A-1/A-3 Joint Assemblies: Dr. Hackney

The Administrative Assembly and the A-3 Assembly will hold a joint meeting Friday, April 22, to hear President Sheldon Hackney on the future of the University and the nonacademics' role in it. He will also give an overview of results of the Penn Staff Survey conducted last fall by SRI International for the Office of Human Resources.

The meeting is at 1 p.m. in Room 351 Steinberg Hall-Dietrich Hall, and is open to all A-1 administrative/professional staff and all A-3 support staff.

For the Administrative Assembly, the meeting also includes election of officers for 1983-84. Since this Assembly holds contested elections, A-Is will receive ballots at the door for choosing between two candidates for chairperson-elect and secretary-elect, and selecting three of six candidates for the Executive Committee. The slate, presented by Nominating Committee Chair Andrea Damm, business administrator at Orthopedic Surgery:

Chairperson-elect: Anthony Merritt, Officer of Research Administration Pat Rose, Career Planning and Placement

Secretary-elect: Kristyne Nicholls, FAS Ave Zammichelli, LRSMS

Executive Committee:
Donald Angst, Internal Audit Ed Carre, Treasurer's Office
Iona Harper, Academic Programs/Med. Catherine Marshall, Annenberg Center
Kevin Vaughan, Student Administrative Services James Yarnall, International Services

It's Lindback Time

This year not eight, but ten faculty members were chosen for the Christian R. and Mary F. Lindback Award for Distinguished Teaching—five each in the health and non-health schools. The one-time rise in the number of awards reflected "the impossibility of choosing among some outstanding candidates whose qualifications and recommendations were just too close to call," Provost Thomas Ehrlich said.

From the Nonhealth Schools:

Dr. Elijah Anderson, associate professor of sociology, and director of the Afro American Studies Program, was praised for stimulating students to think: ...vividly communicates the complex intricacies of the urban social order... "does not, however, ignore the very human energy that is aroused when a class of extremely diverse political, racial, ethnic and professional contingencies attacks such controversial issues as social stigma."

Dr. Nina Auerbach, associate professor of English, drew letters on her ability to challenge students, her willingness to devote time and energy to their projects, "thoroughly critiquing our written work" and "belief in graduate students' ability and future careers." Colleagues called her "often the important intellectual and professional influence on many of our students."

Dr. Jean Gallier, assistant professor of computer and information science, was cited for "the ability to 'demystify' difficult concepts... with stunning and remarkable ease." Many letters called him "the best teacher at the University," and colleagues added that outstanding research abilities help make "an education... at the University something of exceptional value."

Dr. Morris Hamburg, professor of Statistics at Wharton—here 37 years since his appointment as instructor—had letters from generations of students, some from as far away as Thailand. (He himself is (continued next page)
now in China—hence the 1955 photo on page 1.) His "approach is to show the relationship between the world of statistics and that of business ... and do so "adoringly and succinctly," becoming "one of a few who leave a lasting impression."

Dr. A. Ronald Walton, assistant professor of Chinese in Oriental Studies, is regarded as revolutionary in development of an original language program stemming from years of psycholinguistic research to produce Chinese speaking "who has been the best trained in the country." With a sense of humor, a highly professional attitude, and an unrivaled expertise he is said to help students "develop a highly sensitive relationship with a whole new culture."

From the Health Schools:

Dr. William W. Beck, Jr., associate professor of obstetrics and gynecology at Pennsylvania Hospital who last year completed five year's service as head of the School of Medicine's admissions committee, was called "an outstanding physician who teaches enthusiastically and well... excellent teacher, compassionate person, inspiring role model." More simply, said one, "He should be cloned."

Dr. Alden H. Harken, associate professor of cardiovascular surgery, was cited for a "Pied Piper" charm in lecturing and "uniquely comprehensive approach to teaching clinical practice ... Superb, funny, knowledgeable, willing to teach 100% of the time." Added one: "Encourage him to teach others how to teach."

Dr. Laura Hayman, assistant professor of nursing and chair of the Nursing of Children Program, had over 100 letters; students rated her courses among the most valuable in the curriculum, and said for her "the phrase 'students come first' is her way of life." Colleagues added that "scholarship, coherent writing... an infectious joy" combine with the development of younger faculty as teachers.

Dr. Ronald Piddington, associate professor of histology in the School of Dental Medicine, is a basic scientist called by some "the unsung hero" of the dental faculty, with an unusual talent for lecturing: "never boring or confusing regardless of the subject matter," with "the ability to tie points into concepts and then neatly relate them to the central topic."

Dr. Martin Pring, associate professor of physiology and the director of the computer center at the School of Medicine, won dual praise for teaching basic science to medical students ("clear, articulate, approachable... there is virtually nothing that he can't explain in a way that you can understand") and for development of computer applications in research and instruction: "He is able to demonstrate not only solutions to our questions, but also the implications of those solutions."

Uses of the University

All faculty and staff are reminded that University equipment, stationery, and campus mail service are to be used solely for University business by authorized University personnel and by officially recognized campus organizations. In addition, the University name must not be used in any announcement, advertising matter, publication, correspondence, or report in connection with personal or unofficial activities of faculty members or staff; if such use in any way could be construed as implying University endorsement of any project, product, or service.

-Vice President for Human Resources

Correction: The restricted fund that establishes a reserve for the Law School's new loan program is the McKean Memorial Loan Fund, not Sloan-Kettering as reported in Almanac April 5. We regret the error.-Ed.

President Hackney on the A.T.O. Decision

The Provost and I have each been asked several times about our positions on the suspension of ATO. In response, we have drawn the attention of the questioner to the sentence in George Koval's report that stated that he had consulted us and that we had fully concurred in his decision. We reaffirm that. Subsequent to the meeting of the Advisory Board of the IFC, the Provost and I met with George Koval and several of his colleagues and discussed at great length what action to take. The decision that George Koval announced was reached in concert with that administration.

The Council and the Penn community should understand, furthermore, that no decision with such serious consequences for the individuals concerned and for the University as a whole will ever be made by an administrative officer without the thorough involvement of the Provost and the President. We and other senior officers certainly do not involve ourselves with daily managerial decisions taken in accordance with standing policy and general direction. With regard to the formulation of major policies and the making of major decisions with large-scale consequences, however, you should assume that normally I involve myself and the President in the decision, and I am therefore willing to take responsibility for it.

In this particular instance, I am very strongly of the opinion that the right thing was done and the proper procedures followed, and I have nothing but praise for the several people in the VPU's area who have worked so hard and so sensitively on this matter.

With regard to individuals who were involved in this incident, I can only now say that we have received the advice of the special faculty committee, chaired by Professor Ralph Spritzer, and we are moving forward as rapidly as we can on the basis of their advice.

Council: Psychological Size... Sexual Harassment

After the traditional reports (including President Sheldon Hackney's update on the A.T.O. fraternity, boxed below), Council passed three uncontroversial resolutions on April 13, then swung into its new mode of discussing selected campus issues without action pending.

The action items were two by-laws changes—one allowing the A-3 Assembly to send alternates if its regular Council Committee member cannot attend; one freeing Council members from the obligation to serve on at least one Council Committee—and the third action was to approve changes in the consultative process for presidential searches. Professor Paul Bender, who was Senate Chair at the time the presidential search proposal was begun, gave the background of the resolution (page 4) which now goes to Senate on Wednesday and later to the Trustees. The discussion topics:

Shrinking the Psychological Size of the University.

Faculty-student interaction was the theme of a presentation by Frank Luntz of the University. A student-student interaction was the theme of a presentation by Frank Luntz of the University. Faculty-student interactions was the theme of a presentation by Frank Luntz of the University. Faculty-student interaction was the theme of a presentation by Frank Luntz of the University.

Sexual Harassment.

Mr. Schwartz introduced three speakers for what Provost Thomas Ehrlich later called "three of the most thoughtful, articulate speakers I have ever heard at Council"—the talks at right, in effect, are from notes.

As lead-off speaker, Dr. Phoebe Leboy, Senate's past chair, emphasized that the discussion would be limited to faculty-student issues in sexual harassment, and would not attempt, in the time available, to deal with employees in the work situation, or with sexual violence.

Dr. Phoebe Leboy: Some definitions of sexual harassment are found in University policy, where "the term 'sexual harassment' refers to any unwanted sexual attention that (1) involves a stated or implied threat to the victim's academic or employment status; (2) has the purpose or effect of interfering with an individual's academic or work performance; or (3) creates a hostile or intimidating or offensive academic or work environment." This definition is similar to guidelines just now coming out from the A.A.U.P. One definition specifically directed toward issues of faculty-student harassment was published in 1980 by the National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs: "The use of authority to emphasize the sexuality or sexual identity of a student in a manner which prevents or impairs that student's full enjoyment of educational benefits, climate, or opportunities."

This power relationship is very important. It can be present in several forms: (1) Coercive harassment or "sexual bribery" occurs when the faculty member authorizes, requests, or implies "You won't get a job if you won't... or I recommend you for a job if you will." (2) Unwelcome advances of a more subtle kind, even if free of implied threat or pressure: Chasing her around the desk is not quite the right image; it's something slower, edging closer, making her move, then edging closer again. (3) Not necessarily physical, but verbal sexual advances take place: The student walks in the office to discuss an exam, but the teacher shifts to her sex life or sexual attitudes. This is the kind of thing she could deal with at a cocktail party by walking away to show she is offended; but she is not free to be so blunt about it, this is her thesis at issue, her exam at issue—if in attempting to talk about an academic problem the woman student is subjected to probing questions about her sex life. This becomes enormously significant for graduate students, where one professor exerts a great deal of control over her future. (4) Finally, the classroom. This has the most public and at the same time most subtle forms of sexual harassment. Some of it is just poor taste, but some has very damaging effects on the student's perceptions of her educational opportunity—women as second-class citizens, as playthings in illustrations for medical lectures, for example. To the extent that they interfere with her educational opportunity, these too are sexual harassment.

(continued next page)
Commentaries on Sexual Harassment

Dr. June Aslin: Sexual advances can put enormous pressure on a young woman at this stage of her emotional development—a time of heightened self-consciousness, self-doubt and vulnerability to feelings of guilt and inadequacy. It is not always easy to say "no" or to explain reasons even she cannot understand. She may be initially confused, unable to read the situation accurately: Was it my fault? What did I do wrong? How should I have behaved differently? And she may have doubt and fear over what to do about it: Can I object? What will happen if I do? If I do object, will I be known only for this incident instead of as a bright and able person? Thus male faculty need to understand that the absence of a "no" does not mean consent—there is no such thing as consent in a power relationship. Even if the reaction seems nominally to be consent, it still creates an emotional problem—student-faculty dependency or acquiescence at a time when the student should be independent.

Between T.A.'s and graduate students there is a particular problem for female graduate students. One year they are students together, and the next year one is a teacher. What was acceptable behavior before is now different—undefined and unhappy situation. T.A.'s need good role models for professional behavior; unfortunately they frequently have models of sexual harassment instead.

In many departments women clue each other about certain faculty members and avoid their courses, even that which holds to escape the dilemma of sexual harassment. In these days of open discussion and grievance procedures, it is still true that women are forced to choose courses, choose dissertation topics on a nonacademic basis. Some studies show that one reason some women choose predominantly-female professions is not just a result of discrimination and low pay compared to males in the professions, but of choosing to go into disciplines where they will not experience the same harassment they went through as undergraduates. Unpleasant encounters thus have an influence and impact beyond what would be expected in the marketplace. The line between discrimination and harassment is blurry, but both have very real impact on important research opportunities and career decisions for women students.

Dr. Jacob Abel: I want to focus on the offender or potential offender. There are four possible interactions, but male oppression of women is overwhelmingly the most common. What is almost never said is that there is a component of naturalness to the inclination...a predictability to the experience...which in itself is inescapable. It is the capitulation to the desire, the acting out, that is reason for guilt. To be civilized is not to be free of primitive impulses; to be civilized is to experience primitive impulses and not to act on them. Can we explain the etiology of harassment without appearing to defend it? If we are capable of reason and have the faculty for critical thinking then we should.

The sexual liaison between the mature academic and female student is one of the enduring and recurrent themes of modern realistic fiction...No book set on campus can fail to include an account of such a relationship. Where our authors fail us is in never depicting the essential corruption, the ugliness, the worldliness of such liaisons. We are presented instead with a romanticized acting-out of a common male fantasy in which there is a relationship. Where our authors fail us is in never depicting the essential corruption, the ugliness, the worldliness of such liaisons.

The payoff is in the high sense of professionalism, the satisfaction of not being manipulated—either of you—and freedom from other constraints. You become free to criticize.

***

Dr. Abel and others then discussed institutional responses—from commitment at the top, to propagation throughout the faculty of attitudes about what is inexplicable, women's awareness of routes for complaint; the role of women faculty as models; and how to take a proactive stance. The Provost reiterated that the University's policy prohibits sexual harassment (Almanac: March 22) and said he is asking senior officers of the University to take initiative—The VPUL through orientation changes this fall, the Vice President for Human Resources through informal training, and the Deans in their Schools, who are being asked to "bring home persuasively" to faculty and T.A.'s the implications of sexual harassment.

Tuition Plan Credibility

John Fischer (Almanac March 22) has questioned the credibility of the newly adopted tuition benefit plan, from the viewpoint of faculty recruiting. Fischer, also, is concerned with the same issue, but my conclusions are diametrically opposed.

1. It is suggested that 100% tuition (hereafter designated the "old" plan) was a major attraction to new faculty. This view implies several tacit assumptions:
   a. that faculty can predict and control the admissions process.
   b. that college-bound children will and should be asked to forego choice.
   c. that faculty whose children are not admitted to Penn have no right even to a significant partial share in the tuition benefit plan.

I find all three assumptions totally insensitive to colleagues and children, and I absolutely reject them.

2. It is contended that the "old" plan was more attractive to potential recruits than the "new" plan. I disagree.
   a. I came to Penn in 1979 with 3 pre-college children. The "old" plan was a disincentive then, and I began advocating a change even before I arrived on campus.
   b. I believe that the "old" plan was an incentive only because potential recruits were led to believe that Penn admissions was a virtual formality so that they could count on the benefit. In my opinion, this was a gross misrepresentation, which demeaned the admissions process.

In summary, every protest confirms to me the collective wisdom of the faculty in voting to alter tuition benefits.

Neal Nathanson, M.D., Professor and Chairman of Microbiology/Med

C-E: Two Medical Faculty Views

The undersigned, as tenured professors in the School of Medicine and because of our responsibilities as representatives of the medical faculty, wish to impress upon our University colleagues that the medical faculty strongly opposes sections of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Long-term Non-tenure Accrediting Academic Appointments (Almanac: April 12). The recommendations on the C-E track will not initiate it, or may have been trained to have a flirtatious style. A great opportunity, with its own rewards, is to take the high road; not to play the game. It does something for both characters. The payoff is in the high sense of professionalism, the satisfaction of not being manipulated—either of you—and freedom from other constraints. You become free to criticize.

The clinician-educator faculty was established by the University Trustees in 1976 on recommendation of the Faculty Senate. The clinician-educator faculty was established by the University Trustees in 1976 on recommendation of the Faculty Senate. The clinician-educator faculty was established by the University Trustees in 1976 on recommendation of the Faculty Senate.

In the opinion of this faculty, the clinician-educator faculty is a step toward the academic role and the mission of the C-E track within the medical center. The clinician-educator faculty is a step toward the academic role and the mission of the C-E track within the medical center. The clinician-educator faculty is a step toward the academic role and the mission of the C-E track within the medical center.

The undersigned, as tenured professors in the School of Medicine and because of our responsibilities as representatives of the medical faculty, wish to impress upon our University colleagues that the medical faculty strongly opposes sections of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Long-term Non-tenure Accrediting Academic Appointments (Almanac: April 12). The recommendations on the C-E track will not initiate it, or may have been trained to have a flirtatious style. A great opportunity, with its own rewards, is to take the high road; not to play the game. It does something for both characters. The payoff is in the high sense of professionalism, the satisfaction of not being manipulated—either of you—and freedom from other constraints. You become free to criticize.

In summary, every protest confirms to me the collective wisdom of the faculty in voting to alter tuition benefits.

...Neal Nathanson, M.D., Professor and Chairman of Microbiology/Med

C-E: Two Medical Faculty Views

The undersigned, as tenured professors in the School of Medicine and because of our responsibilities as representatives of the medical faculty, wish to impress upon our University colleagues that the medical faculty strongly opposes sections of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Long-term Non-tenure Accrediting Academic Appointments (Almanac: April 12). The recommendations on the C-E track will not initiate it, or may have been trained to have a flirtatious style. A great opportunity, with its own rewards, is to take the high road; not to play the game. It does something for both characters. The payoff is in the high sense of professionalism, the satisfaction of not being manipulated—either of you—and freedom from other constraints. You become free to criticize.

This proposed limitation of the number in this track in the following recommendation:

"At no time shall the voting strength of faculty members of the new clinical faculty track exceed 25 percent of the voting strength of the School of Medicine as a whole." (Almanac: April 6, 1976)

This proposed limitation to 25% of the voting strength of the School of Medicine faculty must be considered an estimate of required faculty strength that was to be evaluated in the years to come.

The proportion of clinician-educators to the "voting strength of the School of Medicine as a whole" is in this year just a fraction over 26 percent. It is now projected by the School of Medicine that this number has to be expanded to 35-40 percent in order to fulfill the academic mission of the C-E track within the medical center. The clinician-educators in the School of Medicine represent the highest caliber of professional educators, clinical researchers, and academic physicians and have proven effectiveness in this faculty category. We ask our faculty colleagues throughout the University, therefore, to support our plea for recognition of the special needs of our School based upon the following facts:

1. Implementation of the ad hoc committee report would change the historical base for the clinician-educator faculty by reinterpreting the 1976 Faculty Senate recommendation that the percentage of clinician-educators be calculated on "the voting strength of the School of Medi-
Phasing Out Tenure?

In 1975-76, when the Faculty Senate originally began working with the Dean and the Provost to arrange for the Clinical Educator track in the Medical School, all parties agreed that the number of C-Es should be limited and that these faculty would not vote in the Faculty Senate. Since then the C-E faculty have acquired the vote, and the original limit of 25% of the standing medical faculty has to some significant degree been exceeded. At the forthcoming Faculty Senate meeting (Wednesday, April 20) the Senate Ad-Hoc Committee on Long Term Non-Tenure Acquiring Academic Appointments will recognize a fait accompli by recommending that the 25% limit on Medical School C-Es be increased to 30% of the standing faculty and standing faculty Clinic Educators.

The purpose of this letter is to support the Committee proposal, but to suggest that we determine really to hold the line at that percentage. Others at the meeting will disagree, and may well move to increase the percentage still more. But if the C-E arrangement has become a device by which the tenure system in the school is to be phased out, we must at the very least acknowledge this as a goal and debate the question on its merits. We should not let the system silently erode.

—Robert F. Lucid, Professor of English

(Congress of the Senate 1976-77)

—Wallace T. Miller, M.D.,
Professor of Radiology:
Chairperson, Medical Faculty Senate

Franz Masthinsky, M.D., Professor of
Biochemistry and Biophysics; Chairperson,
Committee on Appointments and Promotions

SPEAKING OUT welcomes the contributions of readers. Almanac's normal Tuesday deadline for unsolicited material is extended to THURSDAY noon for short, timely letters on University issues. Advance notice of intent to submit is always appreciated.—Ed.

COUNCIL/Senate

Proposed Trustee Standing Resolution on the
Consultative Committee for the Election of the President

See Article 3.2b of the June 19, 1981, Revision of the Statutes

The consultative committee to advise the Executive Committee in the nomination of a candidate or candidates for president shall be chaired by a trustee and, in addition, shall be composed of an equal number of trustees and members of the Faculty Senate and half that number of students. The Executive Committee shall determine the overall size of the consultative committee. The trustee members shall be selected by the Executive Committee and shall include at least one faculty member. The faculty members shall be selected by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. Half of the student members shall be undergraduates, and half shall be graduate/professional students. The student members shall be selected by the appropriate student governance organizations. The charge to the consultative committee shall come from the Executive Committee and shall be reviewed by the consultative committee. The consultative committee shall endeavor to carry out a broad search and solicit suggestions from the entire University community, alumni, and friends of the University.

Acceptance of appointment to the consultative committee signifies full acceptance of the obligation to preserve the confidentiality of the identity of candidates and the proceedings of the committee, except where disclosure of such matters is expressly authorized by the consultative committee as part of its efforts to obtain information about and to evaluate candidates. The members of the consultative committee shall, in a manner consistent with their obligation of confidentiality, attempt to obtain information about inside and outside candidates from a broad range of faculty, students and administrators at this and other institutions.

In reporting to the Executive Committee, the consultative committee shall endeavor affirmatively to recommend at least three candidates. The consultative committee may rank-order the candidates that it affirmatively recommends to the Executive Committee.

Members of the Executive Committee shall endeavor to make a nomination or nominations for president from among the candidates affirmatively recommended by the consultative committee. In making a nomination or nominations, members of the Executive Committee are not bound by any rank-order recommended by the consultative committee. If members of the Executive Committee, after review of the recommendations of the consultative committee, wish to nominate a candidate or candidates not affirmatively recommended by the consultative committee, the Executive Committee shall inform the consultative committee and seek the consultative committee's specific advice about the proposed nomination or nominations before presenting such nomination or nominations to the Trustees. When presenting a nomination or nominations for president to the Trustees, the Executive Committee shall communicate to the Trustees the views of the consultative committee regarding the candidate or candidates so nominated.

The consultative committee shall submit a final report to the University community which shall include the relevant facts necessary to inform the University about the search process.

Passed by the Senate Executive Committee March 2, 1983; To be reported at the Faculty Senate Meeting April 20, 1983
Passed by the University Council April 13, 1983
The raw data indicate why there has been some concern on the part of the faculty. They show a per capita increase of 29.4% in salaries, wages, and benefits for personnel in the administrative centers between fiscal 1981 and the 1983 budget, compared with faculty salary increases of 17% to 19%. When the impact of inflation was taken out of these increases, the per capita salaries, wages and benefits of these personnel—A-I and support personnel—increased 14.5%, while faculty salaries went up only 4%. The total salary, wages and benefits expenditures in real terms grew by 22%, yet total expenditures on central administration in real terms grew only 6.5%. These data indicate that the increase in central administration costs from 1981 to 1983 are primarily due to increases in compensation for personnel, and that the compensation increases reflect both increases in numbers of employees and increased average salary per employee. The contrast between the relatively large increase in personnel costs and the much smaller increase in total expenditures suggests that the administration has been moving towards providing for a greater proportion of its needs by employing slightly more personnel at higher average compensation per employee.

Considering the expanding responsibilities inherent in administering an increasingly complex University, a 6.5% real growth in the budget seems to us to be a modest aggregate change. The faculty has increased 9.6% and the student body 1% since 1980, a recessionary economy has required more aggressive fund-raising, and University relationships are more subject to litigation.

To check this conclusion over a longer time period, the committee went back to the 1976 Report of the Senate Committee on Education, Donald D. Fitts, Chair (Almanac 4/27/76). Part I of that report contained an analysis of the General Administration budget only. A comparison of these fiscal 1976 budget numbers with the General Administration (General Expense excluded) budget numbers of recent years revealed that total salaries, wages and benefits have about doubled and total salaries, wages and benefits per capita for A-I's have increased 80%, but if the effects of inflation are removed, total salaries, wages and benefits have increased by only 17% and, on a per capita basis for A-I's, have increased by only 2%. These figures underscore the committee's general observation that, overall, administrative expenditure increases in the last two years have not been excessive—and that when the non-discretionary elements of inflation and expanded responsibilities are removed from the increases, the residual discretionary increases have been modest.

C. Central Administrative Functions

The General Administration and General Expense budgets are grouped into eight major offices of the University's central administration. 

1. Office of the President. The President, his assistants, their clerical staff, the offices of External Affairs, including Commonwealth and Federal Relations, Budget Analysis, Planning Analysis, the General Counsel and fees paid to external attorneys, the Office of Management Studies and Internal Audit, the Affirmative Action Director, Almanac and the Director of Communications.

2. Office of the Provost. The Provost, his associates and assistants, their clerical staff, the Vice Provost for University Life, the Office of Research Administration, the International Programs Office, the Chaplain and, for our
D. Detailed Findings

Tables I, II and III present summaries of the data the committee studied.

Table I presents salary, wages and benefits and total expenses for each of the eight groups for fiscal 1981 through fiscal 1983. The figures in the table are the total of the General Expense and Administration budgets. Overall, central administrative expenses will have increased 21% (if the budgeted numbers for fiscal 1983 are realized) over the two-year period; personnel expenditures will have increased 38%. The largest single category is the Vice President for Finance operations, and this category shows the largest dollar increases — although it is anticipated that actual fiscal 1983 numbers will be below budgeted amount. The question the committee sought to answer was this — are these two-year increases excessive?

Table II shows the same categories of expenses as Table I, except that the effects of inflation have been removed. The B.L.S. Consumer Price Index was used as a rough measure of price changes to deflate the nominal dollar numbers, so that data in Table II show real changes — i.e. changes in the levels of expense in terms of constant dollars. The overall changes, when prices are accounted for, is 6.5% (rather than 21%), and the personnel expenditure changes are 21% (rather than 38%).

Table III shows the number of A-1 and A-3/4 personnel on one day in the middle of each fiscal year. (They are neither the average for the year, nor the budgeted number of employees.) The number of personnel has increased about 6.5% — just about equal to the real growth in expenditures. The committee regards this overall increase as not unreasonable in view of the growth in faculty, students and scope of institutional responsibilities.

The committee spent some time analyzing the individual service centers and their subgroups. (Copies of the full Tables I, II and III are available to Faculty Senate members from the Faculty Senate Office.) The major observations from this analysis are these:

President’s Office: Three functions generated most of the budget growth: (1) The General Counsel’s budget showed a real growth of 17%, which can be attributed to the increased volume of litigation common to institutions of higher education in recent years. The University is seeking to improve its control over these costs by using its own counsel and decreasing its reliance on outside attorneys; (2) The combined budgets of the Offices of External Affairs, Community, Commonwealth and Federal Relations have increased substantially, reflecting the greater effort required to maintain positive relationships with political groups whose influence on the University and extraordinary

Central Administrative Service Center Budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Center</th>
<th>FY 1981 Actual</th>
<th>FY 1982 Actual</th>
<th>FY 1983 Budgeted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>$1,741</td>
<td>$3,034</td>
<td>$2,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>1,552</td>
<td>1,802</td>
<td>1,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Finance</td>
<td>3,855</td>
<td>2,576</td>
<td>2,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Dev/Alum. Rel.</td>
<td>2,890</td>
<td>4,037</td>
<td>2,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Health Affairs</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Human Resourc.</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Operational Svcs.</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>1,612</td>
<td>1,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$12,367</td>
<td>$28,163</td>
<td>$13,762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Salaries, wages and benefits.

*FY 1982 total includes $215,000 large-usage discount for Uni-Coll. It is uncertain whether this will be repeated.

*Savings in FY 1983 are expected from increased revenue from Graduate Hospital; and lower expenses for University Press, Audit charges and Contract Overdrafts (which are the accumulated excess of costs over grants for sponsored programs).

Central Administrative Service Center Budgets In Constant Dollars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Center</th>
<th>FY 1981 Actual</th>
<th>FY 1982 Actual</th>
<th>FY 1983 Budgeted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>$1,741</td>
<td>$3,034</td>
<td>$2,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>1,552</td>
<td>1,802</td>
<td>1,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Finance</td>
<td>3,855</td>
<td>2,576</td>
<td>2,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Dev/Alum. Rel.</td>
<td>2,890</td>
<td>4,037</td>
<td>2,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Health Affairs</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Human Resourc.</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Operational Svcs.</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>1,612</td>
<td>1,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$12,367</td>
<td>$28,163</td>
<td>$13,762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The numbers in this table are the Table I figures deflated by the Consumer Price Index, which was calculated for each year as follows:

1981 CPI: 256.9, the average of the monthly CPI from July 1980 to June 1981.
1982 CPI: 281.8, the average of the monthly CPI from July 1981 to June 1982.
1983 CPI: 293.1, the average of the monthly CPI from July 1982 to February 1983, which is an 8-month average.
(Data were obtained from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.)

D. Detailed Findings

Tables I, II and III present summaries of the data the committee studied.

Table I presents salary, wages and benefits and total expenses for each of the eight groups for fiscal 1981 through fiscal 1983. The figures in the table are the total of the General Expense and Administration budgets. Overall, central administrative expenses will have increased 21% (if the budgeted numbers for fiscal 1983 are realized) over the two-year period; personnel expenditures will have increased 38%. The largest single category is the Vice President for Finance operations, and this category shows the largest dollar increases — although, it is anticipated that actual fiscal 1983 numbers will be below budgeted amount. The question the committee sought to answer was this — are these two-year increases excessive?

Table II shows the same categories of expenses as Table I, except that the effects of inflation have been removed. The B.L.S. Consumer Price Index was used as a rough measure of price changes to deflate the nominal dollar numbers, so that data in Table II show real changes — i.e. changes in the levels of expense in terms of constant dollars. The overall changes, when prices are accounted for, is 6.5% (rather than 21%), and the personnel expenditure changes are 21% (rather than 38%).

Table III shows the number of A-1 and A-3/4 personnel on one day in the middle of each fiscal year. (They are neither the average for the year, nor the budgeted number of employees.) The number of personnel has increased about 6.5% — just about equal to the real growth in expenditures. The committee regards this overall increase as not unreasonable in view of the growth in faculty, students and scope of institutional responsibilities.

The committee spent some time analyzing the individual service centers and their subgroups. (Copies of the full Tables I, II and III are available to Faculty Senate members from the Faculty Senate Office.) The major observations from this analysis are these:

President’s Office: Three functions generated most of the budget growth: (1) The General Counsel’s budget showed a real growth of 17%, which can be attributed to the increased volume of litigation common to institutions of higher education in recent years. The University is seeking to improve its control over these costs by using its own counsel and decreasing its reliance on external attorneys; (2) The combined budgets of the Offices of External Affairs, Community, Commonwealth and Federal Relations have increased substantially, reflecting the greater effort required to maintain positive relationships with political groups whose influence on the University is considerable; (3) The combined areas of Planning and Budget Analysis, Management Studies/Internal Audit and some of the departments under the Vice President for Finance have expanded significantly (discussed in Section E below).

Provost’s Office: The fiscal 1983 budget includes a new Associate Provost with new functions involving budgeting of schools and minority faculty and student development. The period between 1981-83 also saw significant expansion in the areas of Student Health and Residential Life. In the opinion of the committee the 21% expansion in the real dollar budget of the Provost’s Office during this period reasonably reflects both expanded responsibilities and increased effectiveness.

**CONTINUED PAST INSERT**
Vice President for Human Resources. This office is undergoing significant program and structural changes. Personnel benefits counseling, for example, has recently been moved from the Office of the Vice President for Finance to this office. Given the current state of flux and the resulting difficulty in making meaningful comparisons across years, the committee found it difficult to draw any conclusions about the level of expenditures in this area.

Vice President for Development and Alumni Affairs. The committee applauds the success of this year's annual giving drive. The efficiency with which development dollars are deployed is an important issue, since 14% of central administration funds go to this activity. The committee has not reviewed efficiency measures such as the change in the revenue return per dollar of development expenditure. However, a comparison of this measure with similar universities is omitted.

Vice President for Operations Services. The budget for this area showed a decline in real dollars from fiscal 1981 to fiscal 1983. Most of this is because of a five-fold increase in revenues brought in from items such as parking revenue (from $72,000 to $354,000), but it also reflects significant cost containment efforts. Whether this result is to be commended depends on whether the University community is satisfied with the level of services provided by this office.

E. Budget/Planning/Internal Management

There is one functional area about which the committee has considerable concern. There have been substantial increases in the budget for items that relate to the storage, retrieval, and analysis of information critical to the University's resource allocation decisions. Has the information system improved commensurately?

Table IV shows the changes in amounts actually spent on these activities in fiscal 1981 and 1982, and compares them to the fiscal 1983 budget. The amounts are expressed both in nominal and real dollars. In real terms, the increase is expected to be somewhat between 7% and 22% and between $875,000 and $1,395,000 in current dollars—depending on whether the planned expenditures for the Data Center are or are not included.

To gain further perspective, the committee compared these data with the fiscal 1976 data for these functions and the Fitts report. Table V presents this comparison, using General Administration data—the only comparable data available. These data tell a similar story: very substantial increases in nominal dollar terms, and still substantial increases when the effects of inflation are removed.

This area of information retrieval and analysis was one with which the committee had some direct experience. We encountered a substantial delay in obtaining each set of numbers. In some cases, several months elapsed. Some of this, we were told, caused by the combination of inadequate data collection, storage procedures, and retrieval system development in prior years. Some was caused, we were told, by current understaffing. This is all the more a matter of concern because such information was easily available in 1976 when far fewer real dollars were spent on information retrieval. We also felt that there was a reluctance to anticipate, in a helpful manner, the information we would require to address the questions we had laid out.

In summary, we have concluded that, despite substantial increases in expenditures, the budget information system is not yet organized in a sufficiently flexible and systematic way to provide a sound and documented basis for administrative resource allocation.

F. Conclusions

The Senate Committee on Administration concludes that the pressures of inflation, the increased number of faculty and students, and the expanded scope of University responsibilities by and large justify the growth in central administrative expenditures over recent years.

There is one area, however, in which we have considerable concern—the quality, quantity, storage and ability to retrieve the budgetary data needed for rational resource allocation decisions. The ability to obtain such data, and the accuracy of the budget as a picture of actual expenditures are relevant to the faculty as it makes recommendations on educational programs and on its salaries and benefits. The announcement by Vice President Gazzerro (Almanac 3/29/83) of the appointment of an Administrative Computing Advisory Board suggests that the administration recognizes these problems, and provides reason to expect improvement. This, then, is among the areas to watch in the next few years.

There is one major aspect of administration which this year's committee has not addressed: Have individual schools taken on more of what were formerly central administrative responsibilities? Have some schools taken on more than others? We urge next year's committee to make the study of administrative costs within schools an important part of their ongoing analysis of administrative expenses.

Senator Committee on Administration:

Bruce Kuklick (history)
Phoebe S. Leboy (biochemistry, Dental)
Setha Low (landscape architecture)
Dan McGill (insurance)
David Solomons (accounting)
Anita Summers (legal studies & public management)
Frank Trommler (Germanic languages), chair
Ex officio: June Axinn (social work), Senate Chair-elect
Murray Gerstenhaber (mathematics). Senate Chair
Committee staff assistant: Lallie O'Brien
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**General Administration and Expense**

**Budget/Planning/Internal Management Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current $ Expenditures</td>
<td>$3,648</td>
<td>$3,950</td>
<td>$4,433</td>
<td>$5,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Current $ Expenditures</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant 1967 $ Expenditures</td>
<td>$1,408</td>
<td>$1,401</td>
<td>$1,513</td>
<td>$1,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Constant 1967 $ Expenditures</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Includes three budget items in the Office of the President (Budget Analysis, Planning Analysis, Management Studies/Internal Audit) and two items in the Office of the Vice President for Finance (University Management Information Systems, Data Center).

*The Data Center was budgeted for with the intention of reducing expenses by releasing the University from its contract with Uni-Coll and providing those services internally. However, a subsequent favorable renegotiation of the contract with Uni-Coll has enabled the University to save significant amounts without undertaking a major investment at this time. The administration expects that most of the $611,000 budgeted for this project will be freed up and available to meet financial obligations elsewhere, while the remainder will be used for consultants and services related to the University's data processing needs. Since the precise breakdown of the $611,000 is not available the comparisons are presented both with the Data Center included and with it excluded.*

---

**General Administration**

**Budget/Planning/Internal Management Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current $ Expenditures</td>
<td>$1,883</td>
<td>$2,287</td>
<td>$2,562</td>
<td>$3,173</td>
<td>$3,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Current $ Expenditures</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant 1967 $ Expenditures</td>
<td>$1,014</td>
<td>$883</td>
<td>$909</td>
<td>$1,083</td>
<td>$1,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Constant 1967 $ Expenditures</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See footnote to Table IV.

*These data are the sum of Executive Director of the Budget, Planning Analysis, University Management Information Systems, Management Studies/Internal Audit, University Studies and Budget Administration.*
Benefits for Faculty and Staff

The 1983-1984 compensation package for faculty and staff has been designed to provide maximum utilization of available funds and competitive salary policies while maintaining the integrity of our comprehensive benefit program. Following are highlights of the compensation package to be made available to faculty and staff as of July 1, 1983.

Health Insurance

Dramatic increases in health care costs, coupled with increased utilization, have resulted in substantial rate increases for Blue Cross/Blue Shield, and moderate increases for the health maintenance organizations (HMOs) in which employees may elect participation.

The new rates effective July 1, 1983, are found in the table below. Subscribers' contributions for single coverage in Blue Cross/Blue Shield "100" plan will increase from $9.28 to $10.92 per month. For family coverage the increase will bring the current $27.15 per month to $36.14.

To ease the financial impact of the rate increases on faculty and staff subscribers, the University is substantially increasing its contributions toward premium costs. For example, there is a $9.19/month increase in cost for single coverage, but since the University will absorb $7.56, the additional cost to the subscriber will be only $1.64. For family coverage, the University will pay $18.23 of the $27.22 increase, making the additional cost to employees $8.99/month.

By federal law, whatever amount the University pays toward Blue Cross/Blue Shield premiums must be extended to premiums charged by HMOs. Rates for HMOs are identified in the chart below and reflect new University contributions toward single and family coverage.

More pleasant news is the fact that Blue Cross/Major Medical single life-time maximum will increase, at no cost, from $250,000 to $1 million. For employees enrolled in Blue Shield "65 Special," the Major Medical maximum increases, again without cost, to $25,000.

Dental Insurance

The University offers two dental plans for eligible faculty and staff: one through Prudential Insurance Company, the other through the School of Dental Medicine (Penn Faculty Practice Plan). Prudential rates will not increase next year. Although there will be an increase of approximately 20 percent in Penn Faculty Practice Plan rates, the University will continue to pay the full premium for single coverage under either plan. For family coverage, monthly contributions for those in the Prudential Plan will remain at $13.30 and will be $12.30 for the Penn Faculty Practice Plan.

Life Insurance

After a review by the Personnel Benefits Committee of life insurance coverage for active faculty and staff 65 or over, the following change is effective as of July 1, 1983: Life insurance coverage provided by the University for employees over age 65 will be adjusted to 1.75 times the annual benefit base salary until retirement. Currently, life insurance for these employees decreases by 10% per year after age 65.

Tuition Benefits

As previously reported (Almanac April 8) the University will increase tuition assistance over the next few years for faculty and administrators/professionals whose dependent children are enrolled in undergraduate programs at colleges/universities other than Penn. For 1983-84, the primary import is to raise the direct grant from $900 to $1,000.

The University continues to examine the feasibility of providing direct grants to dependent children of non-exempt (A-3) staff. A decision on this is expected by June 1, 1983.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Dental Programs</th>
<th>Monthly Premium Rates Effective July 1, 1983 through June 30, 1984</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prudential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Rate—Single:</td>
<td>$12.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Contribution</td>
<td>12.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriber contribution (Monthly Pay Deduction)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriber contribution (Weekly Pay Deduction)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Rate—Family:   | $38.20                              | $38.20                |
| University Contribution| 25.90                               | 25.90                 |
| Subscriber contribution (Monthly Pay Deduction) | 13.30 | 13.30 |
| Subscriber contribution (Weekly Pay Deduction) | 3.07 | 2.84 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Medical Insurance and Health Maintenance Program</th>
<th>Monthly Premium Rates for Subscribers and Dependents Under age 65, effective July 1, 1983 through June 30, 1984</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Rate—Single:</td>
<td>$58.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Contribution</td>
<td>47.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriber Contribution (Monthly Pay Deduction)</td>
<td>10.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriber Contribution (Weekly Pay Deduction)</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Rate—Family:                                      | 170.47                               | 186.85                           | 168.23                           | 151.30*                                      | 133.30                           | 163.18                           | 158.46                           |
| University Contribution                                  | 134.33                               | 134.33                           | 134.33                           | 134.33                                       | 133.30                           | 134.33                           | 134.33                           |
| Subscriber Contribution (Weekly Pay Deduction)          | 8.34                                 | 7.50                             | 7.82                             | 3.92                                        | -0-                             | 6.66                             | 5.57                             |

*HMO-PA filed these rates with the Insurance Department of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Approval is pending.
Salary Adjustments for Nonacademic Staff

I. Salary Scales

The University is committed to maintaining equitable salary relationships. Periodic salary surveys are conducted to ensure that our salaries compare favorably with those paid by other educational and non-profit institutions. Salary scales are reviewed and are periodically adjusted to maintain a competitive structure.

This year's market surveys support a shift in the salary scales. For all non-exempt and exempt grades, the minimums have increased by approximately 10%, and the maximums have increased by approximately 6%. In addition, a new "Hiring Maximum" has been established, representing the maximum starting salary for fully-qualified employees.

Furthermore, as another step in the continuing development of the Compensation program, the University is merging its current four salary scales into two. The dual-scale approach unifies non-exempt positions on one scale, G3 to G10, combining the previous T, C, and S/ K scales, for the technical, clerical, and service/craft positions. The second salary scale, PA1 to PA10, covers all exempt (Professional/Administrative) positions. (See the new PA and G salary scales, below.) The G scales show the 35-hour week. Separate tables are available from the compensation office for those working 37.5 or 40-hour weeks.

II. Guidelines

Guidelines for the distribution of increases effective for the next fiscal year have been distributed to the major responsibility centers to provide adequate time for them to make timely salary decisions on all regular staff hired prior to April 1, 1983.

The 1983-84 non-academic staff salary increase guidelines are designed to insure that employees are compensated in relation to their duties and responsibilities and that individual differences in performance are recognized.

Highlights of the 1983-1984 Non-Academic Staff Salary Increase are:

1) A 6% aggregate pool for non-exempt and exempt employees (An increased range of 4% to 9%, with 4% representing satisfactory performance);
2) The merging of four salary schedules into two—one for exempt and one for non-exempt positions;
3) An approximate 10% increase in the grade minimums and an approximate 6% increase in the grade maximums, for both non-exempt and exempt grades;
4) The establishment of a hiring maximum representing the maximum starting salary for fully-qualified employees;
5) That Employees' salaries must be at or above the minimum of the appropriate salary grade, effective July 1, 1983.
6) Within each responsibility center or school, the salary pool available for the non-exempt category may not be used to supplement the other categories.

---Gary J. Posner, Vice President for Human Resources

---

Definitions:
In the text at left and the tables below, the following terms are used:

Salary Scale: A pay structure based upon pay grades. There are two salary scales (PA and G).

Grade: The pay grade to which a job title is assigned. All grades have dollar minimums and maximums. There are 10 PA grades (professional/administrative) and 11 G grades (support staff).

Old Grade: Previously existing support staff salary grades (C, T, S/K) which have been combined into the new G grades.

Hiring Maximum: The highest starting salary which may be offered to a fully qualified candidate for a position in that grade, without additional approvals being required.

---

### Monthly Paid

**Effective: July 1, 1983**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>PA 1</th>
<th>PA 2</th>
<th>PA 3</th>
<th>PA 4</th>
<th>PA 5</th>
<th>PA 6</th>
<th>PA 7</th>
<th>PA 8</th>
<th>PA 9</th>
<th>PA 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>$13,200</td>
<td>$14,400</td>
<td>$15,600</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$19,200</td>
<td>$23,575</td>
<td>$27,150</td>
<td>$31,000</td>
<td>$35,850</td>
<td>$41,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>$1,100.00</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
<td>$1,300.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$1,964.58</td>
<td>$2,262.50</td>
<td>$2,583.33</td>
<td>$2,875.33</td>
<td>$3,445.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring Maximum</td>
<td>$17,250</td>
<td>$19,500</td>
<td>$21,600</td>
<td>$24,350</td>
<td>$27,375</td>
<td>$31,100</td>
<td>$35,400</td>
<td>$40,500</td>
<td>$44,500</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>$1,437.50</td>
<td>$1,625.00</td>
<td>$1,804.17</td>
<td>$2,029.17</td>
<td>$2,281.25</td>
<td>$2,591.67</td>
<td>$2,950.00</td>
<td>$3,375.00</td>
<td>$3,712.50</td>
<td>$4,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>$21,400</td>
<td>$23,850</td>
<td>$27,550</td>
<td>$30,800</td>
<td>$34,200</td>
<td>$40,500</td>
<td>$46,700</td>
<td>$53,400</td>
<td>$61,600</td>
<td>$68,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>$1,783.33</td>
<td>$1,987.50</td>
<td>$2,395.83</td>
<td>$2,550.00</td>
<td>$2,891.67</td>
<td>$3,375.00</td>
<td>$3,891.67</td>
<td>$4,450.00</td>
<td>$5,133.33</td>
<td>$5,868.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### 35-Hour Work Week, Weekly Paid

**Effective: July 1, 1983**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Old Grade</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Hiring Maximum</th>
<th>Annual Pay</th>
<th>Weekly Pay</th>
<th>Monthly Pay</th>
<th>Hrly Pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>C1 T1</td>
<td>$8,400</td>
<td>$161.53</td>
<td>$6,915</td>
<td>$9,725</td>
<td>$187.00</td>
<td>$5,343</td>
<td>$9.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4</td>
<td>C2 S/K18</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>163.45</td>
<td>6,870</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>202.91</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>10.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5</td>
<td>C3 T2</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>175.00</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>10,900</td>
<td>206.62</td>
<td>6,999</td>
<td>11.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G6</td>
<td>C4 S/K20</td>
<td>9,650</td>
<td>185.57</td>
<td>5,302</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>225.01</td>
<td>7,531</td>
<td>13.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G7</td>
<td>C5 T3</td>
<td>10,325</td>
<td>198.55</td>
<td>5,873</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>240.38</td>
<td>8,588</td>
<td>14.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8</td>
<td>C6 S/K22</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>215.39</td>
<td>6,154</td>
<td>13,350</td>
<td>256.73</td>
<td>8,882</td>
<td>15.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G9</td>
<td>C7 T4</td>
<td>11,650</td>
<td>224.00</td>
<td>6,401</td>
<td>14,250</td>
<td>274.05</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>15.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G10</td>
<td>C8 S/K24</td>
<td>12,350</td>
<td>237.51</td>
<td>6,798</td>
<td>15,250</td>
<td>283.26</td>
<td>8,979</td>
<td>16.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G11</td>
<td>C9 T6</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>253.85</td>
<td>7,253</td>
<td>17,250</td>
<td>331.73</td>
<td>9,478</td>
<td>16.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G12</td>
<td>C10 S/K27</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>276.92</td>
<td>7,912</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>374.96</td>
<td>10,714</td>
<td>17.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G13</td>
<td>C11 S/K28</td>
<td>15,900</td>
<td>306.74</td>
<td>8,424</td>
<td>21,650</td>
<td>416.36</td>
<td>11,986</td>
<td>18.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23,850</td>
<td>458.64</td>
<td>13,104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,550</td>
<td>529.70</td>
<td>15.137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

ALMANAC, April 19, 1983
Academic Calendar
April 29 Spring term classes end

Children's Activities
April 27 After-School Program: Arbor Day Story Hour, ages 5-7, hear stories, have a tree snack and take home a tree seedling; 3:30-5 p.m., Morris Arboretum, $7 per child, $5.25 for Arboretum members. Reservations: 247-5777.

Conferences

Third Annual CLAS Symposium, 2 p.m., West Lounge, Williams Hall (Comparative Literature Association of Students).

April 23 American Historical Archaeology Symposium, 5 p.m., Rainey Auditorium, University Museum, admission $2.50 for members and senior citizens, free for Penn faculty, students, and staff.

April 29-May 1 Literature and History: Theoretical Problems and Russian Case Studies, keynote address April 28, 7:30 p.m. Members’ Lounge, International House (Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures). Free admission. Information: Ext. 8704.

Coursework and Training
Coursework and Training
College of General Studies
April 23 Press Release Workshop, 9 a.m.
Computers for the Home User, 9:30 a.m.

April 23, 27 Effective Time Management, 9:30 a.m.
April 24 Music by Women Composers: Renaissance, Baroque and Contemporary, 2 p.m.

April 25 Meet the Phyllis Pop, 6 p.m.
April 30 A Workshop on the Novel, 9:30 a.m.

These are non-credit courses sponsored by CGS. Dates shown are starting dates of courses. Information and registration: Ext. 6479 or 6493.

Morris Arboretum
April 23 Rock Gardening for the Beginner, 11 a.m.
April 24 Spring Flower Walk, 1:30 p.m.

April 28 Water Gardens, 7 p.m.
April 29 Spring Migration Bird Walk, 8 a.m.
May 1 Trees of the City, 2 p.m.

These courses are sponsored by the Morris Arboretum. Pre-registration is required for all classes. Information: 247-5777.

School of Nursing
April 21 Inferility: A Nursing Perspective, Penn School of Nursing, Information/registration: Ext. 4522.

Training Division of Personnel
April 18, 19 Approaching Your Staff, 9 a.m.-noon (participants must attend both sessions). $30 fee per participant, charged to the participant’s department, following supervisory approval.

April 20 The Interview Process: From Start to Finish for Staff with Hiring Responsibilities, 1-4 p.m. $10 fee per participant, charged to the participant’s department, following supervisory approval.

April 22 The Art of Delegation, 9 a.m.-noon, $10 fee per participant, charged to the participant’s department, following supervisory approval.

Information/registration: Training Division, 516 Franklin Building, 16, Ext. 3400.

Exhibits
Through April 24 Connection: Bridges/Ladders/Ramps/Staircases/Tunnels: Institute of Contemporary Art.
April 29 Mesopotamian Gallery reopens, University Museum. On display in the refurbished gallery are the gold and lapis bull-headed lyre, the Ram in the Thicket, the golden headress of Queen Pu-abi, the treasures of the Royal Cemetery of Ur.

Through April 30 Planet for International Peace, 1300-1455, Klein Corridor, Van Pelt Library.

Baroque and Contemporary: A photo exhibit presented by the Women’s Center in honor of Year 102 and developed by the Smithsonian Institution, first floor, Houston Hall.

Through May 8 Sculpture by Sergio Castillo, distinguished Chicano artist, recent works in stainless steel, bronze and brass, Faculty Club.

Through May 12 Wharton School Authors, an exhibit consisting of copies of books and articles by Wharton faculty, teaching and research staff, lounge area of Dietrich Graduate Library Center, Van Pelt-West.

Ongoing Egyptian Mummy: Secrets and Science at Polytechnic University Museum.

Exhibition Hours
Faculty Club 36th and Walnut Streets. Monday-Friday 9 a.m.-7 p.m.

Institute of Contemporary Art Fine Arts Building, 34th and Walnut Streets. Tuesday, Thursday, Friday 10 a.m.-5 p.m., Wednesday 10 a.m.-7 p.m., Saturday and Sunday noon-5 p.m.

University Museum 33rd and Spruce Streets, phone: 222-7777.

Exhibition Hours: Monday-Tuesday 10 a.m.-4:30 p.m., Wednesday 1-5 p.m.

Van Pelt Library Monday-Friday 9 a.m.-11 p.m. except holidays. Rosenwald Gallery, Monday-Friday 9 a.m.-5 p.m.

Wine Concert: Wednesday
To launch its new pops-style late-afternoon concert series, the Faculty Club asked pianist Susan Starr to select a promising young performer and introduce him or her at Penn. Thus Francisco Martinez Ramos, appears Wednesday, April 20, in Alumni Hall. After wine and cheese from 5 to 6 p.m., Mr. Martinez Ramos performs Bach’s Tocata and Fugue in C-sharp Major, Beethoven’s Appasionata, and Moussorgsky’s Pictures at an Exhibition. Tickets at $5.50 include wine and cheese and there is a buffet dinner afterward at $7.50. For reservations: Ext. 4618.

Music
April 20 Claude White conducts the University Wind Ensemble in music transcribed from the opera repertory, including excerpts from Mozart’s Don Giovanni for wind octet, “Prelude to Act III” of Wagner’s Lohengrin, waltzes from Strauss’ Der Rosenkavalier. Michael Acciavica Magnone conducts the overture to Rossini’s L’Italiana in Algieri, 8 p.m., Harold Prince Theatre, Annenberg Center.

April 23 Collegium Musicum performs Flowers of the Renaissance, a florid polyphony and spring songs for voices, viols and lutes; under the direction of Mary Anne Ballard; 2 p.m., lower Egyptian Gallery, University Museum. Admission free, $2 donation requested.

April 24, 25 Music by Women Composers: Renaissance, Baroque and Contemporary, program highlighting the work of women musicians through live performance and narration by Oracle, a choral ensemble specializing in performance of a cappella masterpieces from Renaissance and Baroque periods; 2-4 p.m., Room 200, College Hall (CGS). $12.

April 25 Performers: Players perform a program including premieres of David Finko’s Fromm Serenade, Stephen Jaffe’s Arch for mixed ensemble, Joel Spiegelman’s Astral Dimensions no. 1, 8:15 p.m., Lang Concert Hall, Swarthmore College.

April 26 William Parbery conducts the University Choral Society and the University Symphony Orchestra in Schubert’s Mass in B flat, 8:30 p.m., Tabernacle Church.

April 31 Penn Relays Concert, 8 p.m., Irvine Auditorium (Groove Phi Groove Social Fellowship—Year 102 Events).
On Stage

April 21, 22 Jesus Christ Superstar, Quadrumains, 8 p.m., Irvine Auditorium.

April 21-23 Marygold Theatre Company's The Lady's Not For Renting, St. Mary's Church, 8:30 p.m., $4.

April 21-May 8 The Philadelphia Drama Guild's All My Sons, by Miller; After the Fall, by N. H. H. M. A., 8:30 p.m. 11 a.m.-4 p.m. Raindate May 1.

Special Events

Through April 24 National Library Week. Van Pelt and the Free Library of Philadelphia will forgive fines and restore borrowing privileges with the return of overdue books.

April 22 Through April 24 Special Events: John Lehman. 7:30 p.m., 200 College Hall. The Navy, John Lehman, Secretary of the Navy. 2 p.m., Alumni Hall.


April 26 Changes in Housework in 20th Century America: Kathy Sneed, department of economics; 12:15 p.m., Room 106, Women's Studies Office. Logan Hall (Women's Studies Brown Bag Luncheon).

The Fallen Woman: Helena Michele, doctoral student; 12:15 p.m., Room 233, Graduate Lounge, Houston Hall (GSSS Lunchbag Seminars).

Poetry Reading and Announcement of Creative Writing Contest Winners: Anthony Hecht, Bollingen Prize 1983, and Anthony Vennera; 4 p.m., floor hall, College Hall (Writing Program and Philomathian Society).

Spring on Spruce Street, 10 a.m.-4 p.m. Raindate May 1.

Sports

April 20 Softball vs. Widener, 4 p.m. Women's Lacrosse vs. Princeton, 7 p.m.

April 23 Men's Heavyweight Crew vs. Yale/Columbia (Blackwell Cup).

April 26 Baseball vs. LaSalle, 3 p.m.

April 29 Men's Tennis vs. Cornell, 2:30

April 29 Women's Tennis vs. Princeton, 7:30 p.m.

April 29 Women's Outdoor Track, Penn Relays

April 30 Softball vs. Trenton, 4 p.m.

April 30 Women's Tennis vs. Cornell, 2:30

April 30 Men's Tennis vs. Princeton, 2 p.m. Dartmouth

April 26 Football vs. Yale, 11 a.m.; Women's and Men's Tennis; River Field: Softball; Schyullkill River: Men's and Women's Crew.

Tallis

April 19 Membrane Glyco-Proteins of Neuroblastoma Cells: Dr. M. C. Glick, CHOP, 12:30 p.m., Physiology Library, Richards Building (Respiratory Physiology Seminar).

Advances in Rapid Solidification Processing: Robert Mehrabian, director, Materials Science Center, National Bureau of Standards; 4 p.m., Auditorium, LERMS (Materials Science and Engineering, I/RSM).

Methods for Forecasting Petroleum Resources: John H. Schuenemeyer, University of Delaware; 4 p.m., Room 217, Steinberg Hall (Dowroch Hall (Civil Engineering Department, Resource Management and Technology Lecture Series).


Toward Preventing Nuclear War: Bearing Witness: Health Advocacy in the Nuclear Age: Suzanne Goren, Neville Schurr, Jacqueline Fawett, Pen professors of nursing; Phyllis Taylor, Osteopathic Medical Center; 7 p.m., Auditorium, Nutrition Education Building (School of Nursing, The Office of the President).

Toward Preventing Nuclear War: Address: U.S. Secretary of the Navy, John Lehman; 7:30 p.m., 200 College Hall (Penn Federal Political Union, The Office of the President).

The Follies: A Musical Mystery Tour

Franklin's Follies, the faculty-staff musical revue this weekend, is billed on posters as a campus Whodunit. For a while, it wasn't Whodunit, so much as the twelve casts rehearsing their separate skits and song-and-dance routines in quarters closely resembling Physical Plant, Alumni Relations, the D.P. and other departments. This week, Professor Alfred A. Bishop and Marjorie Weiss took the wraps off: Yes, Sheldon Hackney, Thomas Ehrlich, assistant vice president and others from the executive suites of College Hall and the Franklin Building will be joining the 60-odd performers scouted out at keyboards and spectrophotometers throughout the University. Linked in a series of the Anthropology School Auditorium, 8 p.m. Friday and Saturday April 22 and 23, tickets are at the Annenberg Center Box Office, $3.50 with employee I.D.

The Makers of Modern Thought, poster reads. But the force that pulled off the wraps was none of those above. It was a man named Thomas Ehrlich. After a career in the office of the President, he wanted to do something different. Ehrlich turned out to be the inspiration for the whole show.
Anatomy—Chemistry Building: near Room 358; Biology Building: near Room 117; Forensic Science Building: east staircase, second floor; Logan Hall: first floor, near Room 117; Science Library: north mezzanine; Student Center: north mezzanine lobby; Van Pelt Library—ask for copy at Reference Desk; Towne Building: ground floor, near Room 117; Rittenhouse Hall: east staircase, second floor; Towne Building: northeast lobby; Volland Library: ground floor, near Room 217;Welsh Hall: northeast lobby; West Hall: north mezzanine lobby; Louis Kahn Building (57); East Hall: first floor, near Room 117; Towne Building: northeast lobby; Logan Hall: first floor, near Room 117; Wright Hall: north mezzanine lobby; Wharton Hall: northeast lobby; Wharton Center: northeast mezzanine.