The tuition increase proposal below will be on the agenda for vote when the Trustees Executive Board meets Friday, March 13, at 2 p.m. in the Faculty Club. At right, for background, are FY1987 Budgeted and FY1988 Projected revenue and expense in the Unrestricted Operating Budget (University only; does not include Hospital or Clinical Practices). Salary guidelines for faculty and staff are normally issued later in the Spring term. The complete FY1988 budget goes before the full Board of Trustees for vote in June.

### Preliminary University Unrestricted Operating Budget FY 1987 vs. FY 1988

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>FY1987</th>
<th>FY1988</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>198,037</td>
<td>211,802</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Appropriation</td>
<td>31,524</td>
<td>33,242</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Income</td>
<td>9,779</td>
<td>10,194</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>9,703</td>
<td>10,210</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost Recoveries</td>
<td>36,761</td>
<td>42,167</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Services</td>
<td>66,390</td>
<td>70,075</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sources</td>
<td>5,543</td>
<td>5,863</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>361,737</td>
<td>383,553</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>FY1987</th>
<th>FY1988</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>193,497</td>
<td>207,554</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Centers</td>
<td>24,067</td>
<td>24,072</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>46,971</td>
<td>47,788</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated Costs &amp; Student Services</td>
<td>96,511</td>
<td>103,593</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>361,737</td>
<td>383,553</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Administration will take to the Trustees Executive Board next week a proposal to increase undergraduate tuition and fees by 6.9%, from FY1987's $11,200 to $11,976 in FY1988. Room and board rise by 5% and 3.9% respectively, so that the overall increase for a residential undergraduate year at Penn will be 6.3% in tables above released by Executive Director of Budget Glen R. Stine.

Graduate student costs also rise 6.9% in these projections, starting with a higher tuition base for a new annual cost of $12,680 plus living expenses. And SAS and Nursing are instituting $100 semester technology fees matching those of SEAS and Wharton—but these will not start until the second semester, Dr. Stine said.

"The budget for 1987-88 is the result of careful consultation with faculty, staff and students," President Sheldon Hackney said. "Our deliberations pit every item in the budget against every other item. Because resources are limited, the inevitable result is a compromise in which we try to accomplish as many of our goals as possible, balanced against each other.

"For 1987-88, we wanted to continue the progress we have achieved on faculty salaries, to maintain our rate of investment in undergraduate education and our research facilities, to provide adequate funds for the upkeep of buildings, to retain Penn's need-blind admissions policy by providing sufficient funds for undergraduate student aid, to close the gap between Penn and other major research universities in graduate student support, and—very importantly—to continue to cut the rate of increase in tuition and fees," the President continued. "We have not been able to do as much in any one of these areas as we would like, because of the constraints under which we operate. But the proposed budget is fair and will allow the University to maintain its momentum while holding tuition increases to moderate levels."

This is the fifth year in a row that the rate of increase has come down, Dr. Stine said (in FY1987 the increase was 7.7%), and over the past ten years Penn has increased tuition less than six of the seven other Ivy League schools have. However, an Undergraduate Assembly petition with some 2200 signatures asked the University to contain the increase to 5.5%, according to The Daily Pennsylvanian. UA leadership will meet this week with the President and Provost on proposals concerning uses of the increased fee.

Although no overall budget totals have been projected for comparison with FY1987's $863 million (including Hospital and Clinical Practices), the unrestricted operating budget rises from $360.7 million to $383.5 million in the new projections (above, right).

Provost Thomas Ehrlich said the budget shows a "major effort to squeeze on every non-academic front we could," with emphasis on sparing funds to enhance faculty salaries and contain the tuition increase as far as possible. Central administrative offices have been held to an average of 4% increase in operating budgets for their continuing activities. But the total for "Allocated Costs & Student Services" rises by 7.2% because of new items not in the 1987 budgets, generally representing the operating cost of new undertakings—such as the campus-wide data transmission network, Career Planning and Placement Center, and other facilities and services.

---

**OF RECORD**

**After a Snow Closing**

The University was officially closed on Monday, February 23, 1987, because of snow. As a result, no student, faculty or staff member should be penalized for not being present that day in a class, office or elsewhere on the campus.

—Thomas Ehrlich, Provost
—Helen O'Bannon, Senior Vice President

---
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Spring is Coming and the Senate is Busy

The first crocus has not yet been sighted and Punxatawney Phil, the woodchuck, has stated, as accurately as usual, that there are three more weeks to winter. This is the season that the daffodil is most full for SEC and the Senate committees.

Two weeks ago, I reviewed some of the proposals of the Committee on Administration for alterations in the Senate Rules. These changes were proposed to speed the decision process and increase your involvement in these decisions through the use of referenda. The proposals were presented to SEC which gave advice, the committee met again and developed further modifications with this advice in hand. The report published at right is a product of this interaction and represents, in my view, an improvement in several areas of concern. It should be read carefully. We encourage your comments in letters and through the Speaking Out column in Almanac. The proposals will be debated and acted upon at the Spring meeting of the Faculty Senate on Wednesday, April 15, at 3 p.m. in 200 College Hall. I urge you to set this time aside on your calendars and attend so that we can consider these important changes in the way that we operate and other significant issues.

In addition to its work on the Senate Rules, the Committee on Administration is considering the effects of the proposed changes in the recreation and parking fees. It is gathering testimony on these topics from a number of sources and will be presenting recommendations. Professor Martin Pring, the chair, and I will be happy to receive your views on these subjects.

The Committee on the Faculty is completing work on a recommendation for guidelines concerning how to incorporate the concept of "goodness of fit" into the tenure decision process. It is reviewing the experience of a clinical track in the Law School and considering a proposal from the School of Social Work to create a clinician educator track. The committee will then initiate discussion of the effects of the new federal law requiring discontinuation of mandatory retirement at age 70 on the faculty appointment, promotion and retention process. Although the recent legislation has given colleges and universities a seven-year period to make adjustments, we must examine all aspects of this complex issue as soon as possible. I believe that this issue will require our best efforts for the next several years. If we do not contribute actively to a solution for this looming problem, you may be sure that others will do it for us. You can look for suggestions from this committee early in the next academic year.

The Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty continues to push your interests on salary as well as benefits. Although progress is being made in the field of salary to partially compensate for that extended period of time when we fell sadly behind in salary levels, pressures are mounting from a number of sources to limit or even reduce benefits to faculty and staff. The activities of this committee provides the major assurance for you that your interests will continue to be advocated and that administration policies will continue to be monitored.

The Committee on Students and Educational Policy is actively undertaking a review of the role of the faculty in the student recruitment process. It is assessing how the faculty can support the recruitment of the brightest undergraduate students to the University and how the University can be made more attractive to minority students. In addition, it is undertaking a comprehensive study of the Honor Code and how plagiarism and cheating can be reduced.

In summary, all committees of the Faculty Senate are active and functioning with your interests and those of the University in mind. As members of the University Committee on Consultation, your Chairs (past, present and future) are in a position to effectively relate the concerns of the faculty to the President and Provost on a regular basis since we meet formally every two weeks and can meet informally as the need arises. This mechanism works effectively and we stand ready to serve you.

Please communicate...
complaints into the open. But they do not do so.

We would further propose that for academic/administrative units identified as potential trouble spots, exit surveys of females and minority group members should be undertaken (including faculty and staff as well as students). These surveys would be along the lines of the Sexual Harassment Survey, but could be considerably briefer. Possibly a group of senior female and minority faculty members should be designated as persons available to those surveyed for confidential discussion of any incidents reported. While such a group would not maintain written records, they might become aware of repeated charges against a particular individual and might then encourage the complainants to come forward cooperatively with a formal complaint. They might also be invited by the President and or Provost to give their judgment as to the seriousness of any problems which may exist in a particular academic/administrative unit.

Jean Adelman, Librarian, Museum
Jean Crockett, Professor of Finance
Adelaide Dellav, Professor of Biochem.
Michelle Fine, Assoc. Professor of Education
Mark Giesecke, Director, Psych Student Health
Ornette Leslie, Assistant Dean and Admissions Officer, School of Social Work
Daniel Malamud, Professor and Chair of Biochemical Dentistry
Kim Morrison, Associate Vice Provost for University Life
Phyllis R. Rackin, General Honors
Jack Reese, Assoc. Professor of History
Ann Strong, Associate Dean, Graduate School of Fine Arts, Professor of City and Regional Planning
Susan Wachter, Assoc. Professor of Finance

Concurrence
I agree with Professor Jean A. Crockett that it would be helpful and appropriate for the University to collect and maintain certain types of information concerning alleged harassment, as proposed in her letter to the editor.

—Neil J. Hamburg, Associate General Counsel

Pennflex Campaign
I am offended by the advertising campaign to which we are being subjected in the name of Pennflex. Not by Pennflex itself, as far as I can tell, it is a perfectly reasonable and even desirable campaign. But the publicity campaign seems to have been elaborately designed (perhaps by a consultant?) to waste my time and the University's money. It gives new meaning to the term excess.

First there came to my home, by first-class mail, a sturdy corrugated cardboard mailer, with a specially-printed glossy mailing label. What did it contain? A glossy, specially-printed file folder, and a flyer giving me a list of all the other things I was going to get at home, by first-class mail, over the next couple of months. Nothing more.

Shortly thereafter, the second mailing arrived. It consisted of a glossy four-page newsletter, with lots of empty space on the pages, a nice color logo, and perhaps—a generous estimate—half a page of real information.

So far, everything I have received could have fit nicely into a one-page memo delivered through the University mail service. A program that ought to be providing me with important information is being treated at the intellectual level of a Publishers' Clearinghouse sales campaign. I especially resent the fact that this nonsense is being paid for with money that could be better used to buy library books or fix leaking roofs.

—C. D. Graham, Jr., Professor, Materials Science and Engineering

Ed. Note: Human Resources refers readers to Speaking Out last week (February 24, p. 2) in which James J. Keller of Benefits responded to similar letters on this subject.

—K.C.G.

Snow Job
The University seems to be able to find new and unique ways to officially screw things up. On Monday February 23, while the radio was telling me about a 10 to 18 inch snowfall and that all Philadelphia public schools were closed, I called the MELT line, and I was told the University was open. A number of people did the same thing, and we all came into work.

It is now 9 a.m. and the sun is shining brightly, the streets around the University are wet, but there is no snow on them, and the MELT line has been changed to tell us that
Effect of the New Federal Tax Law on Graduate Student Support

The Tax Reform Act of 1986, signed by President Reagan on October 22, 1986, makes significant changes affecting the Federal tax status of scholarship and fellowship awards and assistantships provided to graduate students. At the request of the President and Provost, we have been considering steps the University might take to limit the potential impact of the new law on scholarship and fellowship recipients, while conforming to its requirements.

The purpose of this notice is to inform members of the University community, particularly graduate students, of our understanding of the new law and its impact on students. Some of the effects of the new law on graduate students are clear, but much of the new law remains subject to further clarification by the Internal Revenue Service, which has not yet issued guidelines as to how universities are to implement these changes. Waiting to inform the University community until the IRS issues such guidelines could, however, affect planning by graduate students and their departments. Therefore, we believe it is prudent for the University to offer its interpretation and preliminary plans for implementation at this time.

The new law will affect students differently, depending on the type of appointment they hold, the amount of their support from the University, their family status, and other sources of income. While it remains each student's responsibility to file an accurate tax return, the University will offer guidance, under the auspices of outside tax experts, for graduate students in need of assistance in understanding their responsibilities under the new law. Guidance sessions will be scheduled and announced in the near future.

The following is our current understanding of the provisions of the new Federal law regarding the different categories of graduate student support, when these provisions will take effect, and our preliminary interpretation of Penn's responsibilities for reporting and recordkeeping. Students should be aware that, at this time, the current treatment of graduate support for state and city tax purposes has not changed. We emphasize that what follows represents our best judgment, based on extensive consultation with colleagues at Penn and at other universities, and with experts in Washington. It is not a guarantee that the IRS will agree with this judgment.

For Pedestrians and Cyclists

The following letter to President Hackney was also sent to Almanac by the author. As one of the bicycle-concerned persons whose letter was earlier published in Almanac, I feel moved to respond to your very thoughtful letter to Sheldon Jacobson, Chair of the University Council Safety and Security Committee (Almanac February 10, 1987).

Many faculty members and students wrote or spoke to me after my letter to Ruth Wells was published. All comments I had were sympathetic to the concerns of pedestrians, but there was also concern for responsible bicyclists.

I agree with you that a total ban of cycling would be nearly unenforceable. I also believe that the combination of some physically designed deterrents (bumps) along with the request for separate lanes (marked cycle paths) would function best both for pedestrians and cyclists. These methods seem to work well in many European cities and universities. I think they would work well here.

If the Safety and Security Committee has a better solution, I would welcome it.

Meanwhile, I am pleased that careful attention has been given to this issue which is not a trivial one in view of the physical dangers and potential civil suits that could occur.

Thank you for your concern.

Marvin E. Wolfgang, Director, Selin Center for Studies in Criminology and Criminal Law

Faculty Surveillance

SAS will examine "the use of faculty time in such areas as undergraduate and graduate instruction, research and scholarship, and service" (Draft of the SAS Five Year Plan, p. 56).

The scene is the Faculty Records and Surveillance Center in a sub-basement deep under College Hall. The Duty Officer is showing a visitor around.

Visitor: "What are those machines over there?"

Officer: "Those computers keep a running record of the faculty's personal and professional data, upgraded weekly. These data are used for many purposes, including salary determination. The faculty gets so much for each published work, so much for each continued past insert
Income tax on these excess amounts, but will report any such amounts to the IRS if required.

Graduate students in the categories of "Teaching Assistant," "Research Assistant," or "Research Fellow" will be taxed on their stipends, because such students perform services, regardless of whether these services are required of all candidates for their degree. Therefore, for awards granted after August 16, 1986 and paid as of January 1, 1987, the University will withhold tax on stipends paid to graduate students in these categories. The University anticipates that the IRS may rule that not more than the stipend will necessarily be compensation for services. To the extent that the non-compensation portion of the stipend is used for course-related expenses, that portion can be excluded from tax. If the IRS so rules, the University will withhold tax only on that portion of the stipend that represents compensation. As the University presently considers tuition and fees to be merit-based and not compensation for services, and in the absence of IRS clarification to the contrary, we intend to treat tuition and fees provided on behalf of graduate students in these three categories as non-taxable. In order to ensure that graduate students' general fees, which in many schools are paid by students from their stipends, will not be subject to tax, they will in future be paid by the University as part of the student's fellowship.

Stipends will not be subject to Social Security (FICA) tax.

Exclusion from Tax of Fees and Course-Related Expenses

As stated above, graduate support not considered compensation will be taxable only to the extent that it exceeds tuition, general fees, and course-related expenses. The law defines "course-related" expenses as fees, books, supplies and equipment required for courses of instruction. It seems reasonable to include in this list such items as educational technology fees and laboratory fees. It is essential that students keep receipts and accurate records of their expenses for such items, so that they can document these expenses at tax reporting time.

Status of Graduate Support for Nondegree Candidates

The changes described in the preceding sections apply to degree candidates only. Under prior law, nondegree candidates not performing services could exclude from tax an award up to $300/month for 36 months. The new law provides that an award made to a nondegree candidate will be fully taxable, except that the partial exclusion from tax (up to $300/month for 36 months) for nondegree candidates under prior law will continue to apply if notice of the award was given prior to August 17, 1986. We believe that multi-year awards made before that date will also remain subject to the prior partial exclusion.

Status of Graduate Support for Foreign Students

Beginning with the 1987-88 academic year, awards that exceed tuition, general fees, and course-related expenses, made to non-immigrant students holding "F" or "J" visas, will be subject to withholding at a rate of 14%. Foreign students entitled to the benefits of an income tax treaty with the United States may be exempt from such withholding, and students should contact the Office of International Programs or the Office of the Comptroller to obtain information as to whether their nation is party to such a treaty and, if so, to apply for an exemption.

General Tax Considerations for Students

As mentioned above, the new tax law will affect graduate students differently, depending on the type and amount of their award, their family status, and their other income. Under the new law, students whose income is below the aggregate of the new zero bracket amount (standard deduction) and personal exemption will pay no tax. In general, a student's "income" from a graduate award will be the stipend, less fees and course-related expenses. In 1987, the zero bracket amount will be $3500 for a single individual ($7000 for married couples filing jointly) and the personal exemption will be $1000.

The University recognizes the considerable complexity of the new law as it affects graduate students and that the new law may in many cases prove some financial hardship. We will continue to make every effort to increase support for graduate students, and to help them cope with the burdens and complexities of the new law.

Alfred F. Beers, Comptroller
Debra F. Fickler, Esq., Assistant General Counsel
Dr. Donald D. Fitts, Associate Dean for Graduate Studies, SAS
David J. Morse, (Chair), Director Federal Relations
William M. Schilling, Director Student Financial Aid
Gary F. Truhlar, Director Human Resources Project, UMIS
Staff Grievance Procedure

The following is a reprint of the policy which went into effect in January of 1984.

In accordance with the University's Staff Grievance Procedure, the Manager, Staff Relations is to maintain a listing of members of the full-time faculty and non-academic staff who have volunteered to be advisors under this procedure and a listing of full-time members of the non-academic staff with at least six months of University service, who have volunteered to be grievance panel members. Individuals willing to serve in either capacity, should send their name, indicating whether advisor or panel member, campus address and phone extension to:

Barbara Johnson
Manager, Staff Relations
Room 516, Franklin Building 6288

Individuals who have volunteered previously will remain on the active list unless Staff Relations is notified otherwise. Any questions about being an advisor or a panel member or any other aspect of the Staff Grievance Procedure, should be addressed to Barbara Johnson at Ext. 6093.

The cooperation of every staff member of the University community is essential to insure that the Staff Grievance Procedure provides a fair and equitable process in attempting to resolve a problem of a member of the non-academic staff.

I. Introduction

There should be several means by which a question, problem, or concern of a staff member may be resolved. The first and most preferable is through some sort of informal process. There are certain offices at the University well-equipped to facilitate informal discussions of employment difficulties. However, there will be a few cases which cannot be resolved on an informal basis. In these instances, therefore, a formal grievance procedure is necessary and desirable.

II. Purpose

The University of Pennsylvania believes that a member of the nonacademic staff should not have to resort to an external procedure for the airing and the resolution of questions, concerns, and problems relative to his or her employment here. At all times it should be the fundamental consideration of the University and the staff member to promote a satisfactory resolution, as quickly as possible, of the problem within the framework of University policies and fairness to the parties involved.

III. Informal Procedure

It is expected that a staff member will first attempt to resolve the matter with his or her supervisor. The Office of Staff Relations and the Office of the Ombudsman, among others, are well equipped to facilitate or aid in such discussions to resolve the matter. The staff member should attempt to resolve the matter in this informal procedure within twenty (20) working days from the day the staff member first knew or could reasonably be expected to have known of the circumstances giving rise to this grievance. If the matter involves an allegation of sexual harassment or discrimination the time period may be extended to provide sufficient time to attempt to resolve the matter. If the matter cannot first be resolved in this manner, the staff member has the right to file a formal grievance.

IV. Formal Procedure

Definition of a Grievance: A grievance is defined as an unresolved problem concerning application of University policy, practice or procedure, excluding position classification decisions, but including disciplinary action, involuntary termination, allegations of sexual harassment or discrimination on the basis of race, sex, sexual or affectional preference, age, marital status, ethnic or national origin, religion or handicap.

Eligibility: This procedure is applicable to grievances arising out of the employment of any regular, full-time or part-time exempt (monthly paid) or non-exempt (weekly paid) staff member holding a nonacademic appointment in a PA or G salary grade but excludes staff members covered by collective bargaining agreements.

Filing Process: The staff member must initiate the formal grievance procedure within twenty-five (25) working days from the date the staff member first knew or could reasonably be expected to have known of the circumstances giving rise to the grievance. The staff member, with the aid of a representative of the Office of Staff Relations or their advisor, completes and signs the grievance form (Form SR-1), which includes the following:

a) a summary of the grievance;

b) a summary of the steps taken to resolve the matter through discussions in the informal procedure and any other action, including any actions taken under any statute or governmental regulation;

c) a summary of all factual information appropriate and necessary for further consideration of the issue.

If the grievance involves a charge of discrimination, the Office of Affirmative Action will be notified by the Office of Staff Relations and will participate in the investigation and resolution of the staff member's grievance. In such a case, the time period for Step I may be extended in order to provide time for such efforts.

The formal grievance procedure:

Step 1. The staff member shall submit the written grievance to his/her immediate supervisor, who shall have ten (10) working days to meet with the staff member and respond in writing to the grievance. A copy of the supervisor's written answer will be forwarded to the staff member and the Office of Staff Relations.

Step 2. If the grievance is not resolved to the staff member's satisfaction at Step 1, the staff member may submit the written grievance, with the supervisor's answer, to the Department Head/Chairperson (or a designated representative).* The written grievance must be presented within five (5) working days of the Step 1 answer. The Department Head/Chairperson or the designated representative shall have ten (10) working days in which to meet with the staff member and respond in writing to the grievance, with a copy to the staff member and to the Office of Staff Relations.

*If the immediate supervisor is the Department Head/Chairperson, Step 2 shall be omitted and the grievance shall move to Step 3.
Step 3. If the grievance is not resolved to the staff member’s satisfaction at Step 2, the staff member may submit the written grievance to the appropriate Dean, Vice President, Director or other designated administrative head of the unit within five (5) working days after the Step 2 answer. The staff member and the identified administrative head will review the matter with the Manager. Staff Relations. The administrative head will reply to the grievance in writing within fifteen (15) working days after the date it is presented, with a copy to the supervisor, staff member and Manager, Staff Relations.

Step 4. If the grievance is not resolved to the staff member’s satisfaction at Step 3, the staff member may submit a written request to the President of the University for a hearing before a five-member panel within fifteen (15) working days following the receipt of the decision in Step 3. Copies of such a request, at the same time, shall be submitted to the supervisor and the Manager, Staff Relations.

The panel shall consist of five (5) members including the Chairperson. The Chairperson will be appointed by the President of the University within ten (10) working days of receipt of the request.

The decision of the panel shall be reported in writing to the President within thirty (30) working days of the appointment of the chairperson. This decision shall be final and binding on all parties unless the President responds in writing within fifteen (15) working days to the Chairperson setting forth his decision in the matter and the reasons for modifying or rejecting the decision of the panel. The Chairperson shall immediately notify in writing all parties involved of the decision of the President which shall become final and binding on the parties.

V. Comments

1. Compliance with University Policy: If the grievance is directed against a specific change in the staff member’s employment status, such change may be effected if a determination is made by the Manager. Staff Relations that University procedures relevant to the matter were substantially followed.

2. Protection Against Discriminatory Action: No staff member will be discriminated against or otherwise adversely treated because he or she has filed a grievance. In the event a staff member claims discriminatory treatment for grieving or participating in a grievance hearing for any purpose, the claim will be immediately heard at Step 3 of this procedure.

3. Confidentiality: The record of any grievance shall, as applicable, be covered by the policy pertaining to the confidentiality of records.

4. Advisor to a Staff Member/Immediate Supervisor: The grievant and the responding administrative unit head may each select an advisor from the full-time faculty or nonacademic staff. Throughout the informal processes, and Steps 1 to 3 of the formal procedures, the advisors may assist the grievant and/or the responding administrative unit head to prepare for formal meetings and discussions. They may actively participate in any formal meetings or formal discussions, although only to the extent of asking questions to elicit facts, but in no way can the advisor impede this process. During panel hearings, legal representatives and advisors to both parties are expected to remain silent, and they are not permitted to participate actively in the dialogue of discussions unless so requested by the Chairperson to insure fair representation.

The most effective and timely way to bring about an equitable resolution of any dispute is for the offended party and the appropriate administrative head to discuss the issue directly. At panel hearings, direct dialogue, questioning, and discussion between the grievant and the panel, between the administrative head and the panel, as well as between the parties, should facilitate the discussion of essential issues in each particular case and lessen the likelihood of diversions from central issues and into procedural maneuvering. The panel hearings need not follow strictly legal guidelines or courtroom procedures. Rather, fairness and openness are to be the guiding principles of panel hearings. All communications shall be between the grievant and the applicable representative of the University.

The Manager, Staff Relations shall maintain a listing of members of the full-time faculty and nonacademic staff who have volunteered to be advisors under this procedure.

5. Chairperson of Staff Grievance Panel: The Chairperson shall have the responsibility of obtaining panel representatives: these two named representatives must be full-time University staff members with at least six (6) months of University service. A panel member may remain on the list until the member serves on a panel. Once a panel member serves on a panel, that member cannot again serve on a panel for at least twelve (12) months from the date of the panel’s written recommendations. The Manager, Staff Relations shall maintain at all times twelve (12) names from each grouping indicated above.

7. Selection of the Panel: Upon receipt of a grievance, the Chairperson shall contact the grievant and the immediate supervisor to obtain the name of their respective panel representative: these two named representatives must be full-time University staff members with at least six (6) months University service. The panel representatives of the staff member and the immediate supervisor cannot be advisors or from the department that was involved in the first two steps of the formal grievance procedure. The panel representatives so named shall be contacted by the Chairperson and each shall select one additional panel member from the current panel list. The panel shall be five (5) persons in total, including the Chairperson.

8. Panel Hearing: The Chairperson shall control and direct hearings in as informal a manner as possible. Both parties to the grievance are required to be present during the proceedings. The Chairperson shall preside at the hearing and shall rule on motions, procedural questions, and admissibility of evidence. At the discretion of the Chairperson a record of the proceedings may be kept in the form of stenographic notes or tape recordings and may be transcribed. For questions pertaining to University policies and procedures the Chairperson shall consult with the Manager, Staff Relations.

9. Time Limitations: All parties involved in the Staff Grievance Procedure shall adhere to the time limitations as set forth. However, it is recognized that sickness, vacation, other personalleave or the nature of the grievance might interfere with the strict adherence to these time limitations. Therefore, additional time may be granted, but only by the Manager, Staff Relations, and then only before the time limit sought to be extended has expired. If a grievance is not answered in or extended in a timely fashion it shall be deemed denied at that level and may be processed into the next step of the grievance procedure.

10. Questions or Interpretations: All questions relating to any aspect of this grievance procedure shall be directed to the Manager, Staff Relations. Unless expressly stated otherwise. The Manager, Staff Relations has the responsibility to provide interpretations as to the meaning or applications of any portion of this procedure.

11. Reports: The Manager, Staff Relations shall submit an annual report to the Vice President for Human Resources, limited to occurrences and issues raised under this procedure during the preceding fiscal year and making any recommendations concerning any aspect of this Staff Grievance Procedure.
### Department of Public Safety Crime Report

This report contains tallies of Part I crimes on campus, a listing of Part I crimes against persons, and summaries of Part I crimes occurring in the five busiest sectors on campus where two or more incidents occurred between February 23 and March 1, 1987.

**Total Crime: Crimes Against Persons—1, Burglaries—1, Thefts—16, Thefts of Auto—0**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time Reported</th>
<th>Area/Highest Frequency of Crime</th>
<th>Incident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crimes Against the Person:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-27-87</td>
<td>12:20 PM</td>
<td>South St. to Walnut St., 32nd St. to 33rd St.</td>
<td>Robbery/no injuries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-28-87</td>
<td>5:40 PM</td>
<td>Palestra</td>
<td>Untended backpack taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-29-87</td>
<td>7:04 PM</td>
<td>Hutchinson Gym</td>
<td>Untended coat/watch/bag/books taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-01-87</td>
<td>9:22 PM</td>
<td>Hutchinson Gym</td>
<td>Untended wallet and contents taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-02-87</td>
<td>1:04 PM</td>
<td>Hirst Auditorium</td>
<td>Two complainants/wallet taken while playing ball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-02-87</td>
<td>4:25 PM</td>
<td>Hirst Auditorium</td>
<td>Personal property taken from secured locker, no forced entry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Civic Center Blvd. to Hamilton Walk, 34th St. to 38th St.**
  - 02-24-87 11:10 AM Medical School
  - 02-25-87 10:34 AM Kaplan Wing
  - 02-26-87 8:51 AM Medical School
  - Various tools removed from secured office area.
  - Master key taken from housekeeping ring.
  - VCR and headphones taken from rear of auditorium.

- **Locust Walk to Walnut St., 36th St. to 37th St.**
  - 03-03-87 1:51 AM Theta Xi
  - 03-04-87 7:40 PM Phi Gamma Delta
  - Property taken from house while members out.
  - Coat, keys and ID taken while unattended.

- **Baltimore Ave. to Walnut St., 40th St. to 42nd St.**
  - 02-22-87 3:54 PM Ley Building
  - Microwave taken from building.
  - Student's coat taken while at party.

- **Walnut St. to Market St., 30th St. to 34th St.**
  - 02-23-87 8:08 PM Hill House
  - Unattended wallet taken from purse.
  - Suitcase missing from trunk/no forced entry.

### Update March on Campus

**FILMS**

**International House**

Films are shown at 7:30 p.m. at International House. Admission: $3.50. Members, students, and senior citizens: $2.50. Information: 387-5125, Ext. 2222.

**4 New Video Japan: Program IV:**

**5 Focus on Jean Renoir: Rules of the Game.**

**ON STAGE**

6 *The Crucible* by Arthur Miller; Zellerbach Theatre


**TALKS**

3 Molecular Genetics of E. coli: Shyam Reddy, Frederick Cancer Research Facility, Bethesda, MD; 11 a.m., Wistar Institute Auditorium (Wistar Institute).

**Direction of Electron Transfer in Modified Cytosol: Stephen Issel, department of chemistry, Rutgers University; noon, Room 404, Anatomy-Chemistry Building (Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics).**

5 Metaphysical Poetry and American Poets: Emily Dickinson and Robert Lowell; Gerd Rohmann, University of Kassel, Germany, 4:30 p.m., Penniman Library, Bennett Hall (English Department).

Formate: A Critical Intermediate for Sodium-Coupled Chloride Transport in the Renal Proximal Tubule: Peter S. Aronson, M.D., departments of medicine and physiology, Yale University, School of Medicine; noon, Hirst Auditorium, 1 Dulles Building, HUP (Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics).

10 Electron Transfer in the Reaction Center Protein: Temperature and Free Energy Dependence of the Rate: Marilyn Gunter, department of biochemistry and biophysics; noon, Room 404, Anatomy-Chemistry Building (Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics).**

12 Mechanisms of Insulin Receptor-Mediated Endocytosis Differ From Among Various Cell Types and from Other Ligands: A Possible Relationship to Insulin Action: Leonard Jaret, department of pathology and laboratory medicine; noon, Hirst Auditorium, 1 Dulles Building, HUP (Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics).

17 An Alternate Approach to the Assignment of 2D NMR Spectra of Proteins: The Main Chain-Directed Assignment of Human Ubiquitin: A. Joshua, Institute for Cancer Research, Fox Chase Cancer Center; noon, Room 404, Anatomy-Chemistry Building (Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics).**

### Deadlines

The deadline for the weekly calendar update entries is Tuesday, a week before the date of publication. The deadline for the April pullout is Tuesday, March 17. Send to Almanac, 3601 Locust Walk/6224 (second floor of the Christian Association).

### W-4 Workshop: Location Changed

The March 12 W-4 Workshop scheduled for Room 200, College Hall from noon-1 p.m. has had to be changed to the Chemistry Auditorium; the time and date remain the same. The Payroll Department regrets any inconvenience this may have caused.

---
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