As the nation and world celebrate the 100th anniversary of the birth of Marian Anderson (center), Penn reveals a new recording and an unknown song by Sibelius in the collection she gave to the Library (page 10). At left, the late alumna Sadie Alexander as she appears on the Penn home page (page 3); and below, a portrait of Dr. Helen O. Dickens, the professor emerita whose life is celebrated annually at Women of Color (page 3).
News in Brief

Benefits Update: 20 Questions
The latest open examination of the Benefits Advisory Committee’s proposed changes in faculty/staff benefits packages came at Council Wednesday, when the Personnel Benefits Committee’s chair, Dr. David Hackney, read out his Committee’s votes on questions about the February 11 report, or those arising from the process of redesign.

None of the 20 questions drew a unanimous vote. Dr. Hackney pointed out (see breakdown, pp. 8-9 of this issue), but several had strong majorities. These endorsed the proposed changes in health insurance and in paid time off. By 88%-12% the Committee proposed an alternative in life insurance (a flat $50,000 instead of 1 x salary), and by 89%-11% supported a recommendation that “the graduate tuition benefit be retained in its present form for current University employees, as well as for employees who have been recruited to the University and who begin working as of 1/1/98.”

Dr. Anthony Tomazanis, Dr. Peter Kuriloff and other members of Council spoke to issues in the report (to be covered next week). After members had spoken, pro-tempo Dr. Larry Gross, recognized two support staff members attending as observers. Paul Lukasik of SSW, an administrative assistant, and John Hogan of the Biddle Library, who is treasurer AFSCME Local 590, critiqued the proposed package in prepared texts that are also scheduled for publication next week.

Elsewhere in this issue:
• In Speaking Out, pp. 6-7, Dr. Martin Pring of Physiology/Med presents a blank table, asking for figures on the projected savings through cuts in benefits—and Drs. Barbara Lowery and Michael Wachter of the Provost’s Office fill in the blanks.
• In Answering Questions: More on Health Insurance Benefits, Dr. Lowery and Human Resources Vice President Clinton Davidson give information that responds to recently-asked questions.
• The A-3 Assembly’s Q & A session on the benefits package is summarized on page 9.

Procedures on English Fluency; Faculty Maternity Leave and Extension of Tenure Probation
Provost Stanley Chodorow has issued Provost’s Memoranda announcing the adoption of three polices (see titles below), effective immediately. All will be placed on the PennWeb this week, and will be published Of Record in Almanac March 18.

• Faculty Maternity Policy is a revision of the 1983 policy in the Handbook; it is based on proposals published by the Senate Committee on the Faculty for comment in Almanac September 19, 1995.
• Policy on Extension of the Tenure Probationary Period is a companion policy that allows extensions of the tenure probationary period, not only for faculty members who become parents, but also for faculty members who experience similar career-disrupting events. In identifying those events, the Senate Committee followed the provisions of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993, President Judith Rodin and Provost Chodorow note in a cover memorandum to the policies.

Globalization and Major Cities: March 21
An Invitation to Members of the Standing Faculty:
For Globalis University and The Provost’s Council on International Programs cordially invite you to participate in the third Annual Provost’s Conference on International Education and Research, The Urban Agenda: The Effects of Globalization of Major Cities. It will be held on Friday, March 21, 8:45 a.m.-1 p.m., followed by lunch (1-2 p.m.), at the Faculty Club. Guest speakers include:
— William Alonso, Saltonstall Professor of Population Policy, Harvard University: Cities, Regions and International Communities;
— Stephen Mayo, Principal Economist and Co-Director for the Housing Indicators Program, Infrastructure and Urban Development Department at the World Bank;
— Saskia Sassen, Professor of Urban Planning, Columbia University: Cities and the Global Economy: Opportunities and Challenges;

Speakers from the University are:
— Gary Hack, Dean, Graduate School of Fine Arts
— Marja Hoek-Smit, Director, International Housing Finance Program, Wharton Real Estate Center
— Robert P. Inman, Professor of Finance and Economics
— Loretta Sweet Jemmott, Associate Professor of Nursing; Director, Center for Urban Health Research
— Michael B. Katz, Sheldon and Lucy Hackney Professor of History; Co-Director, Urban Studies Program
— Douglas S. Massey, Dorothy S. Thomas Professor of Sociology; Chair, Department of Sociology
— Martin Meyerson, President Emeritus and University Professor
— Julia Paley, Assistant Professor of Anthropology; Assistant Professor, Urban Studies Program
— Susan M. Wachter, Professor of Real Estate and Finance

Because of space limitations, particularly at lunch, advance registration is required. RSVP: Elva Power, by March 14, Ext. 8-1640, or e-mail: power@pobox.upenn.edu. Please inform Mrs. Power of dietary restrictions.

— Joyce M. Randolph, Director, Office of International Programs

Steinberg Symposium April 1-2: Rethinking Adam Smith
The Steinberg Symposium and the School of Arts and Sciences, in conjunction with the economics department’s annual Economics Day, presents a two-day symposium, Rethinking Adam Smith, exploring the implications of Adam Smith’s economic theories. The program, funded by Gayfryd and Saul (’59) Steinberg, will feature lectures and a student reading project. All events are free and open to the public.

April 1 Student Reading Project: papers for the reading project can be found on-line at www.sas.upenn.edu/sasalum/steinberg/readings.html or by contacting Anita Mastroieni at 898-5262 or mastroieb@ben.dev.upenn.edu; small-group discussions of the readings with faculty members over dinner will be held at 6 p.m. in the Faculty Club; registration required: contact Ms. Mastroieni by March 27.

April 2 Adam Smith: Past and Present: moderator: Nobel laureate, Lawrence Klein, professor emeritus of economics; speakers: Douglass C. North, professor of economics at Washington University, will discuss history and Adam Smith, and Jeffrey D. Sachs, director of the Harvard Institute for International Development and professor of international trade at Harvard, will discuss applying Adam Smith’s economic theories today; 2-4 p.m.; Rainey Auditorium, University Museum.

The Legacy of Adam Smith; John Kenneth Galbraith, professor emeritus of economics at Harvard, discusses Adam Smith in the 21st Century; 4:30-5:30 p.m.; Rainey Auditorium, University Museum.
Leaving for Duke: V.P. Clint Davidson

H. Clint Davidson, Penn’s vice president for human resources since 1995, has accepted the position of associate vice president for human resources at Duke University, Executive Vice President John Fry announced Friday.

Mr. Davidson is expected to leave Penn at the end of the semester. He has been instrumental in launching several key human resources initiatives, including the recently published Benefits Redesign proposals and the University-wide Job Classification Study, which is in progress.

“We are grateful to Clint for the role he has played in developing a number of strategic human resources programs,” said Mr. Fry. “He is leaving behind a strong foundation which will help shape Penn’s human resources programs for the future.”

“Penn is a wonderful place, and it is destined to be even better,” Mr. Davidson said. “But this is a marvelous opportunity for me to return to the part of the country where I spent so much of my professional life, and at an institution as prestigious as Penn. That combination of factors was difficult to ignore.

“I am in debt to many, many people at Penn, in particular to the Human Resources staff and the members of the Benefits Advisory Committee, which has worked so very hard on the first comprehensive benefits review here in 15 years. Their work ethic, and their contributions, have been invaluable in the process.”

— Based on a News & Public Affairs release

PPSA Meeting: March 17

The Penn Professional Staff Assembly’s meeting of officers on Monday, March 17, is open to attendance by members of PPSA, Marie Witt, chairperson, has announced. The meeting starts at noon in the Bishop White Room of Houston Hall.

The annual meeting and elections will be held on May 7, with time and place to be announced. Members who wish to be advised of meetings and activities electronically may consult the PPSA home page at http://www.upenn.edu/ppsa/ or, to be added to the electronic mailing list, send a message by email to ppsa-request@pobox.upenn.edu.

Women of Color Day: How It All Began

Ten years ago the National Institute Women of Color proclaimed March 17 as the first National Women of Color Day, calling on all women and men to remember not only the deserving well-known achievers but also the “ordinary women who made extraor-diary contributions to their families, communities and the world.” In 1988 Suzanne Brooks, then director of affirmative action at Penn State and a member of NIWC’s Board of Directors, wrote several women at Penn, including her then-counterpart JoAnn Mitchell, to urge them to join.

A small group of women organized Penn’s first annual celebration, held at the Penn Tower Hotel on March 1, 1988. There, 65 women decided to institutionalize the celebration and invite students, faculty and staff members of the community to attend. As word spread about Penn’s Women of Color Celebration, attendance grew. By 1991, attendance had reached 350. For this year’s Women of Color Day, last Friday, there were 500 celebrants—the maximum that Penn Tower’s ballroom can take—and a waiting list of over 200, according to one of the coordinators, Winnie Smart-Mapp.

Since its inception Penn’s Women of Color Day Celebration has included awards for deserving members of the Penn community who have made a difference in the lives of women of color. Marcia Rafig, former General Manager of the Penn Tower Hotel, was the first honoree. In 1990, a special category was established for student honorees. The first Certificates of Merit for students, faculty and staff were awarded in 1991.

In 1991, Dr. Helen O. Dickens was nominated for the faculty/staff award—and in the course of giving it, became clear to the planners that “her lifetime achievement set a standard to which most of us could only hope to aspire. Therefore, it was with great pride that the Helen O. Dickens Lifetime Achievement Award was established and presented to her namesake at the luncheon in 1991.

Subsequently, the Dr. Helen O. Dickens Lifetime Achievement Award has only been given to exemplary candidates whose long history of service to women of color in the Penn and Delaware Valley communities merited such an honor,” said Sheila Horn, chairperson for 1997.

Dr. Dickens headed Ob/Gyn at Mercy Douglass Hospital, then joined Women’s Hospital, which was later acquired by Penn. She pioneered the development of teen pregnancy and medical minority affairs programs. She maintains her practice, continues to teach, recruits students, and works tirelessly to increase the presence and permanence of women of color at Penn.

Penn Women Who Made History

For Women’s History Month, Penn’s home page is featuring women of the University who have made history. Presently highlighted is Sadie T.M. Alexander (1898-1989), the first black woman in the U.S. to obtain a Ph.D. and the first admitted to the Pennsylvania bar. At Penn she took her B.S. in education in (1918) and her Ph.D. in economics (1921), returning later for a Penn Law degree.

http://www.upenn.edu
Penn Schools and Departments in the ’97 U.S. News Rankings of Graduate Schools

Three of Penn’s schools—Nursing, Veterinary Medicine and the Wharton School—are third in the nation among their peers in this year’s U.S. News study of America’s Best Graduate Schools—and one of them is separated by only .1 from the Number One position.

In what the study calls “average reputation scores,” Penn Nursing stands at 3.7, but the only score higher is 3.8—where U.C. San Francisco and the University of Washington are tied.

In Veterinary Medicine, the top three are UC Davis (4.7), Cornell (4.6) and Penn (4.1).

For business schools, the presentation shifts to an “overall score” in which the highest school is given a rank of 100. The Wharton School’s 99.1 is edged by Harvard (99.5), and Stanford holds the 100 spot.

Wharton’s Executive Education Program is tied for second in its category, “top non-degree M.B.A. Programs.” Returning to the “average reputation scores” framework, U.S. News shows Wharton’s program and Northwestern’s Kellogg School at 4.6, and Harvard at 4.7 has a lead of .1.

The Medical School is Number 7, and three more schools are in the top 20 in the country—Law is at 11th—a rank unchanged by U.S. News’s later discovery of an error in methodology—to be corrected in the upcoming issue. Both Education and Social Work are at 18th in their fields.

PennMed, on a scale similar to the one used for B-schools, is at 94.2, with Yale just above it (94.4). Above Yale in ascending order are Washington University (in Missouri) at 94.7, U.C. San Francisco at 94.8, Duke (95.2), Johns Hopkins 99.7, and Harvard in the 100 position.

In SAS, GSFA and SEAS, some individual disciplines also placed in the top ten to twenty-five in the country. The name and score in parenthesis is the “high,” and the full lists can be seen on-line at

Ranked departments in SAS include:

- Economics, 8th at 4.4 (Harvard 4.9)
- English, 9th at 4.5 (Berkeley 4.9)
- Psychology, 9th at 4.2 (Stanford 4.8)
- History, 14th at 4.2 (Princeton 4.9)
- Sociology, 15th at 3.7 (Chicago 4.8)
- Physics, 17th at 3.9 (CalTech 4.9)
- Mathematics, 19th at 3.9 (Harvard 4.9)
- Biological Sciences, 20th at 3.9 (Harvard 4.8)
- Chemistry, 20th at 3.8 (Berkeley 5)

GSFA’s high scorer is Architecture, 9th at 3.8 (Harvard 4.6), and SEAS’s Computer Sciences is 22nd at 3.6 (Carnegie Mellon 4.9)

A Writing Prize for Police and Planners


Penn’s Bob Lundgren and Custer’s Last Stand

A month ago Bob Lundgren was one of hundreds waiting to hear who won the national competition to design a monument for the Battle of the Little Big Horn in Montana. Now the jury has forwarded its top three to the Secretary of the Interior and Bob Lundgren is among them: third in a field of over 550, he has been awarded a $5000 prize. His entry becomes the property of the U.S. National Park Service and can be incorporated into the final design.

“The idea to build a memorial was enacted by Congress after many years of talks with the three Indian tribes who asked to be recognized as the winners of the battle,” said Mr. Lundgren. The theme of the competition, co-sponsored by the U.S. National Park Service and the Southwest Memorial Parks Association, was “Peace Through Unity.” Mr. Lundgren worked from a concept of “story stones” shaping a kind of council ring “because we obtain knowledge through stories, and can build unity from knowledge.”

In recognition of his research, and of his international role as educator and consultant, Dr. Richard Estes (below), professor of social work, received the Council on Social Work Education’s 1997 Award for Distinguished Recent Contribution to Social Work Education. His work on social welfare issues focuses on how countries change to support their populations, and particularly how governments meet basic needs, including how they produce and supply food.
Dr. George Karreman, Mathematical Biologist

Dr. George Karreman, a professor of physiology who retired in 1983 as Penn’s first Professor Emeritus of Mathematical Biology, died on February 27 at the age of 76.

Born in Rotterdam, the Netherlands, George Karreman took his B.S. in physics and mathematics at Leiden University in 1939 and his M.S. in theoretical physics there in 1941, one month before the university was closed. For the remainder of the Second World War he kept food on the table by tutoring.

In August 1948 he arrived in Chicago with a ten-day supply of food $100 in his pocket and contacted Dr. Nicholas Rashevsky at the University of Chicago. He was awarded a University of Chicago fellowship and completed a Ph.D. in mathematical biology in 1951, despite the interruption of heart surgery as he became, in 1950 at the age of 30, the third cardiac patient to undergo successful coronary surgery at the University of Chicago.

Computers brought Dr. Karreman eventually to Penn. After working as scientific research advisor to Dr. Albert Szent-Gyorgi at the Institute for Muscle Research at the Marine Biological Laboratory in Woods Hole, Mass. he moved to Philadelphia to access more advanced computers in 1957, initially as Senior Medical Research Scientist at the Eastern Pennsylvania Psychiatric Institute. In 1962 he was appointed associate professor of physiology at the School of Medicine, working at the Bockus Research Institute of the Graduate Hospital, which was then affiliated with Penn. He was named full professor in 1970.

Dr. Karreman was president and co-founder of the Society for Mathematical Biology, and a member of Sigma Xi, the American Physiological Society, the New York Academy of Sciences, the Franklin Institute, the Society for Supramolecular Biology, and the Society for Vascular System Dynamics.

He was known as a devoted educator and an inspiration to his students, family, and friends. All of his children received advanced degrees from the University of Pennsylvania. He was an avid reader and chess player, and a devoted husband and father. In his later years he developed an interest in painting and sculpture and traveled frequently to the Pacific Northwest to be with his son and daughter and their families.

He is survived by his wife of 44 years, Anneke, and their children Grace, Frank and Hubert-Jan, by a daughter-in-law Jennifer, granddaughter Nancy, brother Herman, and sister-in-law Erna. — From a tribute by colleagues in physiology.

Dr. William Kintner, Ambassador and Scholar

Dr. William R. Kintner, 81, a soldier, scholar, diplomat, author, and professor emeritus of political science at Penn, died on February 1 after a long bout with cancer.

Born in Lock Haven PA, Dr. Kintner graduated from West Point in 1940 with a B.A. and a commission as second lieutenant. He continued his education at Georgetown, where he took an M.A. and a Ph.D. ; his doctoral dissertation, The Front is Everywhere, a study of the Soviet Communist Party, was published in 1950.

Dr. Kintner retired from the Army in 1961 at the rank of colonel. At the time, he held various posts within the Office of the Chief of Research and Development and the strategy analysis coordination group for the Army’s Chief of Staff. He also had earned a Bronze Star and a Legion of Merit, both with oak leaf clusters.

When he retired, Dr. Kintner was appointed professor of political science at Penn. During his tenure here, he was active in the Foreign Policy Research Institute (FPRI), where he served as deputy director from 1961, and became director in 1969. In 1970 Dr. Kintner was to oversee the separation of the Institute from the University as Penn implemented a policy prohibiting classified research, which was applicable to some FPRI research on arms control.

In 1973, Dr. Kintner left his post as director to become then-President Ford’s ambassador to Thailand. He had the task of securing Thai support for a war that the United States was leaving. He returned to Philadelphia in 1975 to assume the position of president of FPRI. A highlight of his achievements was orchestrating a joint project with the Soviet Institute for the Study of the United States and Canada that permitted annual exchanges of top non-governmental scholars and analysis despite the Cold War. Retiring from the Institute in 1985, he served on the board of directors of the United States Institute for Peace.

Dr. Kintner authored many books, including Forging a New Sword with Joseph Caffey and Raymond Albright; A Forward Strategy for America with Robert Strauss-Hupé and Stephan Possony; and Soviet Global Strategy. He also published in Esquire, National Review, Reader’s Digest and the New Leader. His last book, The Role of Ancient Israel, subtitled A Swedenborgian Perspective..., was published in 1996.

Widowed in 1986 after a 46-year marriage to the former Xandree Marie Wyatt, he is survived by his second wife, the former Faith Child, and their children; and three great-grandchildren.

Charles King, Union President

Charles King, who was on the Quad maintenance staff for 29 years and was a union president during major campus strikes in the 1970s, died on February 13 after a long illness at age 69.

Mr. King joined Penn in January 1961 and retired in April 1989.

From 1974 to 1978, he was president of the now-defunct United Building Maintenance and Service Employees Local 1202. At his head, Mr. King led two highly publicized campus-wide strikes: a six-week walkout in 1975 that affected dining services and trash collection; and the 1977 strike over housekeeping that lasted almost six months.

Mr. King is survived by his wife, Mary A.; his son, Charles Francis Jr., a custodian in Houston Hall for nearly 14 years; his daughter, Christina Oleykowski; his granddaughters, Lauren, Leigh Ann and Liz Oleykowski; and his brothers and sister.

Speaking Out

Some Personal ‘Bests’

This is in response to the “Best Art on Campus” list in the February 18 Compass feature in Almanac. It deals with the University’s collection of Fine Arts and Architecture and asks two highly qualified faculty experts, to list their favorite choices. It is not often that attention is called to Penn’s art treasures and to the contribution they make in raising the cultural consciousness of all of us.

Although to a great degree Penn’s art treasures bring a subliminal influence to bear, they play a significant role in shaping the values and personalities of our young people during their time spent at Penn.

Having said my thank yous, I would like, if I may, to add a few more items to the “Best Art on Campus” list. I begin with a veritable treasure trove of sculptures now stored away in some remote stacks of Meyerson Hall. I refer to the large-scale models constructed by the distinguished French Engineer, Robert le Ricolais, with the help of his Architecture students. They were fabricated to support le Ricolais’ research in the effects of stress on structure in space. Seen as sculptural works of art they need no further rationale.

Another candidate for my “best” is the rarely visited collection of R. Tait McKenzie’s sculpture in the Gimbel Gym’s Art Gallery. And I would certainly include Harry Bertoia’s cascade of shimmering bronze, hanging from the lofty ceiling in the Annenberg Center’s lobby. Added to my list is Sam Maitin’s joyously-colored abstract relief on the wall of the Annenberg School.

My list would not be complete without Archipenko’s mysterious bronze King Solomon standing guard outside the Hillel Foundation on the 36th Street Walk.

Call it hubris if you will, but I take pride in having played an important part in the selection and installation of the two Annenberg pieces and Archipenko’s Solomon.

S. Barterson

Director, Faculty Club Art Gallery

Donations can be made out to “The Henry Wade Meacham, Jr. Children’s Trust” and sent to Michael O’S. Floyd, Esq., Drinker Biddle & Reath, PNC Building, Philadelphia, PA 19107.

More Speaking Out next page
Speaking Out

Information, Please

I am becoming deeply suspicious. When the Associate Provost and Vice President for Human Resources introduced the benefits review to the Senate Executive Committee, September 4, 1996, two of the foremost motivations given were “Penn’s 30.1% employee benefits rate may be among the highest at comparable institutions” and “Its retirement programs ... may not meet Internal Revenue Service comparable value guidelines.” (Almanac September 10, 1996, p.3).

The latter incentive has been postponed for a year, but the current proposal (Almanac Supplement February 11) again highlights “... costs ... now exceed $139 million in FY ’97. ... approximately 12% of the total University budget.” Yet nowhere in this proposal does one find a clear statement of what the impact of its recommendations on this would be. Instead one may glean snippets, for example, that it would reduce the average University contribution to health care insurance from 89% to 83% of the total, and that the graduate tuition benefits for spouses and dependents, that it recommends phasing out, currently cost $1.3 million.

I was prepared to attribute this to oversight in preparing an already long and complex document. Then I attended a meeting of the Deputy Provost and Associate Provost with my School’s faculty this past Monday, March 3. One questioner asked what the reduction in overall compensation to an average faculty or staff member would be, but the response was “It depends on your health insurance plan—which one is it?”. It was the response was “It depends on your health insurance plan—which one is it?”. It was

Later in that meeting I asked for a comparison of the benefits cost to the University in FY ’97 under the existing package with what it would have been if all the new proposals had been in effect. The Deputy Provost said he “could get those figures for me.”

This is his chance. I invite him to fill out the table below. The extensive use of explanatory footnotes is encouraged. For example, it would be reasonable to list the cost of the life insurance benefit as the same under both scenarios, due to the proposed one-time conversion of flex-dollars to direct compen-

The Universit’s retirement benefits rate may be among the highest at comparable institutions” and “Its retirement programs ... may not meet Internal Revenue Service comparable value guidelines.” (Almanac September 10, 1996, p.3).

The latter incentive has been postponed for a year, but the current proposal (Almanac Supplement February 11) again highlights “... costs ... now exceed $139 million in FY ’97. ... approximately 12% of the total University budget.” Yet nowhere in this proposal does one find a clear statement of what the impact of its recommendations on this would be. Instead one may glean snippets, for example, that it would reduce the average University contribution to health care insurance from 89% to 83% of the total, and that the graduate tuition benefits for spouses and dependents, that it recommends phasing out, currently cost $1.3 million.

I was prepared to attribute this to oversight in preparing an already long and complex document. Then I attended a meeting of the Deputy Provost and Associate Provost with my School’s faculty this past Monday, March 3. One questioner asked what the reduction in overall compensation to an average faculty or staff member would be, but the response was “It depends on your health insurance plan—which one is it?”. It was the response was “It depends on your health insurance plan—which one is it?”. It was

Later in that meeting I asked for a comparison of the benefits cost to the University in FY ’97 under the existing package with what it would have been if all the new proposals had been in effect. The Deputy Provost said he “could get those figures for me.”

This is his chance. I invite him to fill out the table below. The extensive use of explanatory footnotes is encouraged. For example, it would be reasonable to list the cost of the life insurance benefit as the same under both scenarios, due to the proposed one-time conversion of flex-dollars to direct compensation, but that should be explained.

We should realise that the table only gives an approximate estimate of the effect of the proposals. For example, if the increase in contributions by employees to health care insurance drives them to change to the less expensive plans, as has been recommended to those who have complained, the University will save more. I am sure that the consultants employed in the development of these proposals made detailed projections of these effects, and equally sure that we will not be told what they were. Nonetheless I would be happy to see the addition of a third column to the table giving estimates of these consequent savings.

In another example the proposal states that “The practice of providing summer hours has also contributed to the costly administrative complexity of accounting for employee time off.” It would be nice to know what savings of this kind are anticipated, too. I would be happy to trade an inconsequential reduction in benefits for the elimination of, say, the equivalent of a floor of the Franklin Building, and would watch closely for the shrinkage.

— Martin Pring, Physiology/Med

Response to Dr. Pring

In this letter, we have filled in your table (see below) and regret that we could not give a ready answer for the question at the meeting. It is difficult to answer certain questions when the material to be explained is complex. Your question on the cost impact of Benefits Redesign asked for a comparison of the “projected ’97” column with the “recommendations” column. The approach we have used is to compare the projected FY 1998 benefit costs assuming the “recommendations” were to be accepted, with the FY 1998 costs assuming “no changes” were made to the plan. To your proposed table, we have thus added another column which portrays

FY 1998 assuming no change in the benefits plan.

Allow us briefly to explain the elements in the table. For health care, if the current recommendations were accepted, the University’s costs would increase from $31.300 million in FY 1997 to $31.370 million in FY 1998. In comparison, the costs would rise to a projected $33.370 million in FY 1998 if no changes were made. Hence, we estimate the savings to the University to be $2 million or $33.370 million minus $31.370 million. Note that the University’s health care costs are still projected to increase from FY 1997 to FY 1998, assuming the recommendations are accepted.

The cost of the tuition benefit is projected to increase from FY 1997 to 1998, since the recommendation delays the implementation of the change to FY 1999. The estimated cost savings of $1.3 million in reduced graduate tuition would not be fully realized until FY 2003, assuming the recommendations are accepted.

The University’s cost of life insurance would decrease from $2.300 million in FY 1997 to $700,000 in FY 1998, assuming the recommendations are accepted, versus an increase to $2.400 million if no changes were made. The reduction reflects the elimination of a few flex-dollars. Note, however, that this reduction in University benefit costs is entirely offset by an increase in employee benefit-base salary. Indeed, as discussed in the original Almanac article, the after-tax improvement in employee compensation is even greater, given the elimination of the tax inefficiency of the current life insurance plan.

The cost of the retirement benefit would increase from $24.800 million in FY 1997 to $26.020 million assuming that the recommendations are accepted. The difference between the $26.020 million and the $25.900 million figure reflects the increased University contributions due to the increase in benefit-base salary mentioned immediately above. The increase in disability plan costs that would result from the implementation of the recommendations also reflects the salary increase from the elimination of flex dollars.

In summary, the proposed recommenda-

Table Submitted by Dr. Pring
(see letter above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost of Employee Benefits to the University in FY ’97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Remission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Time Off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table by Drs. Wachter and Lowery in Response to Dr. Pring’s Letter (see exchange above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected Cost of Employee Benefits Affected by Benefits Redesign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected ’97</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Remission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Notes:
1. The difference between the **Recommendations** and **No Change** columns is $3.560 million. This reflects the reduction in employee benefit costs assuming the recommendations are accepted. Even if the recommendations are accepted, University benefits costs will still increase, as is made clear by comparing the **Projected ’97** and **Recommendations** columns.
2. The cost savings from the reduction in paid-time-off, including summer hours, are difficult to quantify. The savings come as an improvement in productivity rather than as a reduction in costs. Hence, no specific figure is included from these savings.
3. We use projected FY 1997 costs to represent current costs. Since the University’s fiscal year does not end until June, actual cost figures will not be available until after then.
tions would reduce employee benefit costs by approximately $3.56 million in FY 1998. This is made up of health cost savings of $2 million and life insurance cost savings of $1.7 million, offset by increases in retirement and disability costs of $140,000. Recommended costs, however, are set lower than the PENNCare PPO to reflect the greater cost containment cost saving to the University. In terms of the original question in your letter, which compares the projected FY 1997 benefit costs against the recommended costs in FY 1998, the total University benefit cost expenditures will increase above current levels, even if the recommendations are accepted. Hence, the cost savings exist only as a reduction from the FY 1998 cost base, assuming no change in the benefit plan.

You mention correctly that any answer to the savings in health care costs will depend on migration among plans and that the consultants looked into this issue. The specific answer to your question is that the University would not save from the migration of employees to the less expensive health plans. Because the indemnity plan will pay a larger portion of the cost of their health insurance, any savings would probably add only to University costs.

One last point. Your letter frequently refers to “the University” and our letter does the same. We should clarify, however, that in a very real sense, it is not “the University” paying for benefits or “the University” saving money on benefits; it is the schools and responsibility centers. They pay for the benefits, bear the burden of any increases in benefits, and reap the returns for any savings on benefits.

—Michael L. Wachter, Deputy Provost
—Barbara Lowery, Associate Provost

Answering Questions: More on Health Insurance Benefits

by Barbara J. Lowery and H. Clint Davidson

In response to a number of questions and comments about health insurance that we have received since the Benefits Advisory Committee published its report February 11 in Almanac, this article gives more information and background on the options the Committee proposed.

Offer a New University of Pennsylvania/Keystone Point of Service (POS) Option. The recommended POS option offers a great deal of flexibility and choice within a plan that is more cost effective than the current PENNCare PPO while providing numerous features that make it a substitute for the PPO. Care can be accessed in one of three ways:

—In-Network Benefits, generally 100% after specified copays, are available through the very broad range of physicians and hospitals within the Keystone HMO network. Each enrollee needs to select a primary care physician from within the Keystone network who will be responsible for providing care and for coordinating referrals to specialists. Enrollees have the right to change primary care physicians during the plan year.

—UPHS Benefits. With the in-network option, benefit incentives (through lower copays for office visits and hospital admissions) are provided for employees who select a primary care physician from within the UPHS network. Note that UPHS doctors and hospitals are already part of the broader Keystone network, so this benefit actually represents an additional level of preferred care within the in-network coverage as described above.

—Out-of-Network Benefits are indemnity benefits comparable (but not identical) to the current Comprehensive plan. These benefits are available within the POS plan at any time a covered member needs medical service with no requirement to use a primary care physician to coordinate care or to obtain referrals. The plan generally pays 80% after a $200 deductible. The added flexibility required to care for the UPHS network. The benefits are available from the much broader Keystone network, rather than only from the more limited UPHS network (in-network benefits are still available on a preferred basis for use of UPHS doctors). Taken together, the three ways of accessing care provide features that are similar to PENNCare and the Comprehensive plan. However, the payroll contributions for the POS option are set lower than the PENNCare PPO to reflect the greater cost effectiveness and managed care efficiencies available through Keystone. Contributions are higher under the POS than for the HMO to reflect the greater degree of choice and flexibility available under the POS option.

Eliminate the BC/BS Comprehensive Option. To streamline plan administration and eliminate options that are redundant, the Committee recommended the elimination of the BC/BS Comprehensive indemnity option—but only after it became clear that benefits similar to those in the Comprehensive plan could be made available under two other options:

• Out-of-network benefits under the PENNCare PPO are set at the Comprehensive plan level except for lifetime maximums.

• Out-of-network benefits under the new Keystone plan are designed to be comparable to the benefits under Comprehensive (while not identical, the benefits are very similar). Open Enrollment materials will explain differences in greater detail.

Current Comprehensive plan enrollees who wish to continue in an indemnity plan should consider enrolling in the POS option as the most economical way to maintain these benefits.

Retain the Current BC/BS Plan 100 Indemnity Option. This plan provides high benefit levels and unrestricted access to doctors and hospitals for all medically necessary care. No changes in benefit levels are proposed. Its higher contribution cost reflects the generous benefit levels and lack of restriction on access to providers.

Retain Current PENNCare PPO. When the PENNCare PPO option was first offered in 1995, neither the University nor the Health System knew the ultimate plan cost since the plan was new and enrollment could not be predicted. It was decided as a first approximation that the new plan should be priced at the same level as the comprehensive indemnity plan. This approach resulted in no contributions for the PENNCare option for the past two years, and 25% of the University population elected this plan.

In evaluating the claim experience under the plan, it has become apparent that the payroll contributions were set too low. The factors that made this plan attractive to employees—generous benefits, no contributions, and no restrictions on access to care—also worked to make the plan economically unsustainable, absent change.

Serious consideration was given to the elimination of PENNCare. This approach was rejected, however, since many employees had enrolled in the plan and would be disadvantaged by its discontinuance. The Benefits Redesign Committee recommended retention of the PENNCare option, and agreed that payroll contributions should be increased to a level that better reflects the plan’s true value and cost relative to other Penn options.

A review of the PENNCare PPO’s features may be useful:

• PENNCare is a “preferred provider organization” (PPO) plan based on the University of Pennsylvania Health System (UPHS) network of doctors and hospitals as the preferred benefit ($10 office visit copays, 100% coverage). There is no requirement to select a “primary care physician” or to obtain referrals to see participating specialists. The benefit levels are comparable to the non-preferred (“out-of-network”) benefits which are available from “non-preferred” physicians and hospitals that are not part of the Health System. This is the “out of network” benefit. In this case, the benefit levels are the similar to those under the current BC/BS Comprehensive indemnity option.

Retain the Current Keystone and USHC Options. A key goal guiding benefits redesign was that Penn should offer health insurance options which are affordable for all employees. The Committee learned that the high level of coverage and low payroll contributions for HMOs have made them the option of choice for a majority of Penn’s A-3 population.

In evaluating these plans, the lack of prescription drug coverage stood out as a significant gap from perspectives of employee cost, quality of clinical care and competitive standing. Although it would mean additional costs to the University, the Committee felt strongly that the addition of prescription drug coverage was critical to employee security and to the overall effectiveness of the Penn benefit program. The recommendation, therefore, is to add a new prescription drug benefit to the HMOs.

The reconstituted contributions for HMO coverage to a level lower than that required for the 1993/94 plan year should be viewed in light of the new prescription plan’s value. In fact, for normal users of prescription drugs, the HMO coverage will cost less.

Another goal in considering possible changes for the HMOs was to explore ways to promote the use of UPHS doctors and hospitals. The recommended program achieves this by adding incentives for selection of primary care physicians from within the UPHS network. Enrollees can still elect a primary care physician from within the broader HMO network.

The authors are co-chairs of the Benefits Advisory Committee.
At the University Council on March 4, Dr. David Hackney appeared on behalf of Council’s Personnel Benefits Committee (PBC). The Committee has met four times since receiving the Review and Recommendations on the Friday before publication in Almanac (February 11), he said, and has not yet prepared a formal report but has voted “yes/no” on various elements of the proposed package.

Below, Dr. Hackney gives the votes in percentages prior to the question itself. A table at the end sums up these votes and indicates the number of abstentions.

Personnel Benefits: A Summary of Committee Views on Benefits Redesign

Life Insurance
A. Yes 36%—No 44% to the question:
The PBC endorses the proposal to eliminate Flexdollars and to provide current employees with a one-time increase in base salary to replace the lost Flexdollars, and provide University-funded life insurance in the amount of 1 x salary. The PBC suggests that further savings to employees and the University may be possible through additional adjustments to the life insurance program. However, adequate analysis of such further options cannot be completed in the time available before 1997 Open Enrollment. Therefore, the PBC proposes that the structure of the life insurance program remain on the PBC agenda, after Open Enrollment, for consideration for possible further changes in later plan years.

B. Yes 88%—No 12% to the question:
The PBC endorses the proposal to eliminate Flexdollars and to provide current employees with a one-time increase in base salary to replace the lost Flexdollars. The PBC proposes to modify the recommendations of the Benefits Advisory Committee (BAC) as follows. Instead of receiving University-funded life insurance in the amount of 1 x salary, each employee aged 65 or younger will receive University-funded life insurance in the amount of $50,000. Employees will be permitted to purchase additional life insurance, with after tax dollars, as described in the BAC report. For employees over the age of 65, the University will calculate the cost of providing $50,000 of life insurance to a 65 year-old individual, and purchase for each employee the amount of insurance that can be obtained for that cost. This will have the effect of reducing the death-benefit amounts of life insurance funded by the University for older employees.

C. Yes 38%—No 63% to the question:
The issues to be considered are complex, life insurance benefits are major and critical portions of the total benefits package, and the time available to review the proposals has been quite limited. For these reasons, the PBC recommends deferral of any decision on the BAC life insurance recommendations for the upcoming plan year, in order permit an in-depth review of the proposals and alternatives.

Health Insurance
D. Yes 75%—No 25% to the question:
The PBC endorses the proposed changes in the health insurance program. Elimination of “zero-premium” options conforms to current practices in plan design, under which employees and employers share the cost of health insurance. For the HMO options, the employee premiums are similar to, or lower than, those charged over long periods of time prior to 7/1/94. The new Point of Service option represents an attractive option for those who desire an indemnity plan at a lower cost than PENNCare. The increase in the price of PENNCare is reasonable given the costs and value of this plan.

E. Yes 33%—No 67% to the question:
The PBC endorses the concept of employee cost sharing for health insurance premiums and recognizes that the proposed prices of coverage compare favorably to competitive norms. However, the price increases are too large for employees to absorb in a single year. Further, the proposed pricing structure will place indemnity insurance out of reach for many lower-income employees. For these reasons, the PBC recommends creating a pricing structure which will continue the availability of the PENNCare PPO to lower-income employees at a very low cost. If necessary, this should be achieved by providing a greater cost subsidy to such employees, with progressively smaller subsidies to those at higher salaries. All employees would receive some substantial level of University contribution to health insurance costs, but higher-income employees would find their subsidies reduced well below those proposed by the BAC.

F. Yes 38%—No 63% to the question:
The current design of the health insurance program enjoys a high level of employee support and satisfaction. Although the level of University contributions are also relatively high, the need to provide comprehensive insurance to all employees at prices they can afford must be considered the most important goal of the health insurance program. For these reasons, the PBC recommends that the current pricing and provisions of the PENNCare PPO be retained in their current form.

Considering the Recent Benefits Redesign Process
G. Yes 67%—No 33% to the question:
The PBC should have been a full partner in discussions of, and development of proposals for, benefits redesign.

H. Yes 75%—No 25% to the question:
Given that the PBC was denied its traditional role as the designated body for recommending changes in the benefits program, the PBC also was not permitted to have input into the redesign proposals while the discussions were in progress.

I. Yes 88%—No 12% to the question:
Given that the PBC was denied its traditional role as the designated body for recommending changes in the benefits program, the PBC was not afforded sufficient time to analyze the suggestions brought forward by the benefits redesign process, and to develop and present alternatives, where appropriate.

Considering future annual benefits reviews and future comprehensive benefits redesign efforts
J. Yes 89%—No 11% to the question:
The PBC should be a full partner in discussions of, and development of proposals for, future changes in the benefits program.

Part Time Benefits
K. Yes 14%—No 86% to the question:
The proposal for adding participation in the health care pretax expense account represents an appropriate, and adequate change in the benefits program for part time employees. No further changes in the part time benefits programs should be considered at this time.

L. Yes 57%—No 43% to the question:
The proposal for adding participation in the health care pretax expense account represents an appropriate, and adequate, change with respect to those benefits considered in the report-health insurance, life insurance, tuition, and paid time off. Part time employee participation in retirement and disability programs should be considered when these components of the overall benefit program are discussed in the near future.

M. Yes 43%—No 57% to the question:
The proposal for adding participation in the health care pretax expense account is an appropriate, but not an adequate, change with respect to those benefits considered in the report-health insurance, life insurance, tuition, and paid time off. Part time employees should receive pro-rated health, life insurance, and tuition benefits, subject to service requirements. Part time employee participation in retirement and disability programs should be considered when these components of the overall benefit program are discussed in the near future.

N. Yes 56%—No 44% to the question:
Due to time constraints, the PBC was not able to conduct an adequate review and discussion of the proposals for changes in the benefits program for part time employees.

Paid Time Off
O. Yes 63%—No 37% to the question:
The proposals for changing the vacation accrual schedule and reducing the number of clas-
sifications of time off represent appropriate modifications in the benefits program.

P. Yes 63%—No 38% to the question:
The proposal to eliminate summer hours represents an appropriate modification in the benefits program.

Q. Yes 38%—No 62% to the question:
The proposals for changes in the paid time off benefits are explained clearly in the benefits redesign report.

Graduate Tuition

R. Yes 89%—No 11% to the question:
The PBC recommends that the graduate tuition benefit be retained in its present form for current University employees, as well as for employees who have been recruited to the University and who begin working as of 1/1/98.

Overall Report

The current report considers parts of the benefits package—health insurance, life insurance, tuition benefits, paid time off, and benefits for part-time employees—now, while deferring decisions on the remainder of the package, including retirement and disability programs, until next year. Since these latter benefits are significant portions of total compensation, we cannot analyze the entire benefits program, on the basis of total compensation, at this time. However, the need for changes in the portions of the program addressed by this report are pressing and will remain next year, if they are not addressed now. Please respond to questions S and T in this context.

S. Yes 75%—No 25% to the question:
The PBC agrees that it is appropriate to revise portions of the benefits program now, with retirement and disability to be considered next year.

T. Yes 33%—No 67% to the question:
The PBC concludes that changes in benefits should be made only after proposals have been developed for all aspects of the program. This will permit analysis of all proposals on the basis of total compensation question.

Summary of Votes and Abstentions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Yes</th>
<th>% No</th>
<th>Abstentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q & A on Proposed Changes in Benefits

Medical Coverage

- Please provide greater detail about how the new prescription coverage will work.
- Detailed information is being furnished in the Open Enrollment packets scheduled to be in the mail by the first week in April. (Open Enrollment is April 21-30.)
- Under the Keystone HMO, when you say “prescription,” does this include prescription eyeglasses, or is only the exam covered?
- After a $5 copay, eye exams are covered and $35 is allowed toward glasses under all the HMO plans. Keystone, U.S. Healthcare, and HIP. There is a discount at the Scheie Eye Institute (a Penn ophthalmology unit housed at the PennMed/Presbyterian site).
- Why are you doing away with Blue Cross Comprehensive when people want this?
- Features of BCC have been incorporated into PENNCare and POS options.
- Penn is terminating QualMed due to service, but PENNCare is not really that great as far as service to the Penn staff. The network doctors are primarily 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. or 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, which are the working hours of the employees. So why should we pay $40 ($104 family) and take the time off (sick time) to use PENNCare?
- This is the basis for providing a range of options including the lower-cost HMOs.
- Will it be possible to have all HMOs make referrals to specialists at Penn and HUP?
- This possibility already exists, but as an out-of-service option that entails cost to subscribers.
- When you retire are you still eligible for health coverage?
- Yes, retirees who meet age and service requirements are eligible for coverage. Effective July 1, 1996 retirees contribute toward their medical insurance just as do active employees.
- If we don’t pay into the pension plan, will we still get our pensions?
- Yes, there is no requirement for contribution in the A-3 retirement plan.

Tuition Benefits

- Why can’t the graduate tuition remission benefit for dependents be grandfathered?
- This question paralleled those at the PPSA meeting on February 17, where the answer was that the benefit is partially grandfathered, in that admissions are open until September 1, 1998, and that students have until 2002 to finish.
- What is meant by “tuition benefit should be available [only] to employees whose salary is subject to the University employee benefits rate”?
- Though physically on campus, some organizations (ROTC and others) are not part of the University in terms of payroll or benefits. This clarifies that tuition remission will not be provided at University expense for their employees.
- What are “special qualifying courses?” How many courses are required and is there an assurance that if you maintain a good GPA you’ll be automatically accepted into one of these schools?
- The actual courses will be spelled out in material to be sent out shortly in cooperation with the College of General Studies.

Making Changes

- Reclassification of positions is said to be complete in June. How will these changes coincide with Open Enrollment’s being over in April? How will benefit adjustments occur?
- There is no direct relationship between the reclassification study and the redesign of benefits. Open enrollment involves the selection of options within the benefits package as finally determined, and the employee’s choices of health plans, etc., will be reflected in coverage starting July 1, 1997.

Summer Hours

- A card presented not as a question but as a statement said: We would like to keep our summer hours! We work hard and we deserve it!
- Other questions asked:
  - Please clarify what you mean by “reduced summer hours should be eliminated.” “Reduced summer hours” refers to the program in which some offices of the University close at 4:30 p.m. instead of 5 p.m. during July and August. [Ed. Note: An annual memorandum specifies the numerous fine points of this program; see Almanac May 14, 1996, for the 1996 memorandum.]
  - Who proposed that summer hours be eliminated and why? Why not work 4 full days and be off on Fridays to save on electric bills?
  - Are summer hours eliminated as of July 1, 1997 or, considering our valid dispute, will they be reinstated?

The Benefits Advisory Committee made the recommendation to eliminate the program (Almanac Supplement February 11), citing its reasons on page S-8 of that report. The President and Provost are expected to give their decisions on this and other recommendations later in March.

Ed. Note: The email address for the Benefits Advisory Committee is benefits@pobox.
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OPPORTUNITIES at PENN

Listed below are the job opportunities at the University of Pennsylvania. To apply please visit: University of Pennsylvania Job Application Center
Funderburg Information Center, 3401 Walnut Street, Ground Floor Phone: 215-898-7285

Application Hours: Monday through Friday, 9 a.m.-1 p.m.
Positions are posted on a daily basis, Monday through Friday, at the following locations:
Application Center—Funderburg Center, 3401 Walnut Street (Ground level) 9 a.m.-1 p.m.
Blockley Hall—418 Guardian Drive (1st Floor and 2nd Floor)
Dental School—46th & Spruce St. (Basement-across from B-36)
Houston Hall—34th & Spruce St. (Basement-near the elevators)
Wharton—Steinberg Hall-Dietrich Hall (next to Room 303)
Job Opportunities of daily papers can also be accessed on the Human Resources web page (www.upenn.edu/hr/). A position must be posted for seven (7) calendar days before an offer can be made. Full descriptions of jobs posted prior to this week can also be found on the H.R. web page.

The University of Pennsylvania is an equal opportunity employer and does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, sex, sexual or affectional preference, age, religion, national or ethnic origin, disability or veteran status.

WHERE THE QUALIFICATIONS FOR A POSITION ARE DESCRIBED IN TERMS OF FORMAL EDUCATION OR TRAINING, PRIOR EXPERIENCE IN THE SAME FIELD MAY BE SUBSTITUTED. POSITIONS WITH FULL DESCRIPTIONS ARE THOSE MOST RECENTLY POSTED.

ANNEBROOK SCHOOL
Specialist: Clyde Peterson

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I (02185CP) G9; $17,614-21,991 2-14-97
Office Systems Tech (02153CP) (End date: 7/99) G10; $19,261-23,999 2-10-97 ASC

ARTS AND SCIENCES
Specialist: Sue Hess

RESEARCH SPEC., JR. (02268SH) Run animals in behavioral experiments; perform surgery; histological analyses of brain tissue; statistics; supervise undergraduates in study students. Qualifications: BA/BS, experience with animal handling & injections; basic knowledge of PC computer operations (spreadsheet exp. preferred); background in biology, psychology &/or chemistry.

BENEFITS SPECIALIST, SR. (02269SH) Assist Benefits Director; manage projects such as implementation of benefits systems, financial analysis of programs & writing & publication of benefits materials, including summary plan description; assist with general benefits materials & correspondence for the Benefits Director; function as secretary to Personnel Benefits Committee & other ad hoc benefit committees. Competencies: bachelor's degree; experience & knowledge of benefits & tax laws; ability to prioritize, handle multiple responsibilities & high volume of work; computer literate; strong organizational & communication skills; ability to work independently; ability to consistently work beyond 40 hr. work week; internal applicants desired. Grade: P4; Range: $26,986-35,123 2-27-97

MHD

COMPUTER OPERATOR I (02227SH) G1; $22,497-27,608 2-7-97

DENTAL SCHOOL
Specialist: Clyde Peterson

DIRECTOR II (01118CP) P5; $29,664-38,677 2-4-97
Fiscal Operations

RESEARCH SPECIALIST, JR. (02241CP) P1; $20,291-26,365 3-4-97 Psychology

OFFICE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT II (01117CP) G10; $19,261-23,999 2-3-97

ENGINEERING/APPLIED SCIENCE
Specialist: Clyde Peterson

DIRECTOR VI (02158CP) P9; $43,569-57,217 2-11-97
Dean’s Office

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT
Specialist: Sue Hess

ACCOUNTANT II (01267SH) Maintain property management systems; reconcile system to general ledger; supervise physical & tagging of capital equipment; monitor equipment purchases; supervise staff of two.
Qualifications: BA/BS in accounting; thorough knowledge of accounting standards & practices; two yrs. experience; knowledge of FinMis preferred; PC literacy; supervisory experience preferred. Grade: P4; Range: $26,986-35,123 2-3-97

GRAD SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Specialist: Clyde Peterson

COORDINATOR II (02233CP) Coordinate International Literacy Institute programs; handle all follow-through connected with international activities of Literacy Research Center & NCAL, including conference, meeting & conference planning & reports; coordinate related grant projects; draft, edit & prepare brochures; perform supervisory & administrative duties in support of project; high level of responsibility for contracts with external sites; exercise judgment, creativity & analysis in maintaining complex computerized records & reports systems; oversee writing of grant proposals. Qualifications: BA/BS; advance graduate work highly preferred; two-three yrs. related experience; working knowledge of Macintosh computer & software; excellent organizational, interpersonal & communication skills required; familiarity with educational research procedures & international experience preferred; foreign language facility preferred. (On-going recruitment & benchmarking that supports renewal of agreement) Grade: P3; Range: $24,617-31,982 3-8-97 ILI

P-T ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I (02043CP) Receive & process education outreach/University project; schedule meeting & semi- nar; coordinate project activities; word processing &
desktop publishing of project publications; assist in re- search planning & in specification of technical portion of project; prepare & submit grant applications; build & maintain a database of software & in data acquisition & management. Quali- fications: Master’s in scientific or technical field; at least five years experience in research; knowledge of data acquisition methodology, data analysis & management skills, excel- lent technical skills. Grade: Pe; Range: $32,857-42,591 3-7-97 Center for Environmental Medicine
Nominations: A-3 Employee of the Month

The A-3 Assembly’s Employee Recognition Committee is looking for excellent employees. To nominate an A-3 staff member, please send nominations to Ms. Stephanie Perkins-Lane, chair of the A-3 Assembly’s Employee Recognition Committee, at 119 Bennett Hall/6273. Deadline for submissions is March 21, 1997.

Nominee’s Name__________________________Nominee’s Position______________________
Your name________________________________Your Position_______________________
Your Campus Address______________________________________Ext. _______________

Do you supervise the nominee?   Yes________ No_______

Please provide specific examples for the questions listed below of your nominee’s actions, attitudes, and abilities which you feel qualify that person for this award.

1. How has the nominee shown dedication to his or her job?
2. How does the nominee demonstrate teamwork skills?
3. How does the nominee demonstrate a high level of communication skills?
4. How does the nominee demonstrate dedication to personal and/or work-related self-involvement?
5. How does the nominee contribute, outside of work, to helping others outside work?
6. Please write one to two paragraphs stating why you feel this individual should be honored by the A-3 Assembly Employee Recognition Committee.
EXHIBIT

19 The Works of Sarah Steele; original watercolors on display featuring flowers and landscapes will be on display at the Penn Women’s Center, 3643 Locust Walk. Through April 17.

FITNESS/LEARNING

17 Instructional Programs: classes forming now in squash, tennis, self-defense, ballet, dance, gymnastics and in-line skating; for more info: 898-6101 (Department of Recreation).

SPORTS

18 Women’s Lacrosse vs. Loyola, 7 p.m.: Franklin Field. 19 Baseball vs. St. Joseph’s, 3 p.m.: Bower Field.

The University of Pennsylvania Police Department
Community Crime Report

About the Crime Report: Below are all Crimes Against Persons and Crimes Against Society from the campus report for February 24 through March 2, 1997. Also reported were Crimes Against Property, including 36 thefts (including 2 forgery and fraud, 3 thefts of auto, 5 thefts from auto, 4 of bicycles & parts, 4 incidents of criminal mischief & vandalism, 1 incident of arson). Full crime reports are in this issue of Almanac on the Web (www.upenn.edu/almanac/v43/n25/crimes.html). — Ed.

This summary is prepared by the Division of Public Safety and includes all criminal incidents reported and made known to the University Police Department between the dates of February 24, 1997 and March 2, 1997. The University Police actively patrol from Market Street to Baltimore Avenue and from the Schuylkill River to 43rd Street in conjunction with the Philadelphia Police. In this effort to provide you with a thorough and accurate report on public safety concerns, we hope that your increased awareness will lessen the opportunity for crime. For any concerns or suggestions regarding this report, please call the Division of Public Safety at 898-4482.

Crimes Against Persons

34th to 38th/Market to Civic Center: Simple Assaults–1; Threats & Harassment–1
02/25/97 1:14 AM Civic Ctr Blvd. Complainant assaulted/private criminal complainant advised
02/26/97 6:05 PM 140 S 34th St Complainant reports being harassed by unknown male

38th to 41st/Market to Baltimore: Robberies (attempts)–1; Aggravated Assaults–1;

3/1/97 11:41 PM High Rise North Unwanted phone calls received.
02/26/97 1:08 AM High Rise North Unwanted phone calls received
02/26/97 9:11 AM 229 S 40th St Male harassing female.
02/27/97 4:26 PM 200 Blk 41st Complainant robbed by unknown suspect w/gun/no injury
02/27/97 9:45 PM 40th & Locust Hot coffee thrown in complainant’s face/arrest
02/28/97 5:22 PM Evans Building Complainant reports patient upset over bill
41st to 43rd/Market to Baltimore: Robberies (attempts)–1
02/28/97 9:06 AM 4300 Blk Spruce Complainant robbed by unknown male by force/no injury

30th to 34th/Market to University: Aggravated Assaults–1; Indecent Exposure & Lewdness–1
02/28/97 8:11 PM Towne Building Report of persons exposing themselves
03/02/97 3:05 PM Palestra Officer assaulted/1 arrest/officer taken to hospital

Outside 30th to 43rd/Market to Baltimore: Threats & Harassment–3
02/24/97 10:06 AM Devon, PA Complainant harassed by roommate
02/29/97 12:20 PM 3500 Powelton Unwanted phone calls received
03/01/97 12:15 PM 4302 Chestnut Complainant harassed by roommates

Crimes Against Society

34th to 38th/Market to Civic Center: Disorderly Conduct–1
02/28/97 2:26 AM 36th & Chestnut Intoxicated male issued citation for disorderly conduct

38th to 41st/Market to Baltimore: Disorderly Conduct–1
02/27/97 2:11 AM 40th & Locust Male arrested after refusing to leave area

30th to 43rd/Market to University: Disorderly Conduct–1
02/27/97 2:18 PM 300 Blk 34th Disorderly male cited

18th District Crimes Against Persons

7 Incidents and 0 Arrests were reported between February 24, 1997 and March 2, 1997, by the 18th District; covering Schuylkill River to 49th Street, Market Street to Woodland Avenue.

02/27/97 8:00 AM 4301 Walnut Robbery
02/27/97 9:00 AM 231 S. 41 St. Robbery
02/27/97 9:46 PM 4000 Locust Aggravated Assault
02/27/97 10:45 PM 3801 Locust Carjacking
02/28/97 12:05 AM 4000 Locust Aggravated Assault
02/28/97 5:00 PM 4334 Pine Robbery
03/02/97 2:00 PM 4800 Market Robbery

Wonderland, at Acadia National Park in Maine, is a 1966 photograph by Jeanette Flamm in in the show Woods, Rocks—Earth’s Treasures at the Faculty Club’s Harrison Art Gallery. Ms. Flamm, who studied with Beck Young at Penn, now she teaches photography for the Philadelphia School System in association with the “Say Yes to Education” program at GSE. Her photographs will be on view through March 28, weekdays 9:30 a.m.-7:30 p.m.

ALMANAC March 11, 1997
There is no more pressing issue for this nation’s future than creating and sustaining hardworking, cohesive caring communities.

The great American pragmatic philosopher John Dewey noted in 1927 that the existence of “neighborly community is indispensable for a well-functioning democratic society. In that same book, *The Public and Its Problems*, he also noted that creating genuinely democratic community is “in the first instance an intellectual problem.”

Seventy years later, we still do not know how to create and sustain the face-to-face, caring and responsible community Dewey described. Given a world of intense and intensifying global competition and of continuous and increasingly rapid change, and given the human suffering found in our deteriorating urban areas, the need to solve the “Dewey problem” has never been more pressing.

I would like to provide some general ideas that might be useful to the subcommittee’s important work. I will focus particularly on the need for an effective, compassionate, “democratic devolution revolution”—or as my colleague Lee Benson and I wrote in 1991, the need to “progress beyond the Welfare State.”

As both political parties recognize, there has been a broad rejection of big, impersonal, distant government. Simultaneously, there are strong movements within corporations, unions, and schools to shift from big bureaucracy toward flexible, democratic, human-sized structures that foster individual initiative and action. A similar shift to small-scale, participatory, effective structures is needed at all levels of government. New and creative thinking and doing is required so that government can serve as a catalyst that sparks creative innovation throughout society. Both tired welfare state models and abdication to market forces will hinder, rather than spark, innovations, leading to further disenchantment, disillusion and despair among large sectors of society.

Calling for an effective democratic devolution revolution is much easier than actually putting it into practice. Let me suggest some approaches that might be considered:

- New and creative thinking necessarily means practicing new forms of interaction among federal, state, and local government, as well as among agencies at each level of government. The “vertical and horizontal integration” of government is particularly crucial if we are to solve the multisided problems besetting our cities.

  - *Government integration is, however, insufficient to produce substantial change. For “democratic devolution revolution” to succeed, new forms of interaction are also needed among the public, profit, and not-for-profit sectors. Government needs to function as a collaborating partner, facilitating cooperation among all sectors of society by supporting and strengthening individuals, families, and communities.*

To state the above in a slightly different fashion: In this approach, government serves as a catalyst providing funds to create stable, ongoing partnerships. Government, however, is a second tier service deliverer, with universities, local community organizations, unions, churches, other voluntary associations, community members, and school children and their parents functioning as the core partners that help enable society to go beyond the debilitating clientism of the welfare state. Government guarantees aid and significantly finances welfare services, but local, personalized, caring delivery of services occurs through the third (private, non-profit, voluntary associations) and the fourth (personal, i.e., family, kin, neighbors, friends) sectors of society. To put it another way, the delivery of services is not primarily the government’s responsibility; but the government does have macro fiscal responsibilities, including the provision of funds.

- A “democratic devolution revolution” would also involve a strategy that emphasizes the development of neighborly communities. Building on John Dewey, it conceptualizes neighborly community as crucial to a genuinely democratic society. As such, it emphasizes adapting local institutions (universities, hospital, churches, public schools, community centers, civic organizations) to the needs of local communities. Institutions are the vehicles for enabling people to have real power through powerful local communities. We need to counterpose a Deweyan vision of democratic local communities comprised of caring, compassionate, hardworking, self-reliant, able individuals to both a statist vision and a vision of atomistic, egoistic individuals engaged in a battle of each against all.

Vehicles and agencies are needed to enable the government to function effectively as a catalyst for realizing the Deweyan vision sketched above. By way of illustration, I would like to note that HUD’s Office of University Partnerships represents one such vehicle. It is a harbinger of how government in general can, should, and must work in the future. The Office serves as a catalyst for tapping the resources of a key institution—the university—that, in turn, can serve as an anchor, catalyst, and partner for local change and improvement in the quality of life in our cities and communities. Indeed, there may be no other institutions that can play so central a role in moving the democratic devolution revolution forward.

Those in higher education, quite simply, have both the interest and ability to make a profound difference. Universities have compelling reasons—including enlightened self-interest—to help to improve America’s communities. They are among the only institutions rooted in the American city. They cannot move—the community’s fate is their fate. Moreover, working to solve the problems of their university’s locality provides students and faculty members with an outstanding opportunity for learning, service, and advancing knowledge. Universities also have enormous resources—human, economic, and other kinds—which can be used creatively to overcome economic and community disintegration.

To illustrate the point, just think of the possible impacts of university-assisted, comprehensive, integrated educationally-based (linked to learning) service provision on a public school, the children, and community. Among other things, it would go beyond co-location of services to a genuine integration of services through the educational process. Dental, medical, social work, education, and nursing students, for instance, would learn as they serve; public school students, in a similar fashion, would have their education connected to real-world problem-solving activities that provide service to other students and community members; and adults in the community would have locally-based opportunities for job training, skills enhancement, and ongoing education. The enormous untapped resources of the community would be tapped as individual members of the community would be able to function as both the recipients and local deliverers of service. This university-assisted community school approach would truly allow us to effectively and compassionately end welfare as we know it—indeed, end the Welfare State as we know it.

This approach, however, does not remotely imply that the federal government abdicates its Constitutional responsibility “to provide for the general welfare.” On the contrary, it is designed to have the federal government provide for the general welfare far more responsibly, democratically, and effectively than it has to date.

The ideas sketched here suggest how government might function as a compassionate catalyst, stimulating effective local partnerships, helping America fulfill its promise as a fair, decent, and just society for all its citizens.