you may choose.

The life insurance coverage paid for by the University is derived from an individual's base salary and age. Faculty/staff may purchase additional insurance at their own expense at the group rate. (NOTE: The IRS calculates imputed income for employer paid group term life insurance in excess of $50,000. PICA taxes and federal taxes must be paid on imputed income.)

The objective of life insurance and the philosophy of the University’s life insurance program is to provide financial support during an emergency transition, and then some support for an employee’s dependents for some period of time. Many people decide they require more life insurance or life insurance which does not relate to their being employed at Penn.

Insurance costs increase with age and the need usually decreases (e.g. as children grow up and become independent themselves). For example the rate at age 35 is $2.04 per $1,000, and at age 65 is $15.96 per $1,000.

Read this section carefully in the Pennflex brochure and call your Benefits Specialist for help if you have questions.

Through our benefits program you may also purchase Dependent Life Insurance and gain from the low group rate. The amounts of coverage are a flat $5,000 for each eligible child and a flat $10,000 for spouses (within state limitations). It is intended to cover emergency costs should a spouse or dependent die. Imputed income is calculated on any coverage purchased for a spouse and dependents.

— The University Data Center (UDC) is the ISC organization being created to operate the new IBM ES9000/480 mainframe computer, which will provide service to academic researchers, the Library, and UMIS. The core staff of UDC is drawn from the former School of Arts and Sciences David Rittenhouse Computing Facility (DRCF), which had extensive experience operating mainframes in support of research, Library operations, and electronic mail.

Benefits Tip: Life Insurance and Tax-Deferred Annuity

If you are enrolled in the Retirement Program for Monthly Paid Faculty and Staff (Tax-deferred Annuity Program) and/or the Supplemental Retirement Program for Monthly and Weekly Paid Faculty/Staff, here is something to keep in mind when planning insurance coverage: In the event of your death before retirement your accumulations in these plans are available to your beneficiary as a lump sum death benefit (should the beneficiary choose to receive the payout in this manner). So when you study your insurance needs/coverage, be sure to include these monies in your figures. — E.R. and A.R.

As a result of federal legislation passed in 1981, “Dependent Care Assistance programs” became a tax-favored employee benefit. Penn’s Dependent Care Pre-Tax Spending Account allows you to reduce your salary by up to $5000 per year for care provided to qualifying dependent children, parents, or spouses which enables you to work. This before-tax amount enables you to save on these expenses an amount equal to your marginal tax bracket.

If you have a qualifying child, parent or spouse who is your dependent and requires care while you must be at the University you should consider using the Dependent Care Pre-Tax Spending Account. You can contribute any amount up to $5,000. As you incur and pay for these expenses you then submit to the Benefits Office the receipts from your care provider and you are reimbursed from your own account. If you contribute and use $5,000 per year and you are in the 28% tax bracket, the savings is $1,400.

If you have a dependent who needs care while you work, read this section of your Pennflex booklet carefully. It really pays to plan ahead! You may also be able to combine the use of this account with the use of child care tax credit. An accountant can advise you on this last item.

In our next letter we will begin to talk about issues related to retirement and how the decisions you make now (or don’t make) might influence the financial security of your years in retirement.

— Elsa Ramsden, Chair, Personnel Benefits Committee
— Adrienne Riley, Director, Human Resources, Total Compensation

Reorganization in Information Systems and Computing—by June 30

Dr. Peter C. Patton, Vice Provost for Information Systems and Computing (ISC), has announced a restructuring of his area, targeted for completion by June 30.

Changes will affect every department within his area, Dr. Patton said. He listed:

— Academic Computing Services (ACS), a new department, is being forged from staff and resources in other ISC areas to provide both direct and facilitating support for the instructional and research computing community. The full-time position of deputy director of ACS, reporting to Dr. Patton, will be posted as soon as possible. An advocacy group, currently consisting of the Heads of Academic computing in Arts and Sciences, Engineering, Medicine, and the Wharton School will advise ACS on its mission and structure, programs and future directions. Dr. N. Ben Goldstein, Ira Winston, Dr. Albert Shar, and Michael Eleey make up the group.

— The Computing Resource Center (CRC) will be reorganized in response to the overwhelming demand for its end-user training and support services. Based on months of self-assessment and meetings with campus computing stakeholders, the “new” CRC will make more use of both technological aids (fax, e-mail, Penninfo, training videos, etc.) and partnerships with school and departmental end-user support organizations. Dr. Jeff Seaman, founding director of the CRC, remains at the helm, with the title of Associate Vice Provost.

— Data Communications and Computing Services (DCCS) will expand both service offerings and outreach efforts while committing to major upgrades in technology. DCCS will have a new leader, Associate Vice Provost Daniel Updegrove, former Assistant Vice Provost for Data Administration and Information Resource Planning (DAIRP), Mr. Updegrove, who had extensive networking experience as Vice President of EDUCOM, has taken the lead in several Penn networking programs, including PennInfo and the Electronic Mail Task Force.

Carl Abramson, who led DCCS during the design and development of PennNet and who has had responsibility for UMIS for the past two years, will continue to head UMIS as Associate Vice Provost.

Vice Provost’s Office: The Office of the Vice Provost itself will also be reorganized. Francine Buchhalter is Director, Fiscal Operations for ISC, with responsibility for overall budget planning, human resources, and financial controls. A new Director of Planning position will be posted shortly.

On the future organization of the Data Administration function, Dr. Patton said he will convene a group of “data stakeholders” from schools and administrative departments to assist in determining the optimal approach, and expects a decision on this within a month.

“I have been impressed,” said Dr. Patton, “with the willingness of ISC staff to engage in tough-minded assessments of our strengths and weaknesses — and with the schools’ willingness to partner with ISC to develop new service delivery options.

“ISC is committed to participating in the growing University effort to improve quality and reduce costs. We believe this extensive restructuring will enhance our ability to harness the rapidly advancing technology to meet our clients’ even more rapidly advancing expectations,” he concluded.

Ed. Note: The column above and article below were scheduled for publication on March 31, and were held for reasons beyond anyone's control.
In 1990-91, the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility reviewed the procedures used in the case of Dr. Jorge Ferrer of the School of Veterinary Medicine, and the sanctions imposed upon him. SCAFR concluded that the dean of the school, having chosen to proceed under the then-promulgated Procedures for Misconduct in Research, was bound by its provisions for restoring Dr. Ferrer to the status quo ante upon a finding by a formal inquiry committee that he had not committed such misconduct, as defined in that policy. The Provost has requested that SCAFR consider the matter further, asserting that the dean of the school properly and necessarily had authority to impose sanctions. We have considered the assertion, and the entire procedure, with the cooperation of all parties.

The essential assertions of this case involve mismanagement, rather than dishonesty. The dean, the inquiry committee, and Professor Ferrer agree that there were deviations from an experimental protocol, and that Dr. Ferrer, as principal investigator for the experiment, bears primary responsibility for those deviations. SCAFR does not challenge the requirement that Dr. Ferrer undergo further training in animal care and experimentation procedures, nor the actions of the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) in monitoring Dr. Ferrer’s proposed experiments. Nor does SCAFR have any comment on salary issues; the faculty grievance procedure provides an appropriate vehicle for Dr. Ferrer to protest, should he feel so inclined.

However, SCAFR is deeply disturbed by the dean’s prohibition (for a two-year period) on Dr. Ferrer’s direct participation in experiments involving a certain class of viruses. This prohibition self-evidently limits (to some degree) his freedom to perform certain kinds of research. Therefore, it is a matter of serious concern. The Statutes of the Trustees (1983, Article 10, quoted in the Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators, page 20) make the point with force:

> It is the policy of the University of Pennsylvania to maintain and encourage freedom of inquiry, discourse, teaching, research, and publication and to protect any member of the academic staff against influences, from within or without the University, that would restrict him or her in the exercise of these freedoms in his or her area of scholarly interest.

For this policy to be meaningful, administrative restrictions on a faculty member’s research, if permissible at all, must be exceedingly rare, must be justified by compelling need, and must observe procedural safeguards commensurate with the importance and sensitivity of the academic freedom interests at stake.

The required procedures, we believe, must include at least three elements: first, an adequate opportunity for the faculty member to be heard on all relevant issues, including particularly the necessity and propriety of the proposed sanction; second, a statement by the administrative officer of the findings and grounds upon which the proposed limitation is based; and third, participation in the decision-making process by an appropriate faculty group. Any restriction on research should be imposed only upon the recommendation, supported by findings and reasons, of a responsible faculty body after conducting a hearing.

The first two factors noted above, hearings and findings, need no elaboration; they are generally recognized to be the minimal ingredients of any system of procedural fairness where important individual interests are at stake.

The third factor, faculty involvement, is, of course, specific to the academic community, but within that setting, it is no less basic. The University’s statutes reflect the principle that severe sanctions — specifically, termination or suspension of employment — cannot be imposed on a faculty member except upon the recommendation of a duly elected faculty committee or of the school’s faculty as a whole. More immediately analogous to the present case than the provisions relating to termination or suspension of employment is the provision (Handbook, p. 54) authorizing the temporary exclusion from classrooms or laboratories of a faculty member whose impairment of capacity presents a risk of substantial harm to persons or property. Such action may be taken for up to seven days by an appropriate administrative officer, or for a longer period by the provost, but in neither case without obtaining the advice of the school’s elected Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility. If consultation with an elected faculty committee is required for even the very brief, safety-based, exclusion of a faculty member with impaired capacity, surely no less is required for a much longer ban on research activities of a faculty member of unquestioned capacity. A scheme of procedural safeguards could not reasonably prohibit unilateral administrative action in the first case while tolerating it in the second.

The force of this analogy might perhaps be blunted if the purpose of the research ban in Dr. Ferrer’s case were assumed to be punishment for past misconduct rather than protection of the public from future risk. But, on that assumption, we question whether a purely punitive research restraint would be proper under any procedures. Absent danger to the public, there is no more justification for punishing an experimental researcher by prohibiting that researcher from a laboratory than for punishing a historian by prohibiting that historian from doing library research — a restraint that would certainly play havoc with constitutionally protected speech as well as academic freedom.

Some might argue that the explicit procedural provisions of the statutes with respect to certain types of administrative actions should be read as negating the existence of additional, unwritten, procedures for other administrative actions. This argument is unpersuasive. Given that a dean’s power to restrict a faculty member’s research activities is itself unauthorized by any provision of the University’s written rules, it cannot reasonably be expected that the procedures attending this power will be spelled out by those rules. We reject the notion that an administrator has broad, amorphous discretion to discipline faculty members while, on the other hand, the procedural safeguards that are necessary to cabin that authority exist only to the extent explicitly provided for. Just as there may be unwritten administrative powers deriving from the practical necessities of governance, there most assuredly are unwritten procedural requirements that derive from basic principles of fairness and academic freedom and, as we have already pointed out, from the underlying principles implicit in the express procedural provisions themselves.

In the present case, we are uncertain whether the Misconduct inquiry placed squarely in issue the propriety of an extended ban on Dr. Ferrer’s participation in live-virus research and gave him an adequate opportunity to demonstrate, by evidence and argument, that this sanction was unnecessary or unduly burdensome. We have no indication that a hearing on this issue was held at any time after termination of the Misconduct proceeding; that the dean ever stated the grounds or findings on which the research moratorium was based; or that he consulted with any faculty body before imposing it. His action therefore lacked two, if not all three, of the procedural elements we believe essential. We must conclude, therefore, that the restriction of Dr. Ferrer’s research activity, once the Misconduct inquiry was completed, was, and remains, an infringement of academic freedom.

Howard Arnold (social work)
Robert F. Giegengack (geology)
Frank I. Goodman (law)
Ian Harker (geology)
Vivianne Nachmias (anatomy/medicine)
James Ross (philosophy), Chair
Mark Stern (social work), ex officio: David K. Hildebrand (statistics), Senate Chair-elect
(Professors Jill Beech and Robert Schwarzman, of the School of Veterinary Medicine, recused themselves from this case.)

* It should be noted that the one faculty body that has thus far passed upon the Ferrer case, the formal inquiry committee in the misconduct proceeding, found that Dr. Ferrer had committed errors in judgment, but recommended no sanctions more severe than warning, reprimand, or the institution of special precautions in future experiments. For this reason, if no other, it cannot be fairly argued that the procedural elements missing from the dean’s action were supplied by the misconduct proceeding.
Speaking Out

The following petition was given to Dean Rosemary Stevens on April 2 by eight undergraduate students including Andrew Howell (Col ’92) who transmitted it to Almanac. The petition below was signed by 135 undergraduate students.

More on Dr. Plotnitsky

We have come to the University of Pennsylvania confident of this institution’s dedication to academic excellence. However, the recent tenure denial of Dr. Arkady Plotnitsky of the English Department has put this confidence in question. We grant that the tenure process is a complex one, taking into account a wide range of factors in the consideration of every candidate. It is nonetheless inconceivable that an academician of Dr. Plotnitsky’s caliber and qualifications be turned away. His loss would cause irreparable damage to the academic quality and prestige of the School of Arts and Sciences and the University as a whole.

As a scholar, Dr. Plotnitsky has distinguished himself exceptionally in the field of literature theory, a field which is being taught more than ever before on an undergraduate level. As a pedagogue, he has combined a compelling and persuasive lecture style with a personable disposition that makes him accessible to all students. Indeed, we cannot conceive what more the School of Arts and Sciences could want out of a professor.

In brief, we undergraduates cannot accept the decision to deny tenure to Dr. Plotnitsky. If some action is not taken to override this preposterous decision, the tenure process—and the academic system as a whole—shall be rendered absurd.

Concerning COLORS

As an active alumnus in several capacities, I have the opportunity to receive Almanac: weekly to keep me abreast of University affairs.

I was pleased to read in the March 3 issue of the splendid “Hands Across the Campus” activity in what has become the annual COLORS program to further diversity and understanding among the University family.

That this activity was initiated by un-undergraduate members of fraternities is commendable. Generally fraternities are singled out by name when they indulge in an activity that is negative, so let’s give credit to the Brothers of Sigma Chi and Alpha Phi Alpha for creating the COLORS idea and ideals and making this important event a regular part of campus life.

— Murray K. McComas, Wh’58

All-Weather Buildings

I read in a recent Daily Pennsylvanian (3/18/92) that the University is about to begin construction of a new $60 million “Biomedical Research Center”. I’m sure this new building will be all-weather and will rely heavily on air conditioning in Philadelphia’s hot and humid summers and will be built in the modern fashion so that the windows can’t be opened.

As you know, new information has come in since the Trustees’ last meeting in January suggesting that the ozone layer situation is much worse than expected. Exactly what you don’t want to do in such a situation is to erect all-weather buildings whose windows can’t be opened, even if they cost $60 million. The University should be ahead of the world (or city) on this, not cruising along beside them or behind them.

— Daniel R. Vining, Jr., Associate Professor of Regional Science

Response to Dr. Vining

Professor Vining is correct in his assumption that the new Biomedical Research Building will be constructed without operable windows. It is important to understand that the heating ventilation and air conditioning systems designed into a modern research facility are nearly as sophisticated as the research they support. These systems must be capable of providing the correct temperature, humidity, pressure and the appropriate air changes throughout the building, independent of the outside temperature and the ongoing research. Should the windows be open, the entire system would be thrown out of balance, putting the comfort of the occupant, and more importantly, the validity of the research at risk.

— Art Gravina, Vice President, Facilities Management

To the University Community: Final Selection of Text for Class of ’96

The ad hoc Text Selection Committee for the Penn Reading project would like to thank those who suggested texts to be read by entering students for next year’s project. We have narrowed the list to the eight texts shown below and invite you to mark your preference and, if you wish, to comment on your choice.

My recommendation is (check one):

[ ] Brecht, Bertolt, Galileo
[ ] Camus, Albert, The Stranger
[ ] Douglass, Frederick, Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, an American Slave, Written by Himself
[ ] Kingston, Maxine Hong, The Woman Warrior
[ ] Lao Tzü, Tao Te Ching
[ ] Mann, Thomas, Death in Venice
[ ] Mphalele, Ezekiel, “The Living and the Dead,” a short story in In Corner B

Comments:

____________________________________________________________________________________

Please clip this form and return it to the ad hoc Text Selection Committee, c/o The College, Mezzanine, 133 South 36th Street/3246.

Name: ___________________________ Department (optional): ___________
PennMed Teaching Awards

On March 31, the School of Medicine announced its teaching award recipients.

Dr. Arnold I. Levinson, associate professor of medicine won the Leonard Berwick Memorial Teaching Award, established by the Berwick family and the department of pathology to recognize “a member of the medical faculty who in his or her teaching effectively fuses basic science and clinical medicine,” particularly in younger faculty. A former trainee comments, “Arnie Levinson is the individual that I point to as the most important influence on my career,” a nomination said. And another: “He showed me how interesting, challenging, and rewarding such a career could be.”

The Robert Dunning Dripps Memorial Award for Excellence in Graduate Medical Education was awarded to Dr. John H. Hansen-Flaschen, associate professor of medicine. Established by the department of anesthesiology for its 1943-72 chair, who pioneered in the specialty of anesthesia, this award recognizes excellence in educators of residents and fellows in clinical care, research, teaching or administration. “As a direct result of his contributions and guidance, the Pulmonary Training Program at Penn is described to be nationally recognized as one of the premier training programs in the country that attracts the most highly qualified residents.”

The Dean’s Award for Excellence in Clinical Teaching was given to Dr. Diane Jorkasky, associate professor of pathology and laboratory medicine. This award recognizes teaching excellence and commitment to medical education by outstanding faculty members from affiliated hospitals. Recipients are selected on the advice of a committee of faculty and students. “Her extraordinary teaching exemplifies the standard of excellence against which all other teaching should be judged.”

Dr. Emma Elizabeth Furth, assistant professor in pathology and laboratory medicine, won the Dean’s Award for Basic Science Teaching. It was established in 1987 to recognize teaching excellence and commitment to medical education by outstanding faculty members from affiliated hospitals. A committee of faculty and students selects the recipient. Dr. Furth is described as having already distinguished herself as an outstanding educator and clinician in surgical pathology, as a model research advisor to residents and students, as an invaluable mentor for those working under her guidance, and as a powerful role model for all women in medicine.

Dr. David A. Piccolo, assistant professor of pediatrics, won the Blockley-Osler Award, created by the Blockley Section of the Philadelphia College of Physicians in 1987 and given annually to a faculty member at an affiliated hospital for “excellence in teaching modern clinical medicine in the tradition of Dr. William Osler and others who taught at Philadelphia General Hospital.” Another citation says, “He has been an active participant and important contributor to the residency program at Children’s Hospital as a member of the graduate education committee and served as acting co-director of the program prior to its recent change in leadership.”

About the 1992 Lindback Award Winners

All members of the University are invited to join Provost Michael Aiken on Thursday, April 23, when he presents this year’s eight Lindback Awards and one Provost’s Award. The party is from 4 to 6 p.m.in the Rare Books Room of Van Pelt Library. Below are some facts about the candidates, gleaned from the nominations dossiers, starting with the four from non-health schools.

William Dailey joined the chemistry department at the University in 1985 after receiving his Ph.D. from Dartmouth College and was awarded tenure in 1991. During this time he established himself as one the the department’s outstanding teachers. Students repeatedly remarked on his enthusiasm for his subject and for his teaching; as one student stated “most professors are trained to teach the nuts and bolts of science; Dr. Dailey also inspires.” Another writes “few teachers can match Dr. Dailey’s impressive blend of clarity, enthusiasm, humor, and genuine concern for his students.” Many students spoke of him as a role model and praised him as a mentor and graduate research advisor. His colleagues in the Chemistry Department were equally enthusiastic; one wrote that as a Lilly fellow “Dr. Dailey developed a unique curriculum incorporating the use of computers into his undergraduate courses and more advanced computational methods in his graduate courses,” and that “he has turned shy, insecure students into confident, well-rounded scientists.”

He has achieved a national and international reputation as a physical organic chemist; he is also regarded as a remarkable and distinguished teacher.

Dr. Alan Filreis became a member of the the English department in 1985 and quickly established his reputation as an outstanding teacher. His SCUE scores are consistently near perfect and students attest over and over to his remarkable energy, his innovative teaching style, and his clear commitment to his students. Many commented that even in large lectures of 80 or 90 students Professor Filreis encouraged discussion and knew all the students by name. His graduate students expressed particular appreciation for sharing his excitement about his profession, and described him as “a truly gifted teacher.” His file is unique in containing two letters of support from parents of students. One wrote that her daughter’s enthusiastic phone calls home prompted her to request and receive permission to audit Professor Filreis’s Course on the Literature of the Holocaust; another said “it is noteworthy enough when a professor makes an indelible mark on a student, but when the stimulation generated extends to the family of the student living in a different city, this is a truly remarkable accomplishment.”

Dr. Carolyn Marvin joined the faculty of the Annenberg School for Communication in 1980 and is currently Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies. She also serves as the faculty sponsor for Women in Communication and is responsible for bringing the chapter to the Penn campus. Her students wrote enthusiastically about her courses, but pointed out that her influence extended beyond the classroom. She takes a personal interest in her students and their personal and intellectual growth. “She mercilessly challenges assumptions and hidden prejudices,” “she pushed my analytic abilities to their limits,” “her lectures can captivate, frustrate, inform, and even amuse, but they always stimulate thought,” “she demanded that each and every one of us think for ourselves, a demand that unfortunately is rarely made of University students” were typical of student responses. Professor Marvin serves as a mentor and as a humane scholar and teacher.

Dr. Frank Warner arrived at Penn from Berkeley in 1968. He has served as both undergraduate chair and chair of the Mathematics department, where he has taught a wide variety of courses; he has been a driving force behind the undergraduate program for over twenty years. He was among the first recipients of the Ira Perlman Distinguished Teaching Award, established by the department of anesthesiology for its recent change in leadership.
The Association of Women Faculty and Administrators has chosen two members of the faculty, Dr. Helen C. Davies of Microbiology/Med and Dr. Christos Coutifaris, to be the recipient of the Alice Paul Award, named for a Penn Social Work alumna who wrote, "Collaborative Restructuring Comprehensive High Schools." She is noted for her innovative approaches to teaching and is currently consultant for the Philadelphia Schools Professorship at G.S.E. Dr. Davies is a professor who challenges and stimulates her students to educate individuals about heart disease, diet and lifestyle. She is noted for her innovative approaches to teaching and has received recognition for her research activities undergraduates to visiting scholars; a colleague mentions that several medical students received recognition for their research activities in Dr. Saunders’s lab, including the prestigious Howard Hughes Medical Institute Research Training Fellowships, a tribute to his ability to inspire productivity and enthusiasm among his students. A research assistant wrote “I can say with confidence that James Saunders is the best supervisor and professor that I have had throughout my entire undergraduate career. He is a professor who truly enjoys seeing his students grow and excel.”

James C. Saunders, earlier a recipient of the Dean’s Award for Teaching Excellence in the Medical School, has made major contributions to the level of teaching and excellence at the School of Medicine. In addition to his teaching at Penn Dr. Saunders has taught a national course for neurologists and neurology residents for the American Academy of Neurology in 1990 and 1991. The response from students at all levels is that he is a superb lecturer and his instruction in the lab is exceptional. Dr. Saunders provides research opportunities for all levels of the University community from undergraduates to visiting scholars; a colleague mentions that several medical students received recognition for their research activities in Dr. Saunders’s lab, including the prestigious Howard Hughes Medical Institute Research Training Fellowships, a tribute to his ability to inspire productivity and enthusiasm among his students. A research assistant wrote “I can say with confidence that James Saunders is the best supervisor and professor that I have had throughout my entire undergraduate career. He is a professor who truly enjoys seeing his students grow and excel.”

Leonore Williams and Alice Paul Awards

The Association of Women Faculty and Administrators has chosen two members of the faculty, Dr. Helen C. Davies of Microbiology/Med and Dr. Michelle Fine of Educational Psychology, for the Leonore Rowe Williams Award. Established by bequest of the widow of the late Provost Edwin B. Williams, this award recognizes outstanding female scholars and leaders.

Dr. Davies, a member of the faculty since 1961, is a founding member of WEOUP, a 1977 winner of the Lindback Award, and winner of several Medical School awards for her teaching. She was recently named associate dean for students and house staff affairs at PennMed. Dr. Fine, who won the Lindback in 1987, holds the Goldie Anna Term Professorship at G.S.E., and is noted for her innovative approaches to teaching and the education of teachers. She is consultant for the Philadelphia Schools Collaborative Restructuring Comprehensive High Schools.

The Alice Paul Award, named for a Penn Social Work alumna who wrote, the Equal Rights Amendment is given jointly by the Association and the Women’s Studies Program to students for their contributions to the quality of University/community life. The award goes to: Gabby Clay (Col ’92), Karma Dimidjian (Col ’92), Marcil Gluck (Col ’92), Katy Henrikson (Col ’92), Helen Jung (Col ’92), and Ellen Somekawa (GSAS/history).
Who are the “Specialists’ Specialists” at PennMed?

To rate physicians for their new book, *The Best Doctors in America*, Pulitzer Prize-winning authors Steven Naifeh and Gregory W. Smith asked thousands of doctors in over 350 specialties a single question: “If a friend or loved one came to you with a medical problem in your field of expertise, and for some reason you couldn’t handle the case, to whom would you send them?” The result is a reference guide that names just over one percent of the nation’s 350,000 practicing physicians. And it includes nearly 10% of the clinicians on Penn’s faculty—the 82* listed below (shown with the home departments and expertise as described in the book). *The Best Doctors in America* is published by Woodward/White, Inc., of Aiken, SC, and can be special ordered from bookstores.

### University of Pennsylvania Medical Center Faculty Physicians Included in “The Best Doctors in America”

* *Ed. Note:* This list was compiled by the PennMed News Office, where it was updated to eliminate the names of those no longer at Penn. The News Office notes that the total number of listings given for Penn in the book was 103, and that some physicians were listed under more than one specialty. On the basis of that figure Penn ranked sixth in the nation. Harvard was first with 252. The next highest number of listings was for the University of California at San Francisco with 170, of whom 104 were clinical. Then came Johns Hopkins, 131; the Mayo Clinic, 128; and the University of Connecticut, 105. The University of Washington at Seattle tied with Penn at 103 listings.

Locally, the numbers were 33 at Jefferson; 32 at Children’s Hospital (many of them Penn faculty); 25 at Temple, 16 at Hahnemann, 13 at Wills Eye, eight at MCP, seven at Fox Chase, and two at Graduate. — K.C.G.

**Abass Alavi, M.D.** (radiology)
General nuclear medicine

**Arthur K. Ashby, M.D.** (neurology)
Neuromuscular disease

**Leon Axel, M.D., Ph.D.** (radiology)
Cardiovascular disease; magnetic resonance imaging

**Lester Baker, M.D.** (pediatrics)
Pediatric endocrinology

**Clyde F. Barker, M.D.** (surgery)
Transplantation

**Henry D. Berkowitz, M.D.** (surgery)
General vascular surgery

**F. William Bora Jr., M.D.** (orthopaedic surgery)
Peripheral nerve surgery

**Alexander J. Brucker, M.D.** (ophthalmology)
Vitreo-retinal surgery

**Alfred E. Buxton, M.D.** (medicine)
Electrophysiology

**John M. Cuckler, M.D.** (orthopaedic surgery)
Hip surgery

**John M. Daly, M.D.** (surgery)
Gastroenterologic cancer

**John J. Downes, M.D.** (surgery)
Pediatric neurosurgical surgery

**Denis S. Drummond, M.D.** (anesthesia)
Pediatric anesthesiology; pediatric critical care

**Newell Fischer, M.D.** (psychiatry)
Psychoanalysis

**Eugene S. Flamm, M.D.** (neurosurgery)
Vascular neurological surgery

**Barbara L. Fowble, M.D.** (oncology)
Breast cancer

**Steven L. Galetta, M.D.** (neurology)
Neuro-ophthalmology

**Celso-Ramon Garcia, M.D.** (obstetrics/gynecology)
Reproductive endocrinology; reproductive surgery

**Robert A. Gatter, M.D.** (medicine)
General rheumatology

**John H. Glick, M.D.** (medicine)
Non-Hodgkins lymphomas and breast cancer

**Gary L. Gottlieb, M.D.** (psychiatry)
Geriatric psychiatry

**Robert I. Grossman, M.D.** (radiology)
Neuroradiology

**Brett B. Gutsche, M.D.** (anesthesia)
Obstetric anesthesia

**Daniel G. Haller, M.D.** (medicine)
Gastrointestinal oncology

**Gerald E. Hanks, M.D.** (radiation oncology)
Genito-urinary cancer

**Sydney Heyman, M.D.** (radiology)
Pediatrics

**Paul J. Honig, M.D.** (pediatrics)
Pediatric dermatology

**Abdulmassih S. Iskandrian, M.D.** (medicine/nuclear cardiology)
Dilation of the aorta

**David R. Jobs, M.D.** (anesthesia)
Pediatric cardiovascular

**Jerry C. Johnson, M.D.** (medicine)
General geriatric medicine

**Mark K. Josephson, M.D.** (medicine)
Cardiology

**Electrophysiology**

**Bernard S. Kaplan, M.B., B.Ch.** (pediatrics)
Pediatric nephrology

**James A. Katowitz, M.D.** (ophthalmology)
Oculoplastic and orbital surgery

**Warren A. Katz, M.D.** (medicine)
General rheumatology

**Mark A. Kelley, M.D.** (medicine)
General pulmonary and critical care

**David W. Kennedy, M.D.** (orthopedic surgery)
Hand surgery

**Paul A. Lotke, M.D.** (orthopaedic surgery)
Reconstructive surgery

**Stephen Ludwig, M.D.** (pediatrics)
Abused children

**Francis K. Marchlinski, M.D.** (medicine)
Electrophysiology

**Luigi Mastroianni Jr., M.D.** (obstetrics/gynecology)
Reproductive endocrinology

**Michael T. Mennuti, M.D.** (obstetrics/gynecology)
Genetics; maternal and fetal medicine

**John J. Mikuta, M.D.** (obstetrics/gynecology)
Gynecologic cancer

**Susan C. Nicholson, M.D.** (anesthesia)
Pediatric cardiovascular

**William I. Norwood, M.D., Ph.D.** (surgery)
Pediatric cardiac surgery

**Charles P. O’Brien, M.D., Ph.D.** (psychiatry)
Addiction medicine

**James A. O’Neill Jr., M.D.** (surgery)
Pediatric cardiovascular

**Peter C. Phillips, M.D.** (neurology)
Neuro-oncology

**David E. Pleasure, M.D.** (neurology)
Neuromuscular disease

**William P. Potsic, M.D.** (radiology)
Cardiography; magnetic resonance imaging

**William I. Norwood, M.D., Ph.D.** (surgery)
Pediatric cardiovascular

**Pediatric surgery**

**David E. Pleasure, M.D.** (neurology)
Neuromuscular disease

**Robert A. Zimmermann, M.D.** (radiology)
Neuroradiology

**Burton Zweiman, M.D.** (medicine)
Adult allergy and immunology

**Lucy B. Rorke, M.D.** (pathology and laboratory medicine)
Neuropathology

**Ernest F. Rosato, M.D.** (surgery)
Gastroenterologic surgery

**Robert L. Sadoff, M.D.** (psychiatry)
Forensic psychiatry

**Peter J. Savino, M.D.** (ophthalmology)
Neuro-ophthalmology

**H. Ralph Schumacher Jr., M.D.** (medicine)
Rheumatology

**Luis Schut, M.D.** (neurosurgery)
Pediatric neurosurgical surgery

**Robert C. Sergott, M.D.** (ophthalmology)
Neuro-ophthalmology

**Howard McC. Snyder, M.D.** (surgery)
Pediatric urology

**Peter J. Snyder, M.D.** (medicine)
Neuroendocrinology

**Lawrence J. Sollin, M.D.** (radiation oncology)
Breast cancer

**Charles A. Stanley, M.D.** (pediatrics)
Metabolic diseases

**Albert J. Stunkard, M.D.** (psychiatry)
Eating disorders

**Leslie N. Sutton, M.D.** (neurosurgery)
Pediatric neurological surgery

**Joseph S. Torg, M.D.** (orthopaedic surgery)
Sports medicine

**Walter W. Tunnessen Jr., M.D.** (pediatrics)
Pediatric dermatology

**Victoria L. Vetter, M.D.** (pediatrics)
Pediatric cardiology

**Alan J. Wein, M.D.** (surgery)
Neuro-urology and voiding dysfunction and urologic oncology

**Ralph F. Wetmore, M.D.** (otolaryngology-head and neck surgery)
Pediatric otolaryngology

**Linton A. Whitaker, M.D.** (surgery)
Craniofacial surgery

**Richard Whittington, M.D.** (radiation oncology)
Gastroenterologic cancer

**Peter C. Whybrow, M.D.** (psychiatry)
Affective disorders

**John R. Wilson, M.D.** (medicine)
Heart failure

**George T. Woody, M.D.** (psychiatry)
Addiction medicine

**Allan E. Wulc, M.D.** (ophthalmology)
Oculoplastic and orbital surgery

**Robert A. Zimmerman, M.D.** (radiology)
Neuroradiology

**Burton Zweiman, M.D.** (medicine)
Adult allergy and immunology

*
On Targeting Financial Aid to Minority Students

On behalf of the University of Pennsylvania, I am writing to comment on the Department’s December 4, 1991 “Notice of Proposed Policy Guidance” concerning institutional financial aid programs targeted to students who are members of minority groups.

I have several specific concerns regarding this Notice but would first like to make two general and interrelated comments. First, I am deeply concerned that the confusion created by the Department’s several pronouncements on this matter will send an unfortunate signal to members of minority groups that adequate levels of financial aid may not be available to them. While I am confident that that is not the Department’s intention, the effect of such a signal to aspiring minority undergraduate and graduate students at a time when so many institutions have demonstrated a commitment to attracting, retaining, and educating such students is quite disturbing. In that regard, Secretary Alexander’s December 4 statement that “a college president with a warm heart, some common sense, and a minimum amount of good legal advice can provide minority students with financial aid” provides me with some notion of what the Department is hoping to accomplish, but the Proposed Policy Guidance does not. Although I would like to think that I am possessed of these three attributes, the Department’s efforts at clarification are far from clarifying as to what one can and cannot do under these new guidelines.

Second, the Notice states on page eight that the Department has provided principles and examples of permissible circumstances for awarding race-exclusive scholarships “to create more certainty in an area where competing responsibilities have created some uncertainty.” It would suggest that, based in part on the Department’s assertion (page two) that there have been few “complaints or inquiries that have addressed the permissibility of race-exclusive scholarships” since the establishment of the Department of Education in 1980, there has in fact been little ambiguity or misinterpretation on the part of institutions of higher education as to the Federal government’s policy regarding minority-targeted scholarships. Longstanding Department policy has clearly suggested that such scholarships have been, in general, permissible. Indeed, any confusion or misunderstanding on the part of institutions of higher education as to the Department’s policy in late 1990 concerning the administration of the Fiesta Bowl minority scholarships, the December 4, 1991 Proposed Policy Guidance, and subsequent “clarifying” pronouncements by Department officials regarding privately-funded scholarships.

My specific concerns are as follows:

First, with regard to the examples and the questions and answers section that accompanied the Proposed Policy Guidance, there is the five “Permissible Examples” the sole types of permitted aid? Are there other examples of permissible programs? It would be helpful if the Department expanded upon the several examples of permissible programs tailored to benefit minorities.

For example, the Proposed Policy Guidance states (page 7) that a scholarship for which a “private donor restricts eligibility to students of designated races or national origin, where that aid does not limit the amount, type, or terms of financial aid available to any student” is permissible. However, a subsequent statement by the Department’s General Counsel, suggesting that such scholarships would be permissible only if the administering college did not solicit funds for that purpose from the private donor, is a further restriction on the Policy Guidance. In practice, the process through which a private donor designates funding for scholarships or for other educational purposes is considerably more complex than the General Counsel’s statement would imply, and usually reflects a confluence, after an extended dialogue, of the doner’s philanthropic desires and the institution’s needs.

In fact, the Policy Guidance’s apparent distinction between sources of funds—private donations versus institutional resources—for race-designated scholarships makes little sense. While the Policy Guidance’s implication is that privately designated funds would not otherwise be available for general scholarship support and that institutionally designated funds would be so available, as a practical matter, if prohibited for targeted scholarships, institutional funds would likely be used for purposes other than generally available student aid. Thus, institutionally designated funds represent an enhancement of total dollars available for aid, rather than a diversion of resources that would otherwise be available for all students.

Second, the Policy Guidance appears to focus exclusively on undergraduate scholarships and fails to consider the important distinction between undergraduate financial aid and support for students at the graduate and professional level. At Penn, undergraduate grant aid is awarded solely on the basis of financial need. Other institutions typically award most, if not all, of their grant aid on the basis of need as well. At the graduate level, grant aid is typically awarded to students based on academic merit and other characteristics as determined by the graduate department.

Penn and its peer research universities have a particular role to play, and, I believe, a responsibility in remedying the shortage of minority faculty throughout the nation, by increasing the pool of highly qualified minority candidates for the Ph.D. Targeted institutional support for minority graduate students, as well as targeted support for promising minority undergraduates who may be encouraged to seek the Ph.D. through efforts such as the Mellon Minority Undergraduate Fellowship Program, can be extremely effective tools for enhancing the size and quality of that pool, and thereby enhancing the diversity of the professoriate.

In sum, I believe that the Proposed Policy Guidance and its accompanying documents are generally unclear, provide too few examples of acceptable minority-targeted aid, and are fundamentally unnecessary and unwise if we are to continue to make progress toward enhancing access to and successful participation in higher education for members of minority groups. Where the Proposed Guidance is clear, it may actually impede that progress. I would urge you to give careful consideration to rethinking the premises of this proposal.

S.H.
Dr. Maurice Attie, an award-winning associate professor of endocrinology in the School of Medicine, was killed April 5 while bicycling along West River Drive. A suspect in the hit-and-run accident was apprehended about ten minutes after the 6:40 p.m. accident and was charged with homicide by vehicle, homicide by vehicle while intoxicated, involuntary manslaughter, driving under the influence and leaving the scene of an accident.

Dr. Attie, 45, came to Penn in 1980 as an assistant professor and became an associate professor in 1988. He took his M.D. from the Washington University School of Medicine in St. Louis in 1975 and trained in the Internal Medicine House Officer Program at HUP that year. Before joining the faculty, he trained also at the National Institutes of Health and served as a surgeon in the U.S. Public Health Service, 1977-80.

Dr. Attie, known as “an excellent teacher and a superb clinician,” had been honored with three teaching awards at Penn: in 1983, the Medical Student Government presented him with the Faculty Honor Roll for excellence in teaching; in 1989, the Class of ‘93 gave him their award for teaching; and last year he received the Leonard Berwick Teaching Award. When his section chief at HUP, Dr. John G. Haddad, presented him with the Berwick award he cited Dr. Attie’s love of teaching, noting that he “relishes the research, collaboration and lucid presentation of relevant material.”

Dr. Attie was the principal investigator on a grant which focused on Interaction of Hormones and Physical Stress on Bone Mass. He was a preceptor for internal medicine residents and for endocrine fellows. A highly published scholar, Dr. Attie was on the editorial boards of the Electronic Journal of Medicine and Women’s Wellness.

Dr. Attie is survived by his wife, Barbara; his three children, Alisa, Jessica and Michael; his parents, Solomon and Lily Attie; his brother, Alan Attie, and his sister, Gina Sardi.

A funeral service for Dr. Attie is scheduled Wednesday, April 8, at noon at the Levine Funeral Home, 7112 N. Broad Street.

Matthew Bronsteiri, a 20-year-old junior in the College, died in a fall April 2 at High Rise East. Mr. Bronstein had not yet declared a major. He was born on July 5, 1971, and resided in St. Croix in the Virgin Islands. He is survived by his parents, Alan and Dorothy, and by a sister, Tikvoh.
A Question of Safety: Is the Escort Service for students only?
No! Anyone with a PennCard can use the service within the boundaries shown here.
Faculty, staff and students who commute can call for Escort to 30th Street Station, too.

Call 898-RIDE for door-to-door van transportation.
Escort Service is a radio-dispatched van service
that will transport you to and from locations
within the boundaries shown here,
provided none of these locations is a
store, restaurant, bar, or other
business establishment. This
service operates from 5 pm to
3 am, seven nights a week.

Escort Service
898-RIDE

SAFETY — EVERYONE'S RIGHT,...EVERYONE'S RESPONSIBILITY
University of Pennsylvania Police Department

This report contains tallies of part 1 crimes, a listing of part 1 crimes against persons, and summaries of part 1 crime in the five busiest sectors on campus where two or more incidents were reported between March 30, 1992 and April 5, 1992.

**Date**   **Time**   **Location**   **Incident**
32nd to 33rd; South to Walnut  03/30/92  9:52 AM  Rittenhouse Lab  Monitors taken from room
32nd to 33rd; South to Walnut  03/30/92  5:14 PM  Rittenhouse Lab  Male exited building with computer table
04/04/92  12:41 PM  Rittenhouse Lab  Secured bike taken from rack
34th to 38th; Civic Center to Hamilton  03/30/92  8:47 AM  Clinical Res. Bldg.  Tape player taken from unsecured room
03/30/92  4:51 PM  Richards Building  Cash taken from desk
04/02/92  9:51 AM  Anat.-Chem. Wing  Secured electronic reference library
36th to 37th; Spruce to Locust  03/30/92  8:12 AM  Steinberg-Dietrich  Secured bike taken from rack
04/03/92  10:53 PM  Steinberg-Dietrich  Wallet taken from unattended bag
34th to 36th; Walnut to Market  03/30/92  4:30 PM  Franklin Building  Bike tire & seat taken/juvenile fled area
04/02/92  9:13 AM  Franklin Annex  Phone taken from room

**TOTALS:**
- Incidents—12
- Arrests—2
- 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.

**18th District Crimes Against Persons**

Schuylkill River to 49th Street, Market Street to Woodland Ave.

**Date**   **Time**   **Location**   **Offense/Weapon**   **Arrest**
03/23/92  8:36 PM  4600 Locust  Robbery/gun  Yes
03/23/92  9:20 PM  4200 Locust  Robbery/shotgun  No
03/23/92  1:33 AM  4200 Chester  Robbery/gun  No
03/26/92  4:00 PM  4500 Pine  Robbery/gun  No
03/27/92  3:23 AM  4000 Chestnut  Robbery/gun  No
03/29/92  12:11 AM  3900 Chestnut  Robbery/gun  No
03/28/92  12:17 PM  4000 Locust  Robbery/strong-arm  No
03/28/92  4:40 PM  4800 Woodland  Rape/strong-arm  No
03/28/92  5:45 PM  4504 Chestnut  Robbery/strong-arm  Yes
03/29/92  3:45 PM  4800 Market  Robbery/strong-arm  No
03/29/92  2:00 PM  3920 Walnut  Robbery/gun  No
03/29/92  11:05 PM  3000 Market  Robbery/gun  No

**University of Pennsylvania Police Department**

This report contains tallies of part 1 crimes, a listing of part 1 crimes against persons, and summaries of part 1 crime in the five busiest sectors on campus where two or more incidents were reported between March 30, 1992 and April 5, 1992.

**Totals:**
- Crimes Against Persons—0
- Thefts—16
- Burglaries—3
- Thefts of Auto—0
- Attempted Thefts of Auto—0

**Date**   **Time**   **Location**   **Incident**
32nd to 33rd; South to Walnut  03/30/92  9:52 AM  Rittenhouse Lab  Monitors taken from room
32nd to 33rd; South to Walnut  03/30/92  5:14 PM  Rittenhouse Lab  Male exited building with computer table
04/04/92  12:41 PM  Rittenhouse Lab  Secured bike taken from rack
34th to 38th; Civic Center to Hamilton  03/30/92  8:47 AM  Clinical Res. Bldg.  Tape player taken from unsecured room
03/30/92  4:51 PM  Richards Building  Cash taken from desk
04/02/92  9:51 AM  Anat.-Chem. Wing  Secured electronic reference library
36th to 37th; Spruce to Locust  03/30/92  8:12 AM  Steinberg-Dietrich  Secured bike taken from rack
04/03/92  10:53 PM  Steinberg-Dietrich  Wallet taken from unattended bag
34th to 36th; Walnut to Market  03/30/92  4:30 PM  Franklin Building  Bike tire & seat taken/juvenile fled area
04/02/92  9:13 AM  Franklin Annex  Phone taken from room

**There was no fifth busiest sector during this period.**

**Safety Tip:** Lock your door and your desk when you leave the room. (In eight seconds someone can walk into an open room and remove your valuables and University property.)