Abrams Award: Henry Gleitman, Ron Miller

The School of Arts and Sciences' Ira Abrams Memorial Award for Distinguished Teaching goes this year to Dr. Henry Gleitman of Psychology and Dr. Ronald E. Miller of Regional Science.

The award, funded and named for a 1931 College alumnus, carries a $1000 prize and the placement of winners' names on a plaque outside the Dean's Office in College Hall. An SAS faculty committee chooses colleagues for teaching that is intellectually challenging which leads to an informed understanding of a discipline, who "embody high standards of integrity and fairness, to have a strong commitment to learning, and to be open to new ideas."

Dr. Gleitman, who joined Penn as professor and chair in 1964 after teaching at Cornell, Swarthmore and New York's New School for Social Research, was described by the SAS faculty committee as "such a presence...as to have gone beyond legend," appreciated "in terms usually reserved for a work of art." Already a winner of the Lindback Award (1977) and the American Psychological Foundation's teaching award (1982), he is the author of an introductory text, Psychology, that the discipline's historians liken to the work of William James. In addition to his work in behavioral and cognitive sciences, he has notable credits in theater as a director (e.g., Six Characters in Search of an Author, The Three Penny Opera, and the recent Antigone done by Penn Players).

Guggenheim, Sloan Awards

Dr. Edward Peters, professor of history, has received a Guggenheim Fellowship to carry out work in The Evolution of the Idea of Curiosity. His award is one of 262 given by the John Simon Guggenheim Foundation this year to scholars in the U.S. and Canada.

Two members of the faculty have received Sloan Foundation Awards in the 1988 round: Dr. Charles Epstein, assistant professor of mathematics, and Dr. Hai-Lung Dai, associate professor of chemistry.

Dr. Gotwals to Emory

Penn's Deputy Director of Libraries, Dr. Joan Gotwals, has been named Director of Libraries and Vice Provost of Emory University. She will take office August 1 in Atlanta, heading a system which has libraries of law, medicine, theology, business and science as well as the central arts and sciences library with its rare book collections, and a branch on the original Oxford Campus. Emory is a private University with some 9000 students, and is a fellow member of the Research Libraries Group where Dr. Gotwals serves on the board.

As Acting Director of Libraries here, Dr. Gotwals is working with Penn's incoming director and vice provost, Dr. Paul Mosher of Stanford, on transition.

Dr. Gotwals joined Penn as a freshman, taking her B.A. in 1956, M.A. in 1958 and Ph.D. in 1963 in political science. After teaching at Drexel for a year en route to the Penn Ph.D., she took her first post in the Penn Libraries as (continued on page 2)
assistant head of circulation in 1962. After heading circulation and reserve, reference and bibliography, she became assistant director of the system in 1972 and associate director in 1974. In a reorganization under Richard DeGennaro in 1981, she was promoted to Deputy Director with responsibility for all operations.

**OF RECORD**

**On Salary Guidelines For 1988-89**

We are pleased to announce that for the academic year 1988-89 the University's salary policy will continue to provide real growth in the incomes of continuing faculty and staff. With inflation this past year increasing to just over four percent, and current estimates showing continued relatively slow growth, the University will have been able to provide real growth in income for eight straight years.

As was the case last year, the format for faculty salary guidelines again emphasizes merit in the allocation of each school's pool. Funds provided above the minimum base increment from both the schools' and the central University faculty salary reserve are to be used to reward extraordinary academic performance, to fund promotions, to adjust for salary inequities, and to respond to special market conditions. As was the case last year, a significant share of the total increase in a school's faculty salary pool is to be allocated for outstanding teaching, and Deans will be asked to inform the Provost how this provision was implemented.

Salary guidelines for classified staff (A-I, A-3, part-time and full-time) also will continue to emphasize merit, as we seek to meet most critical needs of the various Schools and Centers such as recruiting, retention and equity. Penn is committed to a competitive salary program for its classified staff. In administering staff salaries during the next few years, market issues will continue to have a major influence in certain job families, particularly clerical, secretarial and technical positions. Strategies for staff salary administration relating to positions in a high demand labor market will be developed in dialogue between centers and the Office of Human Resources over the next few months.

The primary planning principle that has defined our priorities for Penn is the recognition that "the University's quality is the strength of its faculty." Each school and program within the University must maintain its ability to attract and retain faculty on a par with the very best universities. Each school and program must ensure growth of faculty real income at both junior and senior levels. Each school and program must attract staff who can provide the support needed to maintain its academic programs and facilitate the work of its faculty. At the same time, the University must conserve its resources and protect its financial integrity. If we are to continue to reward and retain our very best faculty and staff, we will need to make substantial gains in our efficiency each year; continued improvement in salary will depend in large measure on controlling University expenses. To that end, we will accelerate our efforts to optimize existing resources, and will continue to work on budget planning that will enable us to meet the difficult challenges we face.

Sheldon Hackney		Michael Aiken		Helen O'Bannon

**Rules Governing Final Examinations**

The rules governing final examinations were reviewed this year by the Council of Undergraduate Deans and reaffirmed without change. The rules are as follows:

1. No student may be required to take more than two final examinations on any one calendar day.
2. No instructor may hold a final examination except during the period in which final examinations are scheduled and, when necessary, during the period of postponed examinations. No final examinations may be scheduled during the last week of classes or on reading days.
3. Postponed examinations may be held only during the official periods: the first week of the spring and fall semesters. Students must obtain permission from their dean's office to take a postponed exam. Instructors in all courses must be ready to offer a make-up examination to all students who were excused from the final examination.
4. No instructor may change the time or date of a final exam.
5. No instructor may increase the time allowed for a final exam beyond the scheduled two hours without permission from the appropriate dean or the Vice Provost for University Life.
6. No classes (covering new material) may be held during the reading period. Review sessions may be held.
7. All students must be allowed to see their final examination. Access to graded finals should be ensured for a period of one semester after the exam has been given.

In all matters relating to final exams, students with questions should first consult with their dean's office. We encourage professors to be as flexible as possible in accommodating students with conflicting exam schedules.

**Salary Guidelines 1988-89**

**For Standing Faculty**

A. The minimum academic base salary for assistant professors will be $28,000.
B. The base increment for the individual members of the continuing Standing Faculty will be 2%. All increments of less than the base increment for individual members of the continuing standing faculty must be reviewed by the Provost and receive his approval.
C. In addition, funds will be available to academic units (e.g., departments) to provide additional salary increases to faculty based on general merit.
D. A significant share of the total increase in a School's faculty salary pool should be allocated to faculty members for outstanding teaching, and the Dean of each School is to inform the Provost how this provision was implemented.
E. Further, the University will establish a salary reserve for continuing standing faculty to cover special case. Individual Schools will also have a salary reserve. The following categories will be used:
   1. promotions;
   2. extraordinary academic performance;
   3. market adjustments; and
   4. adjustments of salary inequities.

—Michael Aiken, Provost

**For Nonacademic Staff**

Highlights of the FY88-89 salary increase program for nonacademic staff are:

1. Annual salary increases for weekly and monthly paid staff to be based on job performance and internal equity. No increase to be given to an employee whose performance is less than satisfactory. Increases of less than 2% and over 6% must be documented.
2. Salary increase monies available for weekly paid staff (A-3) are to be utilized solely for weekly paid staff and may not be merged with salary increase monies available for monthly paid staff (A-1).
3. An approximate 3% increase to the salary grade hiring maximums with corresponding adjustments to the grade minimums and maximums. (Please see salary scales, page 7).
4. Employees' salaries must be at or above the minimum of the appropriate salary grade effective July 1, 1988 before the application of any merit increase. Detailed guidelines will be distributed to schools/units this week.

—Helen B. O'Bannon
Senior Vice President
'No' to Second Tier
The SAS faculty will be asked to vote on a proposal to institute a second tier of courses for "distributional credit." Though the intent is a good one, I will vote "no" on the proposal and would like to explain why.

The proposal would require our undergraduates to take a course providing a non-Western or minority perspective on knowledge, an excellent idea. What, however, is a minority perspective?

As a member of the Judaic studies program I must face this question. I offer an undergraduate course in the Sociology of Jewry. The sociological concepts which I use are European and Christian in origin. This is true of all the Judaic Studies offerings, influenced as we are by the nineteenth-century Wissenschaft des Judentums movement. The curricula of Jewish theological schools are influenced by Jewish perspectives. It is difficult to see how we might do this in the context of a secular university but it is certainly worth investigating. This problem faces instructors in other courses, Women's Studies, Chinese, and other non-Western studies as well. Studying China using European concepts in not the same as adopting a Chinese perspective. No such perspectival curricula are being considered by the Committee under its current proposal.

Also, I believe that the first tier of distributional credits merits some review. The basic concern which led to the program, the misdistribution of students among courses, is valid. However, the selection of courses for distributional credit proceeded without full consultation with the relevant instructional staff. One of its effects has been simply to reduce first and second year enrollment in those of our lower level courses not listed by the Committee.

-Samuel Z. Klausner, Professor of Sociology

'Yes' to Breadth Requirement
On April 5th, at the SAS Faculty Meeting, many scholars spoke eloquently and persuasively on the positive aspects of the passage of the Perspectives Requirement. Further, at this well-attended meeting, those present voted overwhelmingly in favor of this motion to require that each of the undergraduate students select, within their ten-course requirement, a Non-Western, Women's Studies, or Afro-American Studies course.

The broadening of the SAS core curriculum is in line with the ideas of many postsecondary educational critics who stress that a balanced selection of knowledge from culture seems a most appropriate way to provide students with a true liberal arts education. As undergraduates in SAS are approximately one-third pre-med and one-third pre-law, there is a possibility that many of the students will never be exposed to non-Western thought or to the different voices within their own society if these courses are not brought to their attention through a requirement.

Most scholars would agree that our knowledge base is increasing at a rapid rate. In the case of one of the choices in the Perspectives Requirement, Women's Studies, a Renaissance is underway. Diaries have been uncovered; books once out of print have been republished; and research studies, often highlighting the problems of sexism, racism, and anti-Semitism in society, have been introduced. The literary canon has been challenged and is slowly being transformed; and new theory and methodologies have been developed. In these ways, many of the traditional disciplines are being viewed from different perspectives, particularly through the eyes of women of all colors.

Currently, most of this new scholarship is not in the mainstream curriculum, which most of our students study. Women's Studies courses challenge much of the traditional knowledge which students have learned in their first 12 years of schooling and they tend to stimulate thought and debate. Students do not passively accept this new scholarship; instead, they begin to critically analyze what they have studied and what they are now learning.

If we wish to prepare students for the 21st Century, a period in which our society will be more multi-cultural and diverse than ever before, it is imperative that SAS faculty pass, through the mail ballot, the Perspectives Requirement. The passage of the Perspectives Requirement can also help our students to hear, acknowledge and be tolerant of other points of view both cross-culturally and within our own society. In this way, we won't end up with the mock turtle's "regular course," in Alice's Adventures in Wonderland, which consisted of "Reeling and Writhe, of course, to begin with....and then the different branches of Arithmetic— Ambition, Distraction, Uglification and Derision."

-Joan Shapiro, Administrative Director Women's Studies Program

Open Expression Complaint
I wish to share with the University community the following letter from Dr. Ervin Miller, chair of the Committee on Open Expression, on April 9:

As a University employee working at the Faculty Club, I hereby ask the Committee on Open Expression to consider and rule upon the matters discussed below.

Briefly, on January 14, 1988, I was ordered by Faculty Club Management to stop leafleting within the Courtyard of the Club. As a result, I was unable to visit a significant number of community members who, in turn, were denied the opportunity to receive it.

When evaluated under the Guidelines on Open Expression, the facts will show the following violations:
1. My freedom of speech was restricted without cause. My leafletting did not interfere with the activity of any community member; my presence did not impede the movement of persons coming into or out of the Faculty Club; my position did not block use of the Courtyard as a thoroughfare;
2. The right of the rest of the community to hear and debate my views was restricted without cause;
3. All the built-in enforcement procedures designed to maintain, uphold and protect the right of Open Expression on campus were denied to me and the community that day.

The order to terminate my speech was made without authorization from the Vice Provost for University Life; no monitor had been sent to the scene; there had been no notification beforehand with any member of the C.O.E.

Ordinarily, there would be no need for the Committee to go beyond these facts in order to assess the damage done. However, in subsequent communications with the Committee, the University has taken a position which not only compounds the damage already done but also promises far greater damage to the future of Open Expression on this campus.

The Administration, I believe, has determined that University Policy on Open Expression does not apply in this case or in any other instance in which an employee is identifiable as one affiliated with a labor organization and the content of speech can be characterized as labor-related. In such cases, the Administration claims, federal labor law determines the extent of freedom of speech on campus and establishes the scope of administrative action permissible.

Yet there is nothing in the National Labor Relations Act or in any other federal law, which would bar application of the Guidelines on Open Expression to University employees who affiliate with a labor organization. Nothing in the Act prohibits an employer from voluntarily granting to its employees rights greater than those required under the law. The University therefore, may extend to its union-affiliated employees all the protections of its Open Expression Policy without fear of violating, contradicting or undermining, in any way, federal law.

Moreover, this University has placed the highest value upon the community's right to freedom of speech. Its Policy explicitly embraces all University employees regardless of affiliation with any group or organization, whether labor, union or other. There is simply nothing in the spirit or in the language of University Policy on Open Expression that would support the Administration's claim.

The Administration's claim, then, is without foundation either in law or in official University policy. Yet, upon that claim, the Committee votes to bar application of the Guidelines on Open Expression to University employees who affiliate with a labor organization. This not only compounds the damage already done but also promises far greater damage to the future of Open Expression on this campus.

The Administration's claim, then, is without foundation either in law or in official University policy. Yet, upon that claim, the Committee votes to bar application of the Guidelines on Open Expression to University employees who affiliate with a labor organization. This not only compounds the damage already done but also promises far greater damage to the future of Open Expression on this campus.

-John E. Hanlon, Bartender, The Faculty Club
Academic Integrity at Penn
A Report of the Student Committee on Undergraduate Education
Randi-Charlene Cohen, Chair

The University currently faces a challenge in the area of academic integrity. The blame for the present lack of academic integrity can be placed on a variety of culprits including society's current emphasis on credentials and grades as opposed to education and knowledge, the general moral ills of the 1980's, and students' self-imposed academic pressure. Regardless of the cause, the burden of improving academic integrity at Penn clearly rests on the student body, faculty, and administration. As an institution of higher learning, the University should ensure that its students understand and value the concept of academic integrity. Unfortunately, a recent SCUE poll (Appendix A)*, revealing that 46.1% of undergraduates surveyed have personally observed someone violate the Code of Academic Integrity, indicates that this concept eludes a large proportion of the student body. While ingraining students with the idea of academic integrity and honor, the University must also remove the opportunities for students to cheat and strongly prosecute those who do. The joint participation of the student body, faculty, and administration is vital in achieving both the short-term goal of eliminating cheating and the long-run ideal of creating an environment in which academic integrity is assured and a sense of honor is instinctive.

I. The Functions of Academic Integrity
An environment emphasizing academic integrity is essential to the University's mission. Without academic integrity, the University's reputation declines since work becomes suspect. The academic community is fragmented as honest students become disillusioned when unethical behavior is tacitly condoned. In addition, students who cheat circumvent their educational opportunities and a severe decline in the quality of learning results.

In an atmosphere of academic integrity, sincere scholarship will flourish. When all students are pursuing their goals under the same guidelines, a community of scholars will thrive. Most importantly, academic integrity instills in students both ethics and a sense of honor which now seem to be absent from many students' undergraduate experiences.

II. The Student Body's Perceptions
Although a narrow majority of students are aware that a Code of Academic Integrity exists at the University, students generally believe that the code is ineffective. A SCUE survey indicates that only 55.3% of students have read the Code. On a scale from 1 to 5, when asked if "the Code of Academic Integrity is effective," over 50% generally disagreed (responses of 4 and 5). Further, almost 52% of students surveyed generally agreed (responses of 1 and 2) that "it is easy to cheat at the University." Responses to the statement "students consider the Code to be important" emphasize the lack of student commitment to the Code, with 50.7% generally disagreeing with the statement. The penalties for violating the Code are generally considered to be mild as opposed to harsh (with 32% responding 1 or 2 and 20.3% responding 4 or 5). Only 80.5% of students surveyed, however, responded to this question. Contrasting this with the minimum of 96% which responded to every other question seems to indicate that students are ignorant of the actual penalties for cheating. One heartening result from the poll is that almost 58% of students surveyed believe that the student body should have some authority to discipline cheaters. This indicates that students realize the importance of their role in maintaining academic integrity. As a whole, these statistics highlight the severe nature of the academic integrity problem at the University.

III. Students Who Cheat
The students who are undermining the atmosphere of academic integrity at the University are a diverse lot. Those who cheat do not all do so for the same reasons nor with the same moral view of their actions. Chronic cheaters are those students who perpetually con the system. They do not consider their cheating a moral issue; therefore, only strong enforcement of the Code of Academic Integrity and an increased emphasis on its penalties will deter their actions. Other students are pressed into cheating by their own grade-competitiveness and time constraints. Reminding these pressured students of their moral wrongdoing and the severe consequences which they face will deter them from cheating.

The joint participation of the student body, faculty, and administration is vital in creating an environment in which academic integrity is assured and a sense of honor is instinctive. As honest students become disillusioned when unethical behavior is tacitly condoned, sincere scholarship will flourish.
commitment to academic integrity can be firmly demonstrated by diligence to cheat. In doing this, however, they must take into account the cheating by failing to discipline students who cheat.

To combat cheating and uphold academic integrity, the University must remove these opportunities to cheat using methods which will be discussed later. In doing this, the University will eliminate the weapons of dishonest students and help to preserve academic integrity.

V. The Code of Academic Integrity

The Code of Academic Integrity should be a key factor in creating a culture of academic integrity at the University. The Code, however, seems to be more of a legal than living document. Effective utilization of the Code requires the combined effort of the student body, faculty, and administration in ensuring academic integrity.

Stating that "academic ethics are the mutual responsibility of both students and professors" (Preface) and that students and professors should consult one another about appropriate ethical conduct (section I.F), the Code clearly establishes this vital link in maintaining academic integrity. From issuing and publishing (section VIII) the Code through the Provost's office to prosecuting students through the judicial system, administrative responsibility permeates the entire Code. To transform the Code of Academic Integrity into a strong and effective policy, the student body, faculty, and administration must recognize and uphold their collective responsibility to create an environment of academic integrity and honor at the University.

VI. The Role of the Student Body

For academic integrity to flourish at the University, the student body must feel a greater commitment to academic honor. Students groups such as SCUE, the Undergraduate Assembly, the SAS Dean's Advisory Board, the Wharton Advisory Board, the Engineering Student Activities Council, the Student Forum of the Nursing School, and others should take the lead in emphasizing the importance of academic integrity and of the student body's role in upholding it. These groups along with the student pool of the Honor Court, and the general Judicial System, should educate the student body about the details of the Code, the methods of enforcement, and the principle of consultation with professors. Most importantly, the aforementioned student groups must create peer pressure not to cheat. A sense of moral abhorrence and intolerance of cheating must be fostered. Students should report those who cheat, and the mechanisms for doing this must be clarified and emphasized. Realizing that it plays an important role in developing an atmosphere of academic integrity at the University, the student body must express a sense of disdain for cheating and respect for academic honor.

VII. The Role of the Faculty

The faculty must effectively serve as the first line of defense against cheating and emphasize the importance of academic ethics in order to fulfill its role in developing a culture of academic integrity. Faculty members must recognize that as a University-wide problem, the lack of academic integrity must be viewed as relevant to every department. Further, they must not assume that all students understand the details of the Code of Academic Integrity or even what constitutes cheating. The faculty faces a difficult task in fulfilling its role because its members must strike that delicate balance between curtailling cheating and curting learning.

Recently, the Faculty Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy examined the Code in order to clarify the faculty's ability to deal directly with cheaters. These revisions emphasize the faculty's first-instance authority to deal immediately with students who cheat. Faculty commitment to academic integrity can be firmly demonstrated by diligently exercising this authority. Faculty members should never condone cheating by failing to discipline students who cheat.

As the first line of defense, faculty members must remove opportunities to cheat. In doing this, however, they must take into account the dynamics of their individual classes in order to determine what measures to impose. Faculty members should take care to ensure that their efforts to curtail cheating do not dramatically disrupt the learning environment of their classroom. Echoing the letter (dated December 7, 1987) that SCUE sent to the departments before the last final examination period, the following recommendations should help to remove opportunities to cheat.

With regard to the Code, faculty members should mention it before exams, consider having students sign the Commitment to Academic Integrity in the blue books (only 31.5% have been asked to do so), and emphasize the consulting and mutual responsibility aspects of the Code. This last point can be followed up by an explanation of plagiarism and a description of expectations and objectives on homework and laboratory assignments.

To deter cheating during an examination, faculty members should make blue books unique, ensure that outside materials are not used, actively proctor, give the exam in a room of appropriate size so that close proximity will not allow for cheating, check signatures or Penn Cards against the class list, keep exam collections orderly so as to avoid last second cheating, and make blue books unique. Faculty members must take the responsibility to guarantee that every one of their exams are given under the same standards of academic integrity regardless of whom proctors it. The adoption of some or all of these measures can significantly increase the deference paid to academic integrity and alter situations which allow cheating.

The faculty role in academic integrity is the vital link between learning and ethical behavior. Faculty members should ensure that all learning related to their course occurs within a framework of academic integrity by removing opportunities to cheat. The solidification of this link between learning and ethics instills a strong sense of honor in the student body and helps to create an environment of academic integrity at the University.

VIII. The Role of the Administration

Student and faculty efforts must be supported by administrative commitment to academic integrity. The administration is the weight which stands behind the Code and which ensures its enforcement. According to the SCUE poll, however, over 40% of students surveyed generally disagree that the "administration considers the code to be important" while only 24.3% generally agree. For academic integrity to thrive at the University, the administration must reverse this negative perception by proving that academic integrity is a high priority.

While some of the undergraduate schools send letters to incoming freshmen stating that cheating will not be tolerated, the University as a whole does not. The Provost's office should send a statement outlining the administration's stance on academic integrity to every matriculating student. Accompanying this statement should be a commitment to academic integrity to be signed by every student upon matriculation, a proposal which is firmly supported by students (over 56% either strongly agreed or agreed with the idea). When this commitment is first sent to matriculating students, it should be simultaneously sent to all returning students. The administration can further demonstrate its commitment by replacing the lengthy Commitment to Academic Integrity which is currently found on the inside covers of blue books with the following statement placed on the front cover:

The University fully expects all students to adhere to the Commitment to Academic Integrity, which they signed upon matriculation, on this and all other academic work.

Also, a few moments during Convocation should be devoted to a statement on academic integrity as this is the only time an entire class will be together before Commencement. While indoctrinating successive freshmen classes, the administration should continue to communicate its commitment to upperclassmen by issuing periodic statements, especially before exam periods.

The administration also needs to demonstrate to the faculty that it is committed to academic ethics. By educating faculty members about academic integrity, the Code, and the judicial system, the administration will communicate this commitment. Also, by devoting more resources to the Judicial Inquiry Officer and the Judicial Administrator, the administration will give these individuals more time which they could, in turn, use to help the faculty in the maintenance of academic integrity. In this manner, the faculty will quickly feel the effects of administrative com-
IX. Conclusion: Creating an Environment

Combating the current problem of academic integrity at the University is the joint responsibility of the student body, faculty and administration. The student body must commit itself to maintaining academic integrity by not tolerating students who cheat. Students and professors must consult one another in order to understand exactly what constitutes academic integrity. The faculty must remove the opportunities to cheat while maintaining a positive learning environment. Finally, the administration must demonstrate its commitment to academic integrity by increasing the amount of publicity given to it and indoctirizing the students with a sense of academic ethics and honor.

By discussing the issue of academic integrity and formulating a coherent policy to ensure it, the University will begin to create an environment in which academic integrity thrives. However, as diligence on the part of all parties increases, more cases of academic misconduct may arise. In the long run, these cases will subside and an environment in which academic integrity is instinctive will surface. The University should strive for this type of environment, for only then will it have fulfilled its mission of instilling academic integrity and a sense of honor in its students.

Subcommittee on Academic Integrity

Neil H. Koffler, Chair
Gwendolyn Campbell
Kathleen T. Governale
Leslie Kerr

Christina L. Lauchlan
Jonathan Masel
Andi L. Shane
Lauren Steinfeld

---

**OF RECORD**

**1988 Summer Hours and Compensation Practices**

Beginning Monday, July 4, 1988, the University will alter its regular schedule of hours worked for the months of July and August. The summer schedule of hours worked at the University, as referred to in this statement, is 9 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Monday through Friday with a one-hour lunch period, resulting in a work week of 32.5 hours.

The following should serve as a set of guidelines in the implementation of summer hours for this year.

A. Effective Period

Summer hours resulting in the following time reductions will be observed Monday, July 4 through Friday, September 2, 1988.

- ½ hour per day totaling ½ hours per week.
- 35.0-hour work week is reduced to 32.5 hours.
- 37.5-hour work week is reduced to 35.0 hours.
- 40.0-hour work week is reduced to 37.5 hours.

B. Guidelines for Implementation

In recognition of the varying operating requirements throughout the University, a particular department or school may need to adopt a flexible schedule to meet its particular needs. However, the summer schedule of hours worked cannot exceed the reduced rate of weekly hours indicated above without additional compensation. Supervisors should advise employees as soon as possible what the summer schedule of hours worked will be in their department or school.

Departments are given flexibility in the scheduling of the reduced work week. Some examples follow:

**Scheduled Work Week**

(Using a 35-hour work week reduced to 32.5 hours)

- **Regularly Scheduled Hours**
  - **Summer Schedule**
  - **Hours Worked**
  - **Straight Time Hours Paid**
  - **Time and One-Half Hours Paid**
  - **Total Hours Paid**

**Examples**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regularly Scheduled Hours</th>
<th>Summer Schedule</th>
<th>Hours Worked</th>
<th>Straight Time Hours Paid</th>
<th>Time and One-Half Hours Paid</th>
<th>Total Hours Paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 hrs.</td>
<td>35 hrs</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.5 hrs.</td>
<td>35 hrs</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 hrs.</td>
<td>37.5 hrs</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Exclusions

Regular part-time employees, University employees working at HUP whose unit does not observe the summer hours schedule, and employees covered by collective bargaining agreements are excluded from this reduced summer hours procedure.

E. Questions

Any questions concerning the above should be directed to Wanda Whitted, Acting Manager, Staff Relations, at Ext. 8-6093.

---

*Office of Human Resources*
Osteoporosis Study Volunteers
Men and women between the ages of 20 and 80 who are not known to have osteoporosis may be eligible to participate in a study on osteoporosis at the University of Pennsylvania Osteoporosis Center.

Participants receive $50 and free diagnostic and laboratory tests, and should have one full weekday morning free. For information call Glorice Bervine at 662-2300.

Afro-American Curriculum Stipends
The Afro-American Studies Program has announced the establishment of a Curriculum Development Fund to underwrite educational initiatives in the Afro-American Studies Program.

Faculty, affiliated faculty, and advanced graduate students interested in developing new courses centered on the African-American experience or reorganizing already established courses to include substantial African-American content, are eligible to receive stipends for this curriculum development.

Stipends, ranging from $2500 to $5000, are available for July-August, 1988.

Proposals, together with endorsements from Departmental Chairs or Deans, should be submitted to Dr. Jacqueline E. Wade, 204 Bennett Hall, Ext. 84965, by May 6, 1988. The following proposal format is required: Name, address, department affiliation, a twenty-five word precis of the proposed course, and an up-to-one-thousand-word (4-page) description of the proposed course with specifications of the Afro-American content.

Preferred consideration will be afforded proposals of courses to be taught during the 1988-89 academic year.

Notification of awards is scheduled for May 27, 1988.

### OF RECORD

#### Recognized Holidays

The following holidays will be observed by the University in the upcoming fiscal year (July 1, 1988-June 30, 1989) on the dates listed below:

- Fourth of July, Monday, July 4, 1988
- Labor Day, Monday, September 5, 1988
- Thanksgiving, Thursday and Friday, November 24-25, 1988
- Christmas Day, Monday, December 26, 1988
- New Year's Day, Monday, January 2, 1989
- Memorial Day, Monday, May 29, 1989

The Special vacation granted to faculty and staff between Christmas and New Year's Day will be December 27, 28, 29, 30, 1988. If an employee is required to be on duty to continue departmental operations for part or all of this period, the special vacation is scheduled for some other time.

In addition, staff are eligible for a floating day off each fiscal year which may be used for any reason, scheduled mutually with one's supervisor. Floating days are not cumulative.

Vacations and holidays for Hospital employees or those employees in collective bargaining units are governed by the terms of Hospital policy or their respective collective bargaining agreements.

Remainder: Memorial Day, the remaining holiday of the current 1987-88 fiscal year (ending June 30, 1988) will be observed on Monday, May 30, 1988.

—Office of Human Resources

### Postdoctoral Training Program in Cellular/Molecular Biology of Aging

Positions are available for postdoctoral trainees (Ph.D. and/or M.D.) to obtain two years of specialized training in the methods and models of research on aging. This program is directed by a consortium which includes the University of Pennsylvania/Wistar Institute (Drs. V. Cristofalo, D. Kritchevsky, E. Levine), Temple University (Drs. R. Baserga, N. Duker, A. Schwartz), the Medical College of Pennsylvania (J. Roberts) and Merck Sharp and Dohme Research Laboratories (Drs. M. Bradley and W. Nichols). Research emphases include: cell cycle kinetics/dynamics; growth factor regulatory mechanisms; growth regulatory genes; cellular transformation and immunomodulation; regulation of gene expression; DNA repair; cytogenetics; nutrition; vascular cell physiology; cardiovascular physiology, pharmacology, and DHEA action in aging and cancer.

Applicants must meet NRSA United States citizenship or residency requirements. Address applications (curriculum vitae, three letters of reference and graduate school transcript) to: Dr. Vincent J. Cristofalo, Director, Center for the Study of Aging, 3906 Spruce Street/6006.

—Robin Charpentier, Assistant to the Director

### OF RECORD

#### Human Resources/Compensation

**Monthly Paid Salary Scale** (Effective: July 1, 1988)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Hiring</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Hiring</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA1</td>
<td>15,925</td>
<td>1327.08</td>
<td>20,425</td>
<td>1702.08</td>
<td>24,525</td>
<td>2043.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA2</td>
<td>17,750</td>
<td>1479.17</td>
<td>22,475</td>
<td>1872.92</td>
<td>27,325</td>
<td>2277.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA3</td>
<td>19,525</td>
<td>1627.08</td>
<td>24,725</td>
<td>2060.42</td>
<td>30,150</td>
<td>2512.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA4</td>
<td>21,475</td>
<td>1789.58</td>
<td>27,200</td>
<td>2266.67</td>
<td>33,725</td>
<td>2810.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA5</td>
<td>23,625</td>
<td>1968.75</td>
<td>29,900</td>
<td>2491.67</td>
<td>37,375</td>
<td>3114.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA6</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>2166.67</td>
<td>32,900</td>
<td>2741.67</td>
<td>41,125</td>
<td>3427.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA7</td>
<td>28,600</td>
<td>2383.33</td>
<td>36,200</td>
<td>3016.67</td>
<td>45,250</td>
<td>3770.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA8</td>
<td>31,450</td>
<td>2620.83</td>
<td>39,600</td>
<td>3316.67</td>
<td>49,700</td>
<td>4145.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA9</td>
<td>34,800</td>
<td>2883.33</td>
<td>43,800</td>
<td>3650.00</td>
<td>54,750</td>
<td>4562.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA10</td>
<td>45,125</td>
<td>3760.42</td>
<td>56,400</td>
<td>4700.00</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA11</td>
<td>52,725</td>
<td>4393.75</td>
<td>64,300</td>
<td>5358.33</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weekly-Paid Salary Scale** (35-hour work week) (Effective: July 1, 1988)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Hourly</th>
<th>Hiring</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Hourly</th>
<th>Hiring</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>8,650</td>
<td>166.35</td>
<td>4.753</td>
<td>10,300</td>
<td>198.08</td>
<td>5.659</td>
<td>12,350</td>
<td>237.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4</td>
<td>9,075</td>
<td>174.52</td>
<td>4.996</td>
<td>11,125</td>
<td>213.94</td>
<td>6.113</td>
<td>13,350</td>
<td>256.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5</td>
<td>9,675</td>
<td>189.90</td>
<td>5.462</td>
<td>12,125</td>
<td>233.17</td>
<td>6.896</td>
<td>14,550</td>
<td>279.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G6</td>
<td>10,775</td>
<td>207.21</td>
<td>5.920</td>
<td>13,225</td>
<td>254.33</td>
<td>7.266</td>
<td>15,850</td>
<td>304.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G7</td>
<td>11,525</td>
<td>221.63</td>
<td>6.332</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>276.92</td>
<td>7.912</td>
<td>17,275</td>
<td>332.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8</td>
<td>12,550</td>
<td>241.35</td>
<td>6.896</td>
<td>15,700</td>
<td>301.92</td>
<td>8.626</td>
<td>18,850</td>
<td>362.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G9</td>
<td>13,700</td>
<td>263.46</td>
<td>7.527</td>
<td>17,125</td>
<td>329.33</td>
<td>9.409</td>
<td>20,550</td>
<td>395.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G10</td>
<td>14,925</td>
<td>287.02</td>
<td>8.201</td>
<td>18,650</td>
<td>358.65</td>
<td>10.247</td>
<td>22,375</td>
<td>430.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G11</td>
<td>15,925</td>
<td>306.25</td>
<td>8.750</td>
<td>20,425</td>
<td>392.79</td>
<td>11.223</td>
<td>24,525</td>
<td>471.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G12</td>
<td>17,750</td>
<td>342.70</td>
<td>9.750</td>
<td>22,475</td>
<td>432.21</td>
<td>12.349</td>
<td>28,050</td>
<td>539.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Salary Structure:** 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 12 PA grades (monthly-paid) and 11 G grades (weekly-paid).

**Weekly Work Week:** The standard work week at the University is five 7-hour work days during the period beginning 12:01 a.m. Monday and ending 12 midnight Sunday.

**Hiring Maximum:** The highest starting salary which may be offered to a fully qualified candidate for a position in that grade. All salary offers must be approved in advance by the Office of Human Resources.
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CONFERENCES

22 Cost and Quality in HMOs: Conflict of Interest? a day-long symposium exploring the tension between cost and quality in health maintenance organizations featuring lectures by authorities on health care services, 8:30 a.m.-3:30 p.m., Annenberg School. Fee: $175. Registration: 735-9005 (Philadelphia Health Plan Foundation and Leonard Davis Institute).

23 Christianity in the Middle East: The Contribution of the Eastern Churches to Regional History and Civilization: a day-long series of lectures and a special exhibit of Ethnographic religious materials; 9 a.m.-5 p.m., Rainey Auditorium, University Museum. Registration fee: $20, $10 Museum members and Civil Affiliates, free for Penn faculty and students. Ext. 8-6335 (Middle East Center and The University Museum).

EXHIBIT

Now
Urban Renewal of Rome: a proposal for redesigning Rome; an exhibition featuring original drawings by Pierluigi Eroli and Paolo Porgtaloghi; 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. daily, Dean's Alley, Meyerson Hall. Through April 23.

MUSIC

30 Late, Great Ladies of Blues & Jazz; an evening of music and song with Sandra Reaves Phillips, 7 p.m., University Museum. Admission: $23, to benefit the Beth David Reform Congregation of Gladwyne. Information: 896-7485.

ON STAGE

22 Before Forever: Philadelphia's Danceteller will present an emotional dance and theatre piece on AIDS which incorporates interviews with local residents with the disease, with a portion of the proceeds to benefit AIDS organizations in the area; 8 p.m., Tabernacle Church. Tickets: $8, $6 in advance. Also April 23, 28, 29, 30 and a matinee performance April 24 at 2 p.m. Information: 468-7720.

TALKS

20 The Presidency Under the Constitution: Judge Edmund B. Spaeth Jr., senior fellow, School of Law; 6:30 p.m., Irving Auditorium. Reservations: Ext. 8-6479 (Bread Upon the Water Scholarship Fund, CGS).


22 Solvent Absorption and Volume Regulation by Epsteinian: Stanley Schultz, University of Texas School of Medicine; 4 p.m., fourth floor, Richards Building (Department of Physiology).

Can We Affect the Appropriateness and Quality of Health Care? Robert H. Brook, professor of medicine and public health, University of California, Los Angeles, Deputy Health Program Director, The RAND Corp.; Class of 1962 Lecture Hall, John Morgan Building (Elizabeth and Duane G. Sonnborn Lecture, School of Medicine).

22 Enlightenment, Mass Deception and Beyond: Daniel Schiller (ASC, MA ’76, Ph.D. ’78), associate professor, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, UCLA; 7 p.m., Room 110, Annenberg School (George Gerbner Lecture in Communications History).

25 Science, Scientists and the New Technologies, for Development: Gabriel B. Ogumolu, University of Ibadan; 4 p.m., Room 200, College Hall. (International Programs, Ibadan Administrative Committee).

30 Effect of Mutations in the 5' Leader Sequence of Avian Sarcoma Virus V-src mRNA on Translation and Packaging; Martin Stoltzfus, department of microbiology, University of Iowa; 2 p.m., Auditorium, Wistar Institute (Wistar Institute).

27 Na and K NMR Studies of the Perfused Rat Mandibular Gland: Yoshiteru Seo, department of physiological sciences, Stopford Building, Manchester, U.K.; noon, fourth floor, Richards Building (Department of Physiology).

28 Regulation of Human Interferon Gamma Gene Expression: Howard A. Young, Laboratory of Molecular Immunoregulation, Biological Response Modifiers Program, NCI/Frederick Cancer Research Facility; 4 p.m., Auditorium, Wistar Institute (Wistar Institute).

18th Police District

Schuylkill River to 49th St, Market St. to Schuylkill/Woodland Ave.

Reported crimes against persons from 12:01 a.m. 4-4-88 to 11:59 p.m. 4-10-88

Total: Crimes Against Persons—5, Aggravated Assault/knife—1, Robbery/strongarm—2, Robbery/gun—1, Attempt Robbery/strongarm—1, Arrests—1

Date Location/Time Reported Offense/weapon Arrest
4-4-88 3901 Baltimore Ave., 12:23 AM Attempt robbery/strongarm No
4-4-88 3256 Walnut St., 7:07 PM Attempt robbery/strongarm Yes
4-9-88 47th and Hazel Ave., 12:08 AM Aggravated assault/knife Yes
4-9-88 4523 Chester Ave., 7:05 AM Robbery/strongarm No
4-9-88 3277 Walnut St., 11:50 PM Robbery/gun No
4-9-88 3277 Walnut St., 11:50 PM Robbery/strongarm No
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4-9-88 3277 Walnut St., 11:50 PM Robbery/gun No
4-9-88 3277 Walnut St., 11:50 PM Robbery/strongarm No
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