Commencement: Barbara Bush
The speaker for Penn's May 14 Commencement will be First Lady Barbara Bush, wife of U.S. President George Bush and an active volunteer with a strong focus on literacy and reading.

Mrs. Bush, the mother of five and grandmother of 12, is a sponsor of the worldwide Laubach Literacy Volunteers; honorary chairperson of the National Advisory Council of Literacy Volunteers of America, Inc., and the National Committee on Literacy and Education of the United Way; and member of the board of Reading is Fundamental.

She is also honorary chairperson of the Barbara Bush Foundation for Family Literacy, set up to "establish literacy as a value in every family in America, to support the development of family literacy programs, and to break the intergenerational cycle of illiteracy."

Baccalaureate: Roy Vagelos
The Baccalaureate speaker, on May 13 at 2 p.m. in Irvine Auditorium, will be Dr. P. Roy Vagelos, the alumnus/trustee/Penn parent who is chairman and CEO of Merck & Co., Inc. Dr. Vagelos, C'50, is the father of Ellen Vagelos, who will graduate with the Class of 1990.

250th Plenary: Ambassador Klimova
Czechoslovakia's new U.S. Ambassador Rita Klimova, a member of the coordinating committee of the Czech resistance group that brought down the Czech communist government, will lead the third and final Plenary Session during Peak Week of Penn 250th Anniversary celebration.

Her appearance May 19 in the Philadelphia Civic Center is preceded by those of former U.S. President Ronald Reagan (May 17) and Nobelist Oscar Arias Sanchez, president of Costa Rica (May 18).

Ambassador Klimova, who as a child during World War II lived in New York City with her journalist parents, returned with them to Prague following the Munich Pact. After working as a machine lathe operator, she studied industrial and political economy at the Prague School of Economics, earned her master's and a doctorate, and taught the history of economic thought and economics of Anglo-Saxon countries at Prague’s Charles University. But in 1970 her Communist Party membership—and with it her job—were taken away as a result of her opposition to Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia.

She found work as an interpreter and translator, and was active in underground publishing during the two decades before now-President Vaclav Havel sent for her as "the person known to speak the best American English in the country" to translate for a press conference he and other dissidents had called to announce the formation of the revolutionary Obcanske Forum, or Civic Forum.
The primary planning principle that defines our priorities for Penn is the recognition that our faculty is our most valuable resource. It is essential that we maintain our ability to attract and retain faculty at a level of excellence equal or better than that achieved by the very best universities; it is also important to attract and retain staff who can provide the support needed to help maintain our academic programs and facilitate the work of the faculty. To that end, we are committed to achieving real growth in salaries for continuing faculty and staff. Within the limits of our financial constraints we have tried to provide as large a salary increment as possible both to reward and retain individuals and to remain competitive with our peer institutions.

This year, as in the past, funds will be available through schools to provide salary increases to continuing faculty based on general merit, scholarship, research, teaching, and citizenship in the University community. A significant share of these funds is to be allocated to faculty members for outstanding teaching, with the Dean of each school being asked to inform the Provost as to how this provision has been implemented. Furthermore, additional funds will be set aside as a Provost's reserve for continuing standing faculty to cover special cases; schools also have the option to add to this reserve. These funds are to be used for promotions, extraordinary academic performances, market adjustments and adjustments of salary inequities.

Individual salary decisions are made at the school level, and as an aid, salary guidelines will be issued to department chairs. These guidelines will obviously reflect relevant resource constraints. Certain uniform standards have been established that apply to all schools. For this coming year, the minimum academic base salary for assistant professors will be $32,000, up from $30,000 the year before. Since in recent years salary increases have been relatively more rapid for junior faculty than for continuing senior faculty, schools are being urged to consider partially redressing that balance. As was the case last year, there will be no minimum base increment stipulated for individual members of the standing faculty. The entire pool available for salary increases will be allocated on the basis of merit.

This policy was initiated for FY90 and will continue to be monitored by the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty. A decision as to its continuation will be made prior to issuing next year's salary guidelines. In the meantime, both faculty and staff have the right to appeal decisions regarding their salaries; for faculty the appeal may be directed to the department chair, the dean, and the Provost; for staff the appeal may be directed through the appropriate chain of supervision, i.e., supervisor, center director, dean or vice president. Salary guidelines for classified staff (A-1, A-3, part-time and full-time) also will continue to emphasize merit, with increases being based on job performance and internal equity; no increase is to be given to an employee whose performance is less than satisfactory. In addition, as a result of continuing discussions between the Office of Human Resources and administrative units of the University, the Salary Management Program will continue to emphasize strategic salary increases, particularly for individuals in job titles that are in high demand within the regional labor market and/or where salary equity issues exist.

Sheldon Hackney, President
Michael Aiken, Provost
Marna C. Whittington, Senior Vice President

Guidelines for the Faculty/Staff Salary Increase Program FY91

I. Funding Parameters

The salary base and the salary increase for FY91 (for continuing faculty and staff) are to be funded from each school, center or administrative budget. Specific funding instructions, including directions about salary reserves for faculty and staff, will be communicated directly to school deans and appropriate center directors.

II. Faculty Guidelines

A. The minimum academic base salary for assistant professors will be $32,000.

B. Again this year, there will be no minimum base increment for the individual members of the standing faculty. Deans will exercise their judgment concerning low salary increases without the Provost's approval. Thus this experimental policy will be continued another year.

C. Funds will be available for promotions, extraordinary academic performances, market adjustments, and adjustments of salary inequities.

D. A significant share of these funds should be allocated to faculty members for outstanding teaching. In June, the Dean of each school will inform the Provost as to how this provision has been implemented.

E. Additional funds will be set aside as a Provost's reserve for continuing standing faculty to cover special cases; schools also have the option to add to this reserve. These reserve funds are to be used for promotions, extraordinary academic performances, market adjustments, and adjustments of salary inequities.

F. Individual salary decisions are made by schools, which will issue their own salary guidelines to department chairs.

III. For Nonacademic Staff

Highlights of the FY91 salary increase program for nonacademic staff are:

1. Annual salary increases for weekly and monthly paid staff are to be based primarily on job performance with some consideration for internal equity. No increase is to be given to an employee whose performance is less than satisfactory. Salary increases may begin at 2% for satisfactory performance, and increase with higher levels of performance, within the limits of available budget dollars. Increases of less than 2% and over 7% must be documented.

2. Salary increase funds available for weekly paid staff (A-3) are to be utilized solely for weekly paid staff and may not be merged with salary increase funds available for monthly paid (A-1) staff.

3. Employees' salaries must be at or above the minimum of the appropriate salary grade effective July 1, 1990, before the application of any merit increase. Detailed guidelines will be distributed to schools and centers.

—Marna C. Whittington,
Senior Vice President

See page 7 for the FY1991 Salary Scales.
Report of the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty

April 12, 1990

The Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty has responsibility for gathering, organizing, and analyzing data on faculty salaries and benefits across the University. This committee is elected by the full faculty to represent its interests in the University’s determination of policy on all matters relating to the faculty’s economic well-being. The committee is charged to report on its work to the faculty once a year.

This year the committee met several times, including two meetings with the Provost. During its discussions the committee considered several issues, which are reported in the following paragraphs.

First, the committee noted with approval the administration’s apparent continued commitment to increasing faculty salaries in real terms. The fact is, however, that the present administration has only managed to restore the real losses suffered by the faculty in the 1970’s. In 1989, for example, the real income of the average Penn faculty member is about the same as it was in 1972. In a similar vein, the committee was also concerned by the rhetoric emerging from the administration regarding the slowing down of revenue growth and the perceived strong linkage of faculty salaries to tuition. A specific worry here is that under a regime of tight budgetary constraints, the inevitable trend towards utilizing “market pressures” may accelerate.

Second, the committee was pleased with the effort being undertaken by the Senate Committee on Administration to investigate the continuing question of the apparent growth of the administrative costs of the University, both centrally and in the schools.

Third, at the time Pennflex was instituted, it was decided that this committee would request an annual report from the Benefits Office on Pennflex, and in particular on the effects of adverse selection. The committee continues to be concerned by potential erosion of the benefits package. For example, the fraction of the cost of health plans paid by the University has declined in recent years, and the University’s draft Benefits Philosophy (dated 3/31/89) does not commit the University to halting or reversing this trend. The committee and its successors would be well advised to monitor issues of benefits very closely in the coming years.

The committee also considered at length the issue of what information it needs in order to discharge its responsibility to represent the faculty in salary matters. Specifically, the issue of making salary data from the schools available to the committee on a confidential basis (aggregated by department, and always conforming to the principle that individual salaries should not be revealed) was discussed with the Provost, but was not satisfactorily resolved. The committee feels that questions such as the extent to which various schools contribute from their own funds to the pool available for salary increases is entirely relevant to the economic status of the faculty; at present the committee has no way to obtain this information. Specific requests to the deans of the schools have not produced the desired result. The committee remains optimistic that future negotiations with the University administration will produce some progress in this direction.

The committee also heard a presentation from the Provost and former Budget Director Glen Stine on how salary increases had been implemented (University-wide) last year. The committee found no evidence that the experiment of permitting zero salary increases without specific approval of the Provost is being abused, although this should clearly continue to be monitored on a year-by-year basis. The committee voted to continue this experiment for an additional year. The committee also reiterated its concern, which had come up in previous years, that there be a clear mechanism available for members of the faculty who feel that they have not been treated fairly in the salary process. The Provost noted that appeals could be made to the department chair, the dean, the Provost, and/or the ombudsman.

Finally, the Provost shared some data with the committee concerning the comparison of Penn salary data (again University-wide) with peer institutions. There has been more progress in the salaries of junior faculty members than for full professors. The committee noted that the data are difficult to interpret because of the large scale of aggregation; this is related to the problems the committee had in obtaining data by schools referred to above.

I. Report of the 1987-88 Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility:


The Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility met 12 times during the year and deliberated over the following two matters:

Two major complaints were lodged with the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility:
A. Infringement of a faculty member’s academic freedom by interference with and plagiarism of the work of that faculty member.
B. Infringement of academic freedom by preventing the full exercise of a faculty member’s academic role, which includes membership on University committees.

The first complaint was not heard and was put in abeyance, pending the complainant’s decision to proceed.

With regard to the second complaint, the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, on April 11 and 27, 1988, unanimously agreed on the following:
1. The Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility did not find evidence that the Steering Committee of the University Council denied the complainant membership in a University Committee and therefore concluded that the academic freedom of the complainant was not violated by that Committee. (Note: D. Balamuth recused himself from deliberations of this case since he had been a member of the Steering Committee at the requisite time.)
2. The Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (SCAFR) also affirmed its stand that the ability to invoke procedures for redress of grievances in an academic community should be regarded as a crucial aspect of academic freedom. It noted with concern that in a letter the President of the University expressed to the complainant a belief that if the filing of a complaint against a department of the University thereby placed the complainant in a position which precluded membership on a University committee evaluating that department. This could be construed as suggesting that the use or invocation of appropriate grievance mechanisms was a legitimate ground for denial of appointment to a University Committee. It would be incompatible with principles of academic freedom for a faculty member to be disadvantaged in any way because of the exercise of his or her academic rights. In a letter SCAF reminded the President and the University community of this essential principle.
II. Report of the 1988-89 Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility:


During the 1988-1989 academic year, the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (SCAFR)

1. Reviewed the actions of one School’s Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility in two cases concerning academic dishonesty and found defects of procedure in both, so serious as to leave the matters without any resolution.

In one matter the School’s Dean made a “just cause” complaint alleging plagiarism against a professor. The School’s Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (CAFAR) violated the “just cause” procedures, as laid down by the Statutes of the Trustees and printed in the Handbook for Faculty Administrators, by improperly using a Sub-committee to consider facts in the matter and by a factual inquisition at a stage where factual evaluation is explicitly prohibited by the just cause procedures which, instead, require the Committees on Academic Freedom, as a whole, to make a finding as to whether the offenses as stated, if true, amount to a just cause for dismissal or suspension under the general standards stated explicitly in the Statutes. The School’s Committee additionally erred by requesting an opinion from the Dean to report to withdraw the charges and failed to report, instead, to the faculty, as such Committees are required to do. The Dean accepted the improper recommendation and dropped the complaint. SCAFAR found the process fatally flawed and no prosecution to have occurred.

2. The second matter concerned a complaint by two professors against a colleague, the incumbence of whom made a complaint against the former Dean and the incumbent Dean, alleging plagiarism of grant proposal material and collusive outing of the complainants from participation in a research project (eventually funded) that they had helped to prepare, and various invasions, including a written threat of salary reprimals, by a former Dean, should the controversy be continued. The School’s CAFAR heard the matter as if part of a “just cause” proceeding, and solely on the issue of whether plagiarism was shown “clearly and convincingly,” and again improperly used a Sub-committee of Inquiry to assess the evidence. Further, the School’s Committee did not note that a “just cause” proceeding cannot be instituted by one faculty member against another. Thus they were treating the matter entirely within the wrong category. Further, their Sub-committee reported to the Dean that the complainants did not meet their burden of proof, and, in effect, that the matter was being dropped. No report on the matter was made, as required, to the School’s faculty as a whole. Further, the Dean made a request that the complainants apologize to the respondent, a request submitted by the respondent to the School’s Committee and improperly forwarded to the Dean and improperly acted on by the Dean. Finally, one of the complaining professors was denied Emeritus status to which he was entitled under University Statutes (Article 9.12, as amended June, 1987).

3. SCAFAR corrected the latter denial by securing a reminder, through the Committee on Consultation, to all Deans that Emeritus status is automatic for faculty of their rank, they have the full protection of academic freedom and responsibility, though there was no formal vote on that point by SCAFAR.

4. SCAFAR found that the School’s CAFAR mistakenly treated this complaint as part of a “just cause” proceeding and, under that misconception, further mistakenly used a Sub-committee of Inquiry—which is not permitted by the “just cause” procedures and, further, violated the prohibition at the first stage against assessing evidence, when the sole issue is whether a “just cause” complaint has been properly stated.

5. SCAFAR also found it was improper for the Dean to request an apology from the complainants or for the School’s CAFAR to have any role in such a request.

6. To avoid further delays, SCAFAR resolved to conduct its own inquiry into “these and related matters” in the School, during 1989-1990 (to abate, however, during any formal action that might be taken by the School’s Dean). (Note: Two members of SCAFAR recused themselves from taking part in these deliberations.)

7. It is to be noted that the incumbent Dean was cooperative with SCAFAR’s requests for documents. However the Chair of the School’s CAFAR refused to give to SCAFAR copies of the procedural advice sought and received from the University General Counsel’s Office for procedural guidance because of potential conflicts of interest between the University attorneys, as attorney for the Trustees, and the faculty. SCAFAR is the first and proper locus of procedural advice to the School Committee and, where necessary, independent legal counsel will be available, as provided above.

8. There were a number of communications between the Committee and the Deputy Provost. The Committee declined to address the same questions concerning faculty versus faculty complaints because such matters were pending in other reviews. We declined to give an opinion as to whether warnings as to what sorts of misconduct would trigger “just cause” as charges by administrators should be published in the Handbook, though the Chair replied by memorandum to the Deputy Provost’s question concerning performance review of faculty after “unapproved retirement” in 1993, an affair being separately addressed, initially, by the Committee on Retirement.

9. SCAFAR advised the School CAFAR on some procedural matters prior to a “just cause” hearing; it advised another School Committee on the questions and procedures on a case before it. SCAFAR also looked into a complaint that official “documentation requirements” from candidates for academic promotion included a “statement of education” philosophy by candidates. SCAFAR expressed concern. The requirement was dropped, though further inquiry was planned for the 1989-90 academic year.

10. In response to persistent requests from faculty members, especially in the professional Schools, for assurance of legal indemnity while serving on School CAFARs, the Chair tried to secure administration publication of the Trustees’ indemnification policy, that legally indemnifies administrators for acting within the scope of their duties. By year’s end that policy had not been circulated by the Deputy Provost, though it is the Chair’s impression that all are in agreement that such is the University’s policy. SCAFAR did not, however, formally vote on the matter.

11. SCAFAR notified all the School Committees on Academic Freedom and Responsibility that SCAFAR has a positive duty under the Statutes of the University to provide advice on the proper procedures for handling claims that academic freedom or responsibility has been violated or infringed. We made clear that School Committees should not undertake to hear such charges without consulting SCAFAR.

12. SCAFAR also formally decided that it is improper for School Academic Freedom and Responsibility Committees to rely upon the University General Counsel’s Office for procedural guidance because of potential conflicts of interest between the University attorneys, as attorney for the Trustees, and the faculty. SCAFAR is the first and proper locus of procedural advice to the School Committees and, where necessary, independent legal counsel will be available, as provided above.

13. SCAFAR also formally decided that it is improper for School Academic Freedom and Responsibility Committees to rely upon the University General Counsel’s Office for procedural guidance because of potential conflicts of interest between the University attorneys, as attorney for the Trustees, and the faculty. SCAFAR is the first and proper locus of procedural advice to the School Committees and, where necessary, independent legal counsel will be available, as provided above.

14. SCAFAR advised a School CAFAR on some procedural matters prior to a “just cause” hearing; it advised another School Committee on the questions and procedures on a case before it. SCAFAR also looked into a complaint that official “documentation requirements” from candidates for academic promotion included a “statement of education” philosophy by candidates. SCAFAR expressed concern. The requirement was dropped, though further inquiry was planned for the 1989-90 academic year.

A practical fact emerged: No one should accept nomination for SCAFAR without a commitment to attend all the meetings, and an understanding that they are frequent, weekly or more often. Too much is at stake for unstable attendance.

In brief, there were serious failures of academic responsibility, not the least by a School’s faculty Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, involving matters of great importance and excessive delays in the handling of serious matters by faculty committees and by administrators.

There is, moreover, a need to remind all faculty that just as, regardless of rank, they have the full protection of academic freedom and should not hesitate to seek the help of the School Committees or of the Senate Committee, there is also a positive responsibility to understand the sorts of academic conduct “are such as to dishonor the University or of the customs of scholarly communities as to render the faculty member unfit to continue as a member of the academic staff.”
On Diversifying Locust Walk

The President's Statement to University Council Wednesday, April 11, 1990

As President of the University of Pennsylvania, I have from the very first placed a heavy emphasis on doing things that would help to meet our need to develop and maintain a very strong sense of community, one that celebrates our diversity yet brings us together in a common commitment to a humane and supportive campus community in which every individual feels a special obligation to treat other members of the community with respect.

A decent academic community has plenty of room for disagreement but ought to have no room for incivility or for the verbal or physical abuse of other people. Though we have made some progress in this regard, we still fall far short of my ideal. I am dedicated to achieving that ideal.

The quality of campus life is of fundamental importance to all of us who live, work and study at Penn. I am deeply concerned about security on campus as well as about the wholesomeness, liveliness, friendliness, and level of intellectual and cultural stimulation that is available to students. With the right sort of living environment, the human relationships made possible by Penn will enhance all of our lives; without that environment, this will deteriorate into an unhappy place.

Many different elements go into making the right sort of total environment, but today I will focus on a small but significant part of the full picture: Locust Walk.

As you all are aware, there has been increased concern in the University community about the atmosphere in the core of the campus, especially along Locust Walk east of 38th Street. I continue to think that one of the nice features of the Penn campus is that students are lives in the middle of it as well as in residential precincts on the periphery of campus. This not only contributes to the sense of life in the middle of the campus after the close of the working day, but it improves safety. Our long-range campus planning envisions the continuation of student residences in the campus core.

I have decided, however, that the current mix of student residences along Locust Walk must change. Only fraternities are to be found there now, of course, but I am not here criticizing fraternities in general, those fraternities in particular, nor any individual students who happen to live along Locust Walk. It is also appropriate here to note that the current situation is not the result of design. Rather, it is the reflection of history, accident, luck, legalities, and the vagaries of the waxing and waning interest in fraternities and sororities over the years. While I think that fraternities should continue to be a prominent part of the student residential precinct in that area of campus, I have nevertheless concluded that there are three reasons for taking conscious action now to change the situation.

First, and perhaps least important, everyone’s impression of Penn is affected by the character of the student residences along Locust Walk, and the current make-up does not come close to reflecting the full range of students at Penn.

Second, a different mix may encourage the sort of student behavior that would set an exemplary standard for the rest of the university to live up to.

Third, as students view living in the core of the campus a real convenience and privilege, it would be more fair if the experience were more equitably made available to a wider segment of the student population. Consequently, we must begin taking steps to transform the area into a more generally welcoming and representative area.

I am establishing a task force to be chaired jointly by Dr. Kim Morrison and Professor David Pope to advise the Provost and me and not about whether the mix of student residences along Locust Walk should change (that decision has been made) but about how the changes might be equitably made. I intend to name to the task force the heads of those offices most directly concerned, the student leaders most directly affected, the president of the Greek alumni council, and one or two other people in positions related to student residential life. I would hope to get from the task force thoughtfully evaluated options for both short-term and long-term actions that could accomplish our goals of a more varied student culture in the middle of the campus. While the semester is almost over, I will urge that task force to work with diligent speed. It is my hope that I will get a set of recommended actions early in the fall, but I also will open to suggestions at any point along the way if earlier action is possible. We may not be able to achieve our full goal for a number of years, but there are things we can do immediately to start us on our way. The goal is a very important one for the entire University community.

About the 1990 Lindback Distinguished Teachers

On May 2, the University community gathers at Kneale Books in Van Pelt between 4:30 and 6:30 p.m. to honor this year’s winners of the Lindback Award and the Provost’s Award. All are pictured on page one. Brief summaries of their dossiers: partly tell why each won:

Dr. Donald Berry, assistant professor in SAS’s chemistry department for four years, “has aggressively championed his concept of faculty members as not just professors, but also as a personal mentor,” serving as freshman advisor, advising first-year graduate students, supervising dissertations and independent studies in addition to classroom teaching and research. Winner of the Young Faculty Award in 1986, “challenges his students to come to him for advice.

Dr. Jan Van der Spiegel, professor of electrical engineering at SEAS since 1982, “teaches more than a discipline; he is also teaching the attitude that important difficult problems need patience, perseverance, tenacity and sometimes group effort in order to be solved.” A winner of the Engineering school’s S. Reid Warren Award for Distinguished Teaching, he is cited for his outstanding intellect and breadth of knowledge, sense of humor and devotion to students outside class. His courses are said to be among the most visible and popular on campus, with highest ratings for teaching quality, and he has clearly motivated his own students to strive for the excellence which he embodies in his own career.

In the Health Schools

Dr. Linda Phillips Brown, assistant professor of nursing education, began as a lecturer teaching her specialties of maternity and neonatal nursing to undergraduates in 1978 and now, as assistant professor, teaches also master’s and doctoral students. She is summed up as an exceptionally gifted scholar, responsible for patient care are never compromised amid her enthusiasm which he embodies in his own career.

The Provost’s Award

Diana Robertson, senior fellow and lecturer, is in her 14th year at the legal studies department of the Wharton School. “She will be affecting our students’ lives in the many ways that come,” says a colleague; letters cite the teaching itself, design of curriculum (including work on the introduction of ethics into the MBA program) and influencing the teaching of others.
Summary Annual Report:
Pennsylvania Annuity Plan, Life Insurance Program,
Dental Plans, Faculty and Staff Scholarship Program and
Retirement Allowance Plan of the University of Pennsylvania
for the Plan Year ending June 30, 1989

This is a summary of the annual reports for the Plans named above of the University of Pennsylvania for the plan year beginning on July 1, 1988, and ending June 30, 1989. These Plans are sponsored by the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania whose employer identification number is 23-1352685. The annual reports have been filed with the Internal Revenue Service as required under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA).

It is also required under the terms of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 that these Summary Annual Reports be furnished to plan participants. To facilitate a single printing, the reports for the plan year ending June 30, 1989 have been combined. Consequently, portions of this summary may refer to plans in which you are not currently participating.

Pennsylvania Annuity Plan: Basic Financial Statement

Funds contributed to the Plan are allocated toward the purchase of individual annuity contracts issued by the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States. Total premiums paid for the plan year ending June 30, 1989, were $300,530.00.

Life Insurance Program: Insurance Information

The Plan has a contract with the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States to pay all life insurance claims incurred under the terms of the Plan. The total premiums paid for the plan year ending June 30, 1989, were $2,131,798.

Plan costs are affected by, among other things, the number and size of claims. Of the total insurance premiums paid for the plan year ending June 30, 1989, the premiums paid under the experience-rated contract during the plan year were $1,969,744.

Long Term Total Disability Income Plan

The Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania have committed themselves to pay all long term disability claims incurred under the terms of the Plan.

Dental Plan (Prudential)

The Plan is a pre-paid program providing dental benefits. Since there is no insurance carrier involved, no insurance premiums were paid during the plan year ending June 30, 1989.

Dental Plan (Penn Faculty Practice)

The Plan is a pre-paid program providing dental benefits. Since there is no insurance carrier involved, no insurance premiums were paid during the plan year ending June 30, 1989.

Faculty & Staff Scholarship Plan

The Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania maintain a program providing scholarships to full time faculty/staff and their dependents. The University provides these benefits in accordance with the terms of the Plan.

Retirement Allowance Plan: Basic Financial Statement

Benefits under this Plan are provided by an insurance contract with the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States and a trust with First Pennsylvania Bank of Philadelphia, PA. Plan expenses were $1,570,913. These expenses included $29,738 in administrative expenses and $1,541,175 in benefits paid to participants and beneficiaries. A total of 4,259 persons were participants in or beneficiaries of the Plan at the end of the plan year, although not all of these persons had yet earned the right to receive benefits.

The value of Plan assets, after subtracting liabilities of the Plan, was $56,978,095 as of June 30, 1989, compared to $50,686,476 as of July 1, 1988. During the plan year the Plan experienced an increase in its net assets of $6,291,619. This increase includes unrealized appreciation or depreciation in the value of plan assets; that is, the difference between the value of the Plan's assets at the end of the year and the value of the assets at the beginning of the year or the cost of assets acquired during the year.

Minimum Funding Standards

An actuary's statement shows that the Plan was funded in accordance with the minimum funding standards of ERISA.

Additional Information

As described below, you have the right to receive a copy of the full annual report of the Retirement Allowance Plan, or any part thereof, on request. The items listed below are included in that report:

1. an accountant's report;
2. assets held for investments;
3. transaction in excess of 5 percent of plan assets;
4. insurance information including sales commissions paid by insurance carriers; and
5. actuarial information regarding the funding of the plan.

You also have the right to receive from the plan administrator, on request and at no charge, a statement of the assets and liabilities of the plan and accompanying notes, or a statement of income and expenses of the plan and accompanying notes, or both. If you request a copy of the full annual report from the plan administrator, these two statements and accompanying notes will be included as part of that report. The charge to cover copying costs does not include a charge for the copying of these portions of the report because these portions are furnished without charge.

Your Rights to Additional Information

You have the right to receive a copy of the full annual reports, or any part thereof, on request. Insurance information for the Pennsylvania Annuity Plan, the Life Insurance Program and the Dental Plan (Prudential) is included in those reports.

To obtain a copy of the full annual report, or any part thereof, write or call the office of the Vice President for Human Resources, Room 538A 3401 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 19104, (215) 898-1331.

The charge for the full annual report of the Retirement Allowance Plan is $3.50; the charge for each other full annual report is $1.50; the charge for a single page is 25 cents.

In addition, you have the legally-protected right to examine the annual reports at the University of Pennsylvania, Benefits Office, Room 527A, 3401 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 19104. You also have the right to examine the annual reports at the U.S. Department of Labor in Washington, D.C., or obtain a copy from the U.S. Department of Labor upon payment of copying costs. Requests to the Department of Labor should be addressed to Public Disclosure Room, N4677, Pension and Welfare Benefit Programs, Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20216.

—Office of Human Resources/Benefits

ALMANAC April 17,1990
Summer Jobs Needed: Campus Openings in View?

During the summer months when a majority of the University Dining Halls are closed, Dining Services reduces their work force. We are seeking help in finding alternate summer employment for these Penn employees who are subject to seasonal layoff. The seasonal layoff period begins May 4, 1990.

Penn is abiding by the terms of the collective bargaining agreement negotiated with the Union representing these University employees, but we want to do more. Penn maintains the insurance benefits for these employees during the summer months. The University guarantees these employees reemployment every September when school (and Dining Services) resume full operation.

Penn notifies local employment service and other agencies of the employees availability. However, we prefer to keep the employees working at Penn. The employees have various skill levels. If your school or center needs summer help (temporary or occasional workers) please contact the Dining Services Personnel Office, Ext. 8-2461. The Personnel Office will provide resumes of qualified individuals.

Thank you for your assistance in helping these members of this Penn Community.

—Jack Heuer, Human Resources
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Human Resources/Compensation

In addition to the scales below, salary scales which show the breakdown by quintile are also available this year. These new quintile scales are designed as an additional tool to assist managers in making salary decisions. If you would like a copy of the quintile scales, please contact Laura Barnes in the Compensation Office at Ext. 8-5503.

Monthly-Paid Salary Scale (Effective: July 1, 1990)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Midpoint</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA1</td>
<td>17,600</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>26,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA2</td>
<td>19,350</td>
<td>21,700</td>
<td>29,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA3</td>
<td>21,275</td>
<td>23,600</td>
<td>35,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA4</td>
<td>23,425</td>
<td>25,750</td>
<td>42,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA5</td>
<td>25,750</td>
<td>28,125</td>
<td>48,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA6</td>
<td>28,325</td>
<td>30,750</td>
<td>56,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA7</td>
<td>31,175</td>
<td>33,625</td>
<td>64,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA8</td>
<td>34,275</td>
<td>36,825</td>
<td>71,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA9</td>
<td>37,700</td>
<td>40,375</td>
<td>78,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA10</td>
<td>42,225</td>
<td>44,900</td>
<td>86,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA11</td>
<td>48,575</td>
<td>51,375</td>
<td>93,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA12</td>
<td>56,750</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>101,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weekly-Paid Salary Scale (35 Hour Weekly-Paid) (Effective July 1, 1990)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Midpoint</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G4</td>
<td>9,925</td>
<td>10,440</td>
<td>11,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5</td>
<td>10,800</td>
<td>11,320</td>
<td>12,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G6</td>
<td>11,775</td>
<td>12,300</td>
<td>13,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G7</td>
<td>12,675</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>14,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8</td>
<td>13,650</td>
<td>14,180</td>
<td>15,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G9</td>
<td>14,875</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td>16,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G10</td>
<td>16,225</td>
<td>16,750</td>
<td>18,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G11</td>
<td>17,325</td>
<td>17,850</td>
<td>19,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G12</td>
<td>19,300</td>
<td>19,825</td>
<td>21,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G13</td>
<td>21,225</td>
<td>21,750</td>
<td>23,275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Terms:

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 salary ranges. There are 12 PA grades (monthly-paid) and 10 G grades (weekly-paid).

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 11:59 p.m. Sunday.

Salary Range: A salary range is a set of figures that reflect the upper, middle and lower limits for salary decisions. All salary offers must be approved in advance by the Office of Human Resources.

ACE-NIP Conference

Registration forms are available from Donna Kahn Patkin at Ext. 8-3012 for the Ninth Annual Conference of ACE-NIP (the American Council on Education-National Identification Program for the Advancement of Women in Higher Education), to be held May 4 from 8:30 a.m.-5:00 p.m., at the Gregg Conference Center, The American College, Bryn Mawr. The conference fee of $60 includes materials and lunch. For more information call Barbara McHale, 464-7300 Ext. 489 or Marianne Stewart, 590-8633.
The University of Pennsylvania Police Department

This report contains tallies of part 1 crimes, a listing of part 1 crimes against persons, and summaries of part 1 crime in the five busiest sectors on campus where two or more incidents were reported between April 9, 1990, and April 15, 1990.

Totals: Incidents -14, Arrests -3

Date Time Location Incident
04/11/90 9:18 PM 100 Blk 34th St Point of gun/actor fled/nothing taken
04/12/90 3:37 AM Houston Hall Secured bicycle taken from rack
04/11/90 1:50 PM College Hall Map taken from room
04/10/90 4:47 PM Houston Hall Cash taken from register
04/10/90 12:52 PM Logan Hall Wallet taken from purse
04/13/90 1:14 PM Meyerson Hall Books taken from room
04/13/90 5:31 AM Meyerson Hall Unsecured bike wheel taken
04/12/90 8:31 AM Van Pelt Library Wallet and credit card taken
04/13/90 12:11 AM Meyerson Hall Unattended wallet taken
04/13/90 1:14 PM Van Pelt Library Bike taken from rail
04/13/90 4:16 PM Lot #24 Steering column damaged on auto
04/11/90 9:18 PM 100 Block 34th St See under crimes against person

Safety Tip: Practice the “buddy system” and watch out for your neighbor. If you see something suspicious or someone being victimized, get involved and notify the Campus Police immediately; call 988-7333 or in case of emergency 511.