In Tony Ventello’s photos of the smoldering Addams Hall, the view is from the roof of the adjacent parking garage.
News in Brief

Benefits: SEC March 19

The Senate Executive Committee’s ad hoc committee examining the redesign of benefits will report to SEC at its meeting tomorrow afternoon (March 19). Dr. Peter Kuriloff told Council earlier this month that redesign team say in a progress report on page 3 of this issue: “After consideration of those recommendations, we will forward our final recommendations to the President, Provost, and Executive Vice President,” the co-chairs of the redesign team say in a progress report on page 3 of this issue. Elsewhere in this issue: Highlights of the March 5 Council discussion are on pp. 4-6, and Speaking Out takes up the topic, pp. 6-7.

Hi-Tech Safety: March 26-27

In a two-day exposition sponsored by the Residential Advisory Board, Penn Public Safety will set up and demonstrate some of the existing and proposed safety devices that are called for in the master plan. The program will be of special interest to those in the schools and centers who have responsibility for the security of the buildings and laboratories, or who have budgetary responsibility for providing such security, according to Security Director Chris Algard, who has authored a guide on pp. 12-13 of this issue.

The fair is open 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. on Wednesday and Thursday, March 26-27, in Bodek Lounge at Houston Hall. All members of the University are invited; for guided group tours, call 573-7800 to arrange in advance.

Wharton’s Even Higher Up...

In last week’s summary of Penn graduate schools’ and departments’ positions in the 1997 U.S. News rankings, we regrettably stopped short of the departmental level when it came to business schools. Not only was Wharton in the top three schools in the nation, but eight of its disciplines ranked in the top five—and two of those were in the Number One slot. The exact positions:

1st: Finance; Real Estate.
2nd: Entrepreneurship (after Babson).
3rd: Accounting (after Stanford).
4th: Marketing (after Northwestern).
5th: General Management (Harvard is 1st).

* We used the Web version, which did not match the printed magazine in that the departments were on the Web, but titled as undergraduate rather than graduate. We regret the incomplete research and are grateful to Dr. Susan Wachter of Real Estate and Finance for her exuberant correction.—K.C.G.

Job Opps: 300 Are On-Line

Human Resources now lists some 300 unfilled positions at its Web site, and all unfilled jobs, both old and new, can be found there at http://www.upenn.edu/hr/hr/.

In addition, new positions are posted daily on the Web and in hard copy at HR’s kiosks (see locations, p. 19.). To mesh with this system, and with a new search mechanism that is being developed at HR, Almanac expects to give first claim for space to newly listed positions and their descriptions.—Ed.

Endowed Chairs in the Law School: Regina Austin and Michael Fitts

Dean Colin Diver has named senior faculty members to two of the Law School’s prestigious endowed chairs: Professor Regina Austin as the William A. Schnader Professor, and Professor Michael Fitts as the Robert G. Fuller, Jr., Professor of Law.

Both were cited for their teaching, scholarship and communications. “Their work is widely recognized by legal scholars throughout the nation,” the Dean said.

Professor Austin, a 1973 alumna of the School, has been on the faculty since 1977. She is an expert in torts and insurance law who is particularly known for her work in cultural conflict and international torts; the socioeconomic and legal status of the working poor; and environmental racism. Between her graduation from Penn Law and her appointment to the faculty she was an associate of the Philadelphia firm of Schnader, Harrison, Segal & Lewis—whose partners joined with the William A Schnader Foundation to create the Schnader Professorship in 1968. Mr. Schnader had been Attorney General of Pennsylvania, president of the National Conference on Uniform State Laws, and a founder of the Uniform Commercial Code.

Professor Fitts is a Yale Law School graduate who joined the Penn Law faculty in 1985 and is serving as associate dean with responsibility for academic activities. His areas of expertise are administrative law, the separation of powers, legislative powers, and the law and the political process. Before coming to Penn he served in the Office of Legal Counsel in the Justice Department in Washington, D.C.

His chair was established in 1971 by Robert G. Fuller, Jr., a 1964 alumnus of Penn Law who has been active with class reunions and served on the Biddle Advisory Council. The Fuller Chair honors “professors who demonstrate scholarship and the ability to communicate to students a knowledge of the essential principles of law and a humanistic understanding of the application of these principles.”

Four SAS Research Fellowships in 1997-98

The School of Arts and Sciences has announced four recipients of Faculty Research Fellowships for 1997-98. The internally-funded program gives each of these faculty members a semester free of teaching and administrative responsibilities to carry out research on the projects shown here:

1. Dr. Rita Barnard, associate professor of English: Literature and the Politics of Place;
2. Dr. Jeffrey R. Fear, assistant professor of history: Organizing Control: The History of Thysen Management, 1871-1934;
3. Dr. Philip Nelson, associate professor of physics and astronomy: Materials Properties of Lipid/Macromolecule Complexes; and

Penn’s Role in West Philadelphia: April 4

Former Senator Harris Wofford, CEO of the Corporation for National Service, will be at the Penn Faculty Club April 4 as part of a student-sponsored Conference on Penn’s Role in West Philadelphia: The Creation, Dissemination, and Application of Knowledge, open to all members of the University community. The former president of Bryn Mawr, who served in the U.S. Senate from 1991-95, will be the luncheon speaker.

Reservations are required for the luncheon but not for the other portions of the day-long program focusing on “how Penn can better integrate its three academic missions of teaching, research, and service with a specific focus on our immediate environment, West Philadelphia,” according to Hillary Aisenstein of the Undergraduate Assembly, the organization co-sponsoring the conference along with SCUE.

Campus speakers for the conference include Provost Stanley Chodorow; Executive Vice President John Fry; Dean Gary Hack of the Graduate School of Fine Arts; Dean Ira M. Schwartz of the School of Social Work; Dr. William Kissick, the George Seckel Pepper Professor of Public Health & Preventative Medicine; and Dr. Douglas Massey, professor and chair of sociology; and Dr. George Thomas, lecturer in historic preservation and urban studies.

The conference begins with coffee, 9:30-10 a.m. on the first floor of the Faculty Club, followed by a keynote address. There are three research sessions, and the day ends with “Channeling the Energy” at 4:30 p.m., led by Dr. Thomas. For information or to make reservations for the luncheon, e-mail the Urban Conference Planning Committee at urbcconf@dolphin.upenn.edu by March 28.
Benefits Redesign: Nearing Final Recommendations

The benefits redesign recommendations now under discussion were put forward by both the Benefits Advisory Committee and the Academic Planning and Budget Committee. Since the announcement of the benefits redesign plan, a very substantial communications process has been followed to further explain the recommendations and to receive feedback from across the University. In advance of the publication of the special supplement, “Benefits Programs of the University of Pennsylvania: Review and Recommendations,” which was published in *Almanac* on February 11, members of the Benefits Advisory Committee met with the Ad Hoc Committee on Benefits Redesign of the Faculty Senate and the Personnel Benefits Committee of University Council.

We discussed with these groups both the eight-month process that led to the recommendations and the rationale for the recommendations. Since publication of the special supplement in *Almanac*, we have received and considered some 300 e-mail responses some of which contained questions that we answered, but most of which contained feedback on the recommendations.

We also have met with members of the faculty in each of the 12 schools, and we have held 23 sessions with some 3,000 members of the staff, both to explain the recommendations and to solicit questions and feedback. We also have attended two sessions of University Council to listen to its concerns, and we have received and considered a report on the recommendations of its Personnel Benefits Committee. In response to many questions on health insurance benefits, we published the article, “Answering Questions: More on Health Insurance Benefits,” in the March 11 issue of *Almanac* to more fully explain our health insurance proposals.

Last week, we returned to the full membership of the Benefits Advisory Committee, which is comprised of faculty, staff and administrators, to provide them with feedback on the many and varied discussions, questions, and responses we have received from the campus community, and to seek their counsel and advice.

We anticipate recommendations from the Senate Executive Committee after its meeting later this week. After consideration of those recommendations, we will forward our final recommendations to the President, Provost, and Executive Vice President.

From our perspective, this process has allowed for very informative exchanges and an unprecedented amount of dialogue on an issue of great importance to the University community.

— Barbara Lowery, Associate Provost
— H. Clint Davidson, Vice President/HR
— Co-chairs, Benefits Advisory Committee

OF RECORD Policies on Faculty Maternity ... Extension of Tenure Probationary Period

In 1994, the Senate Committee on the Faculty was asked by Deputy Provost Walter Wales to consider whether Penn should institute an extension of the tenure probationary period for junior faculty members who give birth. The committee decided to broaden the scope of its discussion and undertook a full-scale review of Penn’s parenting policies. After considerable discussion and responses to a report published for comment in *Almanac*, the Committee recommended the adoption of two distinct policies. The first is a revision of the current Faculty Maternity Policy; the second is a new policy allowing extensions of the tenure probationary period, not only for faculty members who become parents, but also for faculty members who experience similarly career-disrupting events. (In identifying those events, the Senate Committee followed the provisions of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993.)

Both of these policies were discussed by the Faculty Senate and the Deans and subsequently approved by us.

On the issue of whether the policy on the extension of the tenure probationary period should be retroactive, we have agreed upon the following:

Any currently employed member of the standing faculty who believes himself or herself to be eligible for an extension of the tenure probationary period because of an event occurring before the adoption of the policy must make a request for consideration to the Provost’s Staff Conference within one calendar year of the adoption of the policy.

Judy Rodin, President
Stanley Chodorow, Provost

Faculty Maternity Policy

A member of the standing faculty who bears a child will be relieved of teaching duties, without loss of salary or benefits, during an academic semester if incapacity due to the prenatal, delivery and recovery period would reasonably require her to interrupt the teaching of her courses in that semester for three or more weeks. For purposes of determining whether teaching would be interrupted, it is presumed that a woman will be incapacitated for six weeks following delivery. In such cases, the chair of the department or the dean of the school, in consultation with the Provost’s Office, will make such arrangements as are necessary and appropriate with regard to covering her teaching responsibilities, including the canceling of an affected course or the employment of substitute instructors. This relief from teaching duties is not a leave of absence. Outside the period of incapacity, and as compatible with her particular situation, the faculty member will be expected to meet her other normal departmental and University responsibilities, including research, committee membership, and advising. The preceding sentence does not authorize assignment of additional such duties to compensate for the period of necessary absence from the job.

Policy on Extension of the Tenure Probationary Period

A. A nontenured member of the standing faculty shall be eligible for an extension of the tenure probationary period (or, in the case of clinician educators in the health schools, the promotion review that normally occurs in the ninth year) corresponding to the semester or year during which:

1. A child is (or, provided that the child had reached her second birthday, was during the immediately preceding semester or summer) born, adopted, or placed for foster care, into the faculty member’s household;

2. (by reason of a serious health condition (as defined in Section 2611(11) of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993) persisting for a substantial portion of the period for which the extension is sought, the faculty member is required to act as the primary caregiver for a parent, child, spouse, or domestic partner (as defined in the domestic partner benefits policy); or

3. (by reason of a serious health condition (as defined in Section 2611(11) of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993) persisting for a substantial portion of the period for which the extension is sought, the faculty member is unable to perform the functions of his or her position.

B. The length of the extension shall be one year unless the faculty member requests one semester instead and the department chair and the dean agree to its feasibility in light of the school’s tenure review process.

C. Extensions of the tenure probationary period shall be without prejudice to the obligation of the University to provide faculty members with twelve-months’ notice of termination.

D. Requests for extensions of the tenure probationary period shall be made in writing via the Chair and/or Dean for consideration by the Provost’s Staff Conference subject to timeliness requirements adopted and publicized by the faculty member’s school. Normally, requests will be viewed favorably by the University and granted unless specific and compelling factors require their denial. The action of the Provost shall be communicated in writing to the faculty member and shall specify any revised date of tenure review and termination date of the probationary period and (in the event that the request is denied) shall specify the grounds for the denial.

N.B. The statute defines a “serious health condition” as “an illness, injury, impairment, or physical or mental condition that involves”—

“(A) inpatient care in a hospital, hospice, or residential medical care facility”; or “(B) continuing treatment by a health care provider.”

“Health care provider” is defined (2611(6)) as: “(A) a doctor of medicine or osteopathy who is authorized to practice medicine or surgery (as appropriate) by the State in which the doctor practices; or

“(B) any other person determined by the Secretary [of Health and Human Services] to be capable of providing health care services.”
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After the standing reports of officers at the University Council March 5, the major item for discussion was the proposed redesign of benefits (Almanac Supplement February 11). A report by the Council’s Personnel Benefits Committee was the focal point, and its written portion appeared in last week’s issue. The following exchanges, edited by Almanac staff from a tape transcription, give the context of the PBC’s report, and some of the responses that came after it.—Ed.

Dr. Larry Gross (serving as moderator in the absence of Dr. David Hildebrand): If you recall, the Personnel Benefits Committee said that they would be prepared to make comments or initiate a discussion. I should also note that I have two requests to speak from people who are not members of Council, and I’ve told them that I would hope to be able to have them speak once members of Council had a chance to speak. We’ll begin with the Personal Benefits Committee, Professor Hackney.

Dr. David Hackney: The Personnel Benefits Committee, to be exact, said that they would follow the instructions of University Council and report. I’m not sure the Committee feels ready to report. We’ve met four times since we got the draft four days before it was published in Almanac. We’ve carried on extensive deliberations by e-mail, as those who were on the receiving end of that can attest. The time for review of the proposals is very short and many members of the committee were concerned that, had there been more time, they might have had different opinions on some of the recommendations they’re going to give you, or more specific suggestions for changes. But ultimately we voted on a series of propositions related to the benefits redesign report, and there were no unanimous votes on any of these....

[Dr. Hackney then presented the 20 propositions that appeared in Almanac last week, citing in each case the percentage of the PBC voting yes/no. He then continued informal discussion.]

Dr. Hackney: I have something compelling to add. I attended the meeting of the Senate Executive Committee at which the sentiments were very different*. There was a great deal of concern about the health insurance program—particularly the large rise in the PENNCare Benefit. I think the reason there’s a difference of opinion between the PBC and other people who may not have been as involved in benefits as we were in the past is that the PBC had been aware of the fact that the health care premiums were dropping to zero—and had believed that this was not an appropriate thing to have happen.

I think to people who weren’t watching what was going on, it looked like the University was simply giving you a better benefit—when in fact, what was happening was a combination of a coincidence and an accident.

And the reason that it didn’t get dealt with earlier was in part because there was no Vice President for Human Resources and in part, because it kept looking as if we were about to have benefits redesign. So I think that perhaps the difference of opinion on that subject is related to being aware of the history.

The discussion of graduate tuition benefits was exactly the same as last week’s two committees. That is, a promise is a promise—if you can’t count on it then what happens to undergraduate tuition next time around?

Dr. Anthony Tomazinis: Some of us have read and reread the statement by the Benefits Advisory Committee and we have a number of observations to make. First we do not agree with, or we felt very alarmed by, the language of the report itself and the philosophy behind it. We were very surprised to find that the definition of “competitiveness” for this University has changed all of a sudden. Once upon a time we thought that competitive meant that we should be in a position that we’re going to attract the best professors, the best administrators, and the best students. Now we find that at least within this statement [the “Review and Recommendations”] the definition is that in order to be competitive we must be the cheapest outfit on the market. We shouldn’t let anybody else be cheaper than we are. History and we haven’t found this multi-year deficit threat to the University, or deficit operations today, or reduction of income. We also see a huge stream of expenses from many other sources. So we came back and said, Who is providing this definition of deficit, or competitiveness, in the name of which we are called upon to start examining carefully everything that we are spending?

Then we came to the specifics. We found—I found, my school has found, my colleagues have found—that the graduate tuition is the first measure of concern, of credibility, of reliability. Do we accept the word of our President, of our Dean, of our Provost, as final word upon which we can determine our acts in this world, or is it a statement which is good for today, but tomorrow may change? Most of us determine our lives on what those officials tell us, and we think that it is a contract of immense significance: the President said it, period, this is it; the Provost said it; the Dean said it, period. When we have negotiations to make with other colleagues, we mention to them “who said so,” in detail, word by word, with every comma there, to make sure that we do not misunderstand key issues; we think that we make a contract. It is beyond belief, the shock, that we discover that all of a sudden because five or six people have changed, now the new definition, new duration, new weight is being applied. We believe those are mistakes.

There is a third item. It appears that the only client for this report is the President, who must be convinced that this is the course that she should follow. But it happens that there are many other clients. Presenting to the President how much profit, or how many savings, is half of the calculation. The question is who pays for it, and how much each one of us will be paying for it. There is no indication of how much more it will cost each of us. For instance there is a comprehensive health insurance [he discusses increase in PENNCare cost]. If there is any work to be done by that [Benefits Advisory] committee it is to realize that there are several clients, and although the President is a very important client and as of now is uncommitted, there are others who also have choices to make, and it is imperative that that statement becomes clear. We cannot wait to see printing that will come two weeks from now.

Dr. Peter Kuriloff: David, I’d like to ask you a couple of questions. Several things came up at SEC around health care. One was that the mental health components are quite inadequate. I’ve heard from the current president of the APA, the American Psychological Association, who’s on our faculty, and from some very distinguished psychiatrists on the faculty, that there is some concern about some counselors on the faculty. All of them feel that with the exception of the PENNCare and Blue Cross/Blue Shield 100, those benefits are very inadequate. There’s also deep concern about the caps; and the third thing is long term care. I wonder if your committee had looked at that and the provisions for that.

Dr. Hackney: The PBC did not discuss any of those issues in this last three weeks since we got the report. I’d agree with you that all three of those issues are important. The long term care issue is one the Benefits Committee has not really had too much discussion of.

My recollection of the discussions about the health insurance plans was that the provisions of them were going to stay the same both to make them relatively more familiar to employees when things changed and because it was a limit of the number of things that could be dealt with in that period of time. But I think that the existence of those lifetime caps is a big problem; I think you’re right. But during this period, you’ll find the PBC was in a pure reaction mode trying to analyze the things that had come to it, and didn’t have time to go very much further...

Dr. Kuriloff: It would be a big service if you could pick up on that and the mental health piece in the future.

Dr. Hackney: That relates to a question that the Committee is very concerned about, and that is, “Is there a role of the Personnel Benefits Committee?” This year it didn’t really have anything to do until the report came out. Many of the things it traditionally would have done, were done by the Benefits Redesign Advisory Committee and since the PBC was out of the loop they couldn’t give any comment to what was going. So I got some very dissatisfied comments—from people who’d had their arms twisted to join the Personnel Benefits Committee this year because benefits redesign was coming up—that nothing was going on.

We had two meetings. At one meeting we spent all our time complaining about the fact that we were frozen out of the process. At the other committee meeting we spent a brief amount of time talking about a financial planning issues for employees, but concluded that it wasn’t really a cost effective thing to do. But the Personnel Benefits Committee has not really had too much of a function this year, except for these last few weeks.

And I suppose in the future, the question is, “Is there a role for the Personnel Benefits Com-
mittee, and if so what will it be?” At the moment, at least in the way this process has gone so far, it really has not had a role. And it believes firmly that it has not had time to analyze these reports that have come out. So there is a great deal of concern that it was not involved while the report was being generated and its ability to give intelligent feedback is limited by the time pressure.

[A speaker asks Dr. Hackney if in connection with the analysis of the tuition benefits there was any discussion about honoring the contracts of those already here.]

**Dr. Hackney:** The suggestion from the committee was not to change the graduate tuition benefit for anyone who’s currently employed or for people who have accepted a job here but haven’t started working. The rationale for that was that people had come here under an expectation that that was the benefit and that it should not be changed. The broader issue of whether any of the other benefits should be changed has to do with whether or not they are considered part of an employment contract; [the Committee] did not consider all of them to be employment contracts; some were considered improvements for the people, specifically the life insurance proposal. The Committee didn’t discuss any option to choose old or new on that and I can tell you my opinion on that: It would be hopelessly complicated... and I think almost no one would choose the old plan if they understood the new plan; I’m not sure how many people do.

[A speaker asks about ways to cushion a presumed drop in real income as a result of contribution to health insurance, and also asks if there will be assistance for employees to find out about and deal with HMO limitations.]

**Dr. Hackney:** After agreeing that real income could come down: What has happened in the recent past is that employee income went up well above the rate of inflation because of the way premiums for health insurance dropped seriously. Specifically about PENNCare: It didn’t exist until two years ago, and when it came out, the Health System said they wanted to put a very aggressive price on it; and they set at a price that was equal to the comprehensive—a fairly barebones benefit, but people quite acceptable indemnity plan. The PBC worried, at the time, how they could offer that rich a plan at that price, but was willing to go along with it so long as the University was not insuring that plan. What happened is the Health System was no longer willing to offer that plan at that price this year. So the Benefits Advisory Committee took suggestions as what reasonable price would be, given the richness of the plan, if the University has to take the risk on the plan.

[As to HMOs’ limitations, he continued:] HMOs provide explicit caps they tell you about—and we will tell you about in the Open Enrollment data. But the other problem is that they have proprietary information about what conditions and procedures they consider appropriate, what treatments they will pay for and which they consider excessive, and which generally will not tell anyone about that.

**Peter Freyd:** I heard in SEC and have my own anecdotal evidence that people have difficulty working with Keystone... I wandered down to Center City and found the drugstores not willing any more to work with Keystone, because of what they said were ridiculous delays in payment. The large chains seem to have working arrangements with Keystone. This is a minor thing but it’s a helpful illustration of the huge complexity of decisions we’re being asked to make within a couple of weeks. There are ramifications of this far beyond what anybody has mentioned. The one I just brought up is the impact of this change on the West Philadelphia community.

**Peter Kuriloff:** I think if these changes go through as proposed, which means substantially more people might move toward an HMO, it’s totally incumbent on the University to act like a 500-lb. gorilla in the dealings with the HMOs that are on our contract, and make sure that they’re satisfactory—that the turnaround rate, the answering of phones, the paperwork are not problematic in any way.

[Dr. Gross turns to the two observers who had asked to speak. Note that their remarks are followed by Dr. Barbara Lowery’s response, on page 6, to some of the questions raised throughout the meeting.

Before the prepared statement Mr. Lukassi commented on PENNCare pricing. He has expanded that into a Speaking Out letter, which starts on page 6. Dr. Lowery and Mr. Davidson respond to him on page 7.]

**Remarks of Paul Lukassi**

The benefits redesign proposal is grossly unfair to Penn’s support staff. The Committee has obviously ignored the fourth principal under which it was supposedly operating, that “no single group should bear a disproportionate burden for benefits cost containment.”

Let’s take, as an example, two single mothers of two—one a file clerk making $20,000 a year, the other an upper-level administrator making $80,000. Both of them are currently enrolled in PENNCare, and are receiving life insurance of four times salary.

To sustain the same level of health coverage, the file clerk will have to contribute 6 and a half percent of gross pay—approximately 8 to 10 percent of her paycheck. Or she can go to a second job and take a 40 hour week, and still wind up with a paycheck significantly smaller. Can anyone at this table imagine a benefits proposal that would demand an equivalent choice and sacrifice from the administrators?

Comments to have been made on differentials in life insurance coverage were deleted by the author with the notation that he agrees with the Personnel Benefits Committee recommendation to substitute life insurance of $50,000 for the proposed 1 x annual salary.—Ed.]

The administrator, who already has a college degree, can take graduate courses at Wharton to improve her job skills for free. The file clerk will have to pay out-of-pocket to increase her job skills, because Penn continues to refuse to make any of its employee tuition benefits transferable.

Let’s be honest. Penn has decided to make a strong signal to us—that the only way to receive fair treatment will be to organize ourselves to bargain collectively. Before Penn decides to impose this plan on us, it had better think long and hard about the long-term implications.

**Statement of John Hogan**

My name is John Hogan. For eight and a half years, I’ve worked in the Penn libraries, currently at the Biddle Law Library. Thus I’ve been a member of AFSCME Local 590, which represents the Library support staff. Currently I serve as local treasurer and as a member of the local’s negotiating team. We will be discussing the University’s proposed benefit redesign in our contract negotiations later this year. But I thought it might be useful for an A-3 employee with an unusual amount of the security to offer some general comments on his own behalf.

I’ve heard a great deal of surprise and dismay from my fellow A-3s, organized and unorganized, at the breadth and abruptness of these proposals. Coming on the heels of numerous layoffs and of the sudden outsourcing of one major business service and the prospective outsourcing of several more, these proposals can only increase the fear and demoralization of the University’s employees. It seems the University is following the example of the City of Philadelphia in their 1992 contract negotiations, when they tried to balance their budget on the backs of city employees through benefit cuts and privatization, only without the fiscal crisis that appeared to justify the City’s harsh and precipitate action.

The University is also following the City’s example in a more sinister way. For years the University, like the City, justified the lower-than-market salaries they paid their staff by pointing to the generosity of the benefits package. The redesign committee, like the City, has isolated this benefit from the package from this context, noted its generosity and proposes to reduce it to market standards with no compensating increase in salaries.

And as I sat in the meeting to explain the proposals to the Law School staff an impression began to form that became clear only later. Employees with two, thirty or more years of hard, dedicated, extremely effective service to the University are being told that their understandings under which they came to work here, on the basis of which they have planned
their futures and the education of their children, are vapor, and that they were naïve to believe that those understandings actually represented commitments by the University. Not only that—they are being given this message by people who have been at the University for three years or less, who don’t know the staff or their work. The Law School meeting was conducted by someone who worked for City Council during the 1992 negotiations and has been at Penn for about a year. I find that harsh. I also find it insulting and alarming.

Penn’s employees deserve better. If the University is in trouble, it is not because her support staff put her there. Any proposal to fix the University at the staff’s expense is unfair; and should be unacceptable to the University community. I hope the University community agrees.

A Response from Dr. Lowery

I’d like to answer just a few of the questions that have been asked. One is about the process. In putting together the committee for benefits redesign the administration asked the Faculty Senate’s input on that committee. Everyone agreed that the chair of the Personnel Benefits committee should be on it because we do appreciate the advice of the PBC; and also, David was a superb person for the Committee, as you can probably tell. He knows quite a bit about benefits and we appreciated his input.

Issues like long term care and mental health were brought up but with so much work to do the Committee decided they would have to be put aside until next year; hopefully the Personnel Benefits Committee would want to do those things. It is not that we are not interested in them; we just did not have the time to do that—it is a complex job.

In terms of Keystone, questions have sort of come out of the blue very recently. We visited all the schools except two and never heard anything about Keystone until yesterday and the day before when we visited Nursing and Medicine and heard issues about Keystone. We will look into those issues and find out what the problem is.

With respect to the lower paid employees: David, I hope you will confirm that the Benefits Advisory Committee worked very hard to make sure our lower paid employees were not taking the brunt of the health care burden. Sixty percent of our lower paid employees are in the HMOs and if you notice, those HMOs are priced very low in comparison to other programs. In addition to pricing those about as low as one can (it’s high from zero but it is relatively low) the Committee decided to add a prescription plan to those two plans where it had not been before—at some cost, but actually the average prescription user will be better off than in the past because the prescriptions are worth a lot of money. A number of our higher paid employees, most of our highly paid employees, tend to be in the indemnity plan in Blue Cross/Blue Shield. Their cost sharing is 37 percent. The cost sharing that we put in for the lower paid employees is 6 percent. The University picks up the rest. So you see both ends of the spectrum there; and I think the committee worked very hard to be fair to the lower paid employees.

As you know Michael Wachter and I have visited all of the faculties on campus, with New Bolton Center yet to do tomorrow. I’ve been very happy with the kinds of feedback we are getting. People are being honest with us, they are saying here are the problems, here are the things you have to fix; and we have been open to listening to that.

I’m pleased that the Personnel Benefits Committee have given us some feedback. It may not be what we started out to do, but we are listening to the feedback and I suspect—I hope—that SEC will do the same. I think it is important for us to get your feedback.

We have worked with the SEC committee for four weeks now. I think, not three. In any event, we have worked with the SEC committee and we would like to see your further input as we proceed to the decisions.

Speaking Out

Benefits: Keeping Excellence

In Almanac dated March 11th you noted we could e-mail comments to the Benefits Advisory Committee; however, a response was received from them by someone else stating that it has already moved out of their hands and our comments need to go further up. I would therefore like to submit the following for publication.

Over ten years ago I came to the University Library System with more than 15 years of library experience. What attracted me was the benefits package. I had worked previously in Drexel University’s Library and then in a Federal Government library. My plan here at Penn was to finish my own education and provide an excellent education for my family.

It was with great interest that I read articles about our new University President when she first arrived. She spoke often about (I believe the term was) “University excellence.” We were to strive for excellence here at Penn. I believe I have kept my part of the bargain, but I feel the administration hasn’t kept theirs.

Isn’t our “business” education? Then why would we even suggest cutting into any type of educational benefit? Shouldn’t we be trying to get more of our employees and their families to get degrees?

Aren’t we striving for excellence? Then why are we looking to businesses in the area and following their example? Shouldn’t we be setting the example?

I was told at the benefits meeting held here at the law school that money had to be saved somewhere; if not on benefits, where? I don’t know, but I do know that you do not attract and keep excellent people by taking away things they were promised when they came, even if it is just being let off early a half hour a day during the summer.

My challenge to the Administration is to keep the excellence we have and to set an example of excellence for others—in education, in benefits, and in the morale of its employees.

— Joseph F. Parsio, Assistant Head of Stacks, Biddle Law Library Circulation Department

‘Unethical’ Pricing of PENNcare

Something has gone seriously wrong at this University in the last couple of years. So wrong, in fact, that the people making the decisions have stooped to use unethical pricing tactics to insure the health of University of Pennsylvania Health Systems, while placing at risk the health of the people who work here and their families.

Dr. David Hackney’s description of the decision to aggressively price the PENNCare option confirmed what many people had suspected; that Penn and its Health Systems subsidiary had conspired to use predatory pricing to create the conditions under which a popular low cost health insurance option could be eliminated and replaced with a high-priced option that would funnel our hard earned dollars into a wholly owned subsidiary of University of Pennsylvania, Inc. It was a variation on the classic bait and switch practices that have been outlawed for most retail products. How predatory the pricing was can be seen in charts 1 and 2.

Chart 1 shows how, for the last two years, Health Systems has priced PENNcare at the same rate as the least or second least expensive health care option—Blue Cross Comprehensive—in order to attract business from other providers. The Comprehensive Plan was particularly targeted—PENNcare offered everything Comprehensive did and much more, for the exact same price. Chart 2 demonstrates how the Comprehensive plan has always been among the most affordable options; and has averaged well under 10% of the cost of Plan 100 coverage since 1991. PENNcare will cost 60% of the price of Plan 100.

The Comprehensive Plan was specifically designed to provide employees with a low-cost alternative to traditional indemnity plans. It was a plan designed to be competitive with HMOs, and in fact was considerably cheaper than the HMOs for most of the last ten years. Because of the ridiculously low pricing of PENNcare for the last two years, 25% of
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employees changed to the UPHS plan. Now that PENNCare has a large chunk of the market, the affordable option that the Comprehensive Plan offers is being eliminated—supposedly because of low enrollment. But it is obviously that the cause of the low enrollment. The Plan 100 was the predominant offering of PENNCare, Penn Care is going up in cost to employees by $109.50; the most expensive plan is going up in cost by less than $14. 

Not only are these kinds of tactics immoral, they also cost employees time and money, and pose a potential risk to the health of Penn’s workers and their families. People have changed their family doctors to participate in PENNCare; they have chosen pediatrician for their children. They have chosen new cardiologists for treatment of their heart disease. Now, they will either have to change back, or pay an unconscionable increase in their health care premiums. And every time you change doctors, you put yourself at risk because you lose the security that continuity of service provides.

The Rodin/Fry administrators were well aware that the David Health Systems was deliberately engaged in unethical practices designed to eliminate the competition, yet did nothing to protect the interests of employees. There is something extremely wrong when University administrators will permit their employees to be placed at risk for the benefit of one of its subsidiary corporations.

It is clear what is happening here—UPHS and Penn conspired to engage in predatory pricing to grab a large share of the market and eliminate much of the competition—and then raise prices to employees. It is equally clear that the primary concern of the Benefits Design Committee—dominated as it was by upper level administrators and UPHS affiliated medical professionals—was not maintaining affordable health care options for Penn employees, but maintaining a robust and healthy profit margin to justify the bloated salaries UPHS administrators. Over the last couple of years, Judith Rodin, John Fry, and William Kelley have assumed extraordinary risks on behalf of Penn and UPHS in order to expand Health Systems. We, Penn’s faculty and staff, are now being told to pay the cost of assuming that risk.

This entire Benefits Redesign Plan needs to be completely junked, and a committee of faculty and support staff needs to start the process over. Penn’s administrators have demonstrated that their priorities and ethics are incompatible and inconsistent with the academic mission of this University, and the legitimate interests of the people who work at Penn.

— Paul Lukasiak, Administrative Assistant, SSW

Response on PENNCare Costs

Mr. Lukasiak’s letter focuses on the pricing of the PENNCare option and the Comprehensive option to make serious allegations about the University administration and its motives in benefits redesign. Since the proposals are a recommendation of the committee we chair, and not the individuals mentioned in the letter, a response from us seems in order.

Mr. Lukasiak believes that the change in the pricing of PENNCare represents, and that the entire health care redesign represents, predatory pricing. He bases this claim on the initial low price of PENNCare, which he believes was to eliminate competition, followed by the recommended price increase in the Benefits Redesign proposal, which he believes was to secure an unfair return to UPHS or the University. This claim is entirely without merit. In predatory pricing, the goal is to eliminate competition. Under the recommended Benefits Redesign, competition is actually increased and not decreased. This is the opposite of Mr. Lukasiak’s claims. With the new point-of-service plan (POS), competition among all providers increases and, in fact, the Keystone POS option, with its larger network of primary care providers, is in an advantageous position relative to UPHS.

When PENNCare was first offered, neither the University nor UPHS knew at what level to set premium rates because enrollment and actual claim experience could not be predicted in advance. It was decided to set the PENNCare price, provisionally, at the same level as the Comprehensive plan until actual claim experience was known. The fact that that price was zero, reflects the malfunctioning of the health care pricing formula, a malfunctioning which we have elaborated on throughout our communications in recent weeks. All plan options, except plan 100, were priced at zero, including plan options offered by providers other than UPHS. Mr. Lukasiak’s own tables, Charts 1 and 2, reflect that malfunctioning. At a time when medical costs and cost-sharing were increasing, Penn’s employee contributions were declining. The recommendations reestablish cost-sharing based on the percentage sharing from 1994. None of these factors suggest predatory policy; instead they reflect the opposite: increased choice among competing providers with relative price differences reflecting difference in plan costs, and with cost-sharing equal to that of just three years ago.

The decision to price PENNCare at the level of Comprehensive left both priced inappropriately. If employees left the Comprehensive plan for PENNCare, it clearly was not because of the pricing of PENNCare, as is suggested in the letter. Moreover, while some employees in the Comprehensive plan did move to PENNCare (the majority did not), the low enrollment in the Comprehensive plan pre-dated the introduction of PENNCare and was the result of the introduction of that program as claimed.

Now that we have actual claim experience, we know that the contributions for the PENNCare option were set too low, that it was not a cost-efficient plan, and that an increase in contributions is indicated. The factors that make the PENNCare plan attractive to employees—rich benefits, no contributions and lack of restrictions on access to care—also make the plan too expensive for Penn to provide without changes in cost-sharing.

Our comments in Almanac on the similarity of the out-of-network benefits in the point-of-service and the benefits in the Comprehensive plan were in response to questions about the plans. While there are differences in the two plans that our employees will need to evaluate at Open Enrollment, the point-of-service plan may offer an acceptable and more affordable option to employees in the Comprehensive plan than accessing the benefits under PENNCare. It is the case that individuals in the Comprehensive plan will face some cost-sharing as they move to other options in the new plan, as is the case with all other employees. It is also the case that the costs and the cost-sharing in all plans will be greater than in the HMOs. The committee has been very open with the community about the lower cost-sharing in the HMOs because the majority of Penn’s lower-paid employees are enrolled in those plans.

This is a principle set early on by the Benefits redesign Committee and one that we hope will continue to guide decisions about health benefits costs.

— Barbara Lowery, Associate Provost

— H. Clinton Davidson, Vice President/HR

Co-chairs, Benefits Advisory Committee

Chart 1: Cost of Family Coverage for Health Insurance at Penn, FY 95-98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>FY 95</th>
<th>FY 96</th>
<th>FY 97</th>
<th>Proposed FY 98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan 100</td>
<td>$337.55</td>
<td>$337.55</td>
<td>$354.45</td>
<td>$337.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total / employee</td>
<td>158.83</td>
<td>158.83</td>
<td>166.75</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn Pays (%)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>172.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In FY 96 and before, employees received Flex credits if the amount that Penn was contributing was not the cost of the program. In FY 97, the “cost” credits were eliminated.

** Despite Penn’s claim that the new Keystone Point-of-Service (POS) is something new, the QualMed plan was a limited Point of Service plan beginning 1/1/96.

*** Penn’s formula, on which it based the amount it contributed for health care, was based on Penn providing each employee with 66% of the cost of Plan 100 toward any of the plans (70% of cost toward single coverage).

Chart 2: Percentage of Cost to Employees—Other Plans and Plan 100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comp/Plan 100</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keystone/Plan 100</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIP/Plan 100</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qual/Plan 100</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

— Barbara Lowery, Associate Provost

— H. Clinton Davidson, Vice President/HR

Co-chairs, Benefits Advisory Committee
The Pennsylvania English Fluency in Higher Education Act, signed into law in 1990, requires the University to evaluate and annually certify to the Commonwealth that all new undergraduate instructional personnel are fluent in the use of the English language in the classroom. In 1990-91, at the request of the Deans of the undergraduate schools, the Provost’s Office developed a single, University-wide standard of fluency and uniform procedures for the evaluation and certification of such fluency. These were published “Of Record” in Almanac, on May 28, 1991.

Last year, in response to some concerns expressed by both faculty and students, I appointed an ad hoc committee, chaired by Associate Dean Dwight Jaggar of the School of Engineering, to review our standard of fluency and procedures to determine if any adjustments were needed. Although the Committee found that some fluency problems remain, for the most part the procedures have worked well. Graduate Group Chairs and Undergraduate Chairs in particular believe there has been great improvement in the quality of TAs since the inception of the English evaluation and certification procedures.

The committee did suggest some changes in the language of the Penn policy in order to clarify its intent. It also updated the policy to take account of the new Test of Spoken English (TSE) introduced in 1996 by the Educational Testing Service. This test uses a new scoring system which must be reflected in our policy. It also will require a change in our certification form, which will be distributed later this semester.

Finally, the committee recommended that a very limited new category—Grader—be created for graduate students who serve as graders and have very limited contact with undergraduates solely through office hours. Upon the written referral of the graduate group chair, graduate students whose native language is not English and who receive scores on the Test of Spoken English of 45 or above but less than 60 may be certified as graders by passing the Grader Exam administered by the English Language Programs. Passing of this exam, which is tailored to one-on-one questions and answers, will certify graduate students as sufficiently fluent in English to serve as graders with limited office hours, but does not certify them to undertake other instructional duties at a later date. Graders can have no responsibility for classroom teaching, tutoring, recitation, or laboratory sessions.

I have accepted the recommendations of the ad hoc committee. The revised policy, which follows below, is effective immediately. In addition to publication in Almanac, it is being distributed as a Provost’s Memorandum to academic deans, department chairs, and graduate groups chairs.

— Stanley Chodorow, Provost

Procedures for the Evaluation and Certification of the English Fluency of Undergraduate Instructional Personnel

Pursuant to the requirements of the Pennsylvania English Fluency in Higher Education Act, the following procedures for the evaluation and certification of English fluency in the classroom of all undergraduate instructional personnel (as defined below) shall be effective immediately and supersede previous school or University procedures.

I. Undergraduate Instructional Personnel

All persons hired on or after July 1, 1997, as members of the Standing or Associated Faculties, Academic Support Staff, graduate and professional student teaching staff, or as tutors, or for other undergraduate instructional duties (including, for example, leading laboratory or discussion sections or holding office hours), regardless of rank or title, in the Schools of Arts and Sciences, Engineering and Applied Science, or Nursing, the Annenberg or Wharton Schools, or the Graduate Schools of Education or Fine Arts, must be evaluated and certified as having met the University’s standard of English fluency in the classroom before completion of the hiring process. In addition, all individuals who hold appointments elsewhere in the University and who are to be engaged in the teaching, tutoring, or other instruction of undergraduates must also be evaluated and certified before appointment. Only members of the Visiting Faculty, instructional personnel whose entire undergraduate instruction (including office hours) will be conducted in a language other than English, and graduate students who have no direct instructional contact (including office hours) with undergraduates (e.g., some graders or research assistants) are exempt from this requirement.

II. Standard of English Fluency in the Classroom

To be certified by the University of Pennsylvania as “fluent in the English language in the classroom,” a speaker must always be intelligible to a non-specialist in the topic under discussion, despite an accent or occasional grammatical errors. General and field-specific vocabulary must be broad enough so that the speaker rarely has to grope for words. Listening comprehension must be sufficiently high so that misunderstandings rarely occur responding to students’ questions or answers. While teaching, the speaker should be able to use transitions to show the relationships between ideas, and to set main points apart from added details. When asked an ambiguous question, the speaker should be able to clarify the question through discussion with the student. When asked to restate a main point, the speaker should be able to paraphrase clearly. When challenged, the speaker should be able to defend his or her position effectively and appropriately.

Prospective instructional personnel, regardless of rank or title, who do not meet the above criteria shall not be certified and may not be assigned to any undergraduate instructional responsibilities.

III. Certification Procedures

a) Newly-Hired Standing Faculty Members

Prospective members of the Standing or Associated Faculties, or of the Academic Support Staff, regardless of rank or title, shall be evaluated and certified by their department chairperson as to their English fluency in the classroom on the basis of one of the methods of evaluation listed in section IV, below. The department chairperson shall certify their English fluency in the classroom to their Dean, or to the Dean’s designee (generally, the Undergraduate Dean), and the Dean shall certify same to the Provost.

b) Native English-Speaking Graduate Teaching Assistants

Prospective graduate teaching assistants whose native language is English shall be evaluated and certified by their department chairperson as to their English fluency in the classroom on the basis of one of the methods of evaluation listed in section IV, below. The department chairperson shall certify their English fluency in the classroom to their Dean, or to the Dean’s designee (generally, the Undergraduate Dean), and the Dean shall certify same to the Provost. (This procedure applies to all native English-speaking graduate and professional student teaching staff, including those undertaking instructional duties as tutors, leading laboratory or discussion sections, graders, or holding office hours.)

c) Non-native English-Speaking Graduate Teaching Assistants

Prospective graduate teaching assistants whose native language is other than English who have not taken either the Test of Spoken English or the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview, or who score below 60 on the TSE or below Superior on the ACTFL, shall be referred by their department chairperson to the English Language Programs for professional evaluation of their English fluency in the classroom. [See section IV.a, below, for further information on these tests. Registration deadlines for evaluation by the English Language Programs are May 1 for the Fall term, November 1 for the Spring term, and March 1 for the Summer term, except for those prospective teaching assistants from abroad who are participating in the summer International Teaching Assistants Program or for whom departments have made special arrangements with the Director of English Language Programs.]

It is anticipated that most graduate students whose native language is not English will not be sufficiently fluent in the use of English in the classroom to undertake undergraduate instructional responsibilities during their first year of graduate enrollment at Penn. Such individuals may be able to acquire fluency in English in the classroom by enrolling in the ELP’s summer International Teaching Assistants Training Program, or during the academic year, by enrolling in GAS 600 (fall semester) or the ELP’s intensive English language and cultural familiarization courses, or
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through alternative programs appropriate to the student’s needs. Graduate students placed in any of the above programs must be re-evaluated by the ELP before the Director may certify to the Provost that they are fluent in English in the classroom.

d) All Other Undergraduate Instructional Personnel
All other undergraduate instructional personnel, regardless of rank or title, shall be evaluated and certified by their department chairperson as to their English fluency in the classroom on the basis of one of the methods of evaluation listed in section IV, below. The department chairperson shall certify their English fluency in the classroom to their Dean, or to the Dean’s designee (generally, the Undergraduate Dean), and the Dean shall certify same to the Provost.

IV. Evaluation and Testing

a) Methods of Evaluation
Department chairpersons and deans shall certify only those prospective instructional personnel whose English fluency in the classroom has been evaluated using one or more of the means of evaluation listed below and has been found to meet or exceed the standard of English fluency in the classroom set forth in section II, above.

The following methods of evaluation may be used as the basis for a departmental certification of all undergraduate instructional personnel except prospective graduate teaching assistants whose native language is other than English:

- A score of 60 on the ETS Test of Spoken English (TSE).
- A score of Superior on the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview.
- Academic presentation and discussion (such as a colloquium, lecture, seminar, or scholarly conference presentation) evaluated by two or more members of the standing faculty and/or the English Language Programs staff.
- Extended, in-person discussion with two or more members of the standing faculty, and/or the English Language Programs staff, of the candidate’s past and future research interests and teaching plans or experience.
- Observation and evaluation of teaching performance in the classroom by two or more members of the standing faculty and/or the English Language Programs staff.
- Videotape of classroom teaching or academic presentation evaluated by two or more members of the standing faculty and/or the English Language Programs staff.

All prospective graduate teaching assistants whose native language is other than English shall be referred to the English Language Programs for professional evaluation of their English fluency in the classroom, using the ETS Test of Spoken English (TSE) or future replacements, the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview, or the Interactive Performance Test (IPT) administered by the English Language Programs (and described in V.b, below).

b) Referral to and Consultation with the English Language Programs
Using one of the methods listed above, department chairpersons and Deans (or the Dean’s designee) shall either certify to the Provost that a prospective faculty member or other undergraduate instructional personnel is fluent in English in the classroom or refer them to the English Language Programs (ELP) for further evaluation before they undertake any undergraduate instructional duties.

It should be borne in mind that, at the discretion of the department chairperson or the Dean, both native and non-native speakers of English may be referred to the English Language Programs for further evaluation before certification of their English fluency.

The department chairperson or Dean may find it useful, especially where the native language of prospective faculty members or instructional personnel is other than English, to consult with the Director of the English Language Programs before certification of English fluency regarding the advisability of further evaluation or the most appropriate method of evaluation.

c) Pre-Admission Testing of Non-native English-speaking Graduate Teaching Assistants
In order to facilitate the certification of all prospective graduate teaching assistants who are fluent in English in the classroom, schools and departments outside of SAS are strongly encouraged to adopt the existing teaching fellowship policy of the School of Arts and Sciences, and to require that prospective teaching assistants whose native language is other than English take the Test of Spoken English prior to appointment to undergraduate instructional duties:

“In order to hold an appointment as a teaching assistant in the School of Arts and Sciences, a student whose native language is not English must submit scores from the Test of Spoken English (TSE).”

[1989-91 Graduate Admissions Catalog, p. 58].

V. Further Evaluation and Appeals

a) Further Evaluation by the English Language Programs
Prospective instructional personnel who are not certified under section III, above, shall be referred to the University’s English Language Programs for further evaluation.

b) Interactive Performance Test
Graduate students whose native language is not English and who receive scores on the Test of Spoken English of 45 or above but less than 60 may be certified for classroom instruction by passing the Interactive Performance Test (IPT) administered by the English Language Programs. The IPT consists of a 10-minute mini-lecture with a question and answer component on a topic in the candidate’s academic discipline.

c) Evaluation and Certification as Graders with Limited Office Hours
Alternatively, and upon the written referral of the graduate group chair, graduate students whose native language is not English and who receive scores on the Test of Spoken English of 45 or above but less than 60 may be certified as graders with limited office hours by passing the Grader Exam administered by the English Language Programs. Graders with limited office hours are defined as graduate students who are responsible for grading exams and assignments and holding individual appointments with undergraduate students for the purpose of explaining grades and answers to exam questions or assignments. Graders with limited office hours have no responsibility for classroom teaching, tutoring, recitation, or laboratory sessions. Passing of this exam, which is tailored to one-on-one questions and answers, will certify graduate students as sufficiently fluent in English to serve as graders with limited office hours, but does not certify them to undertake other instructional duties at a later date.

d) Appeals of Certification Decisions
Appeals of certification decisions made by department chairpersons may be directed to the appropriate Dean, and appeals of certification decisions made by Deans or by the Director of English Language Programs may be directed to the Provost.

VI. Deadlines for Certification and Reporting

In the case of appointments to the Standing or Associated Faculties, all submissions to the Provost’s Staff Conference or Mini-Conference for appointments in SAS, Wharton, SEAS, Nursing, ASC, GSE, or GSFA (and for any faculty members in other schools who will ever teach undergraduates) shall include in the required documentation a certification by the Dean stating that the candidate’s fluency in the English language in the classroom has been evaluated and found to meet or exceed the University’s standard of fluency. The Dean’s certification shall also include a description of the means used to evaluate such fluency and the results of such evaluation. (The Provost’s Memorandum of October 13, 1988, outlining required documentation for Provost’s Staff Conference submissions will be updated and reissued to reflect this requirement.)

In all other cases, including graduate teaching assistants and academic support staff, the certification must be approved by the Provost before final approval of the appointment in the school or department and prior to the start of the term for which the individual is first hired for undergraduate instructional duties (specifically, by September 1 for the Fall term, by January 1 for the Spring term, and by May 1 for the Summer term).

Each Dean shall report to the Provost, no later than August 1 of each year, that all faculty and other undergraduate instructional personnel (as defined in section I, above) hired since the Dean’s previous certification have been evaluated for English fluency in the classroom prior to their appointment and were found to meet or exceed the University’s standard of fluency.

VII. Monitoring and Reporting of Complaints

a) Monitoring
Each school shall have in place one of the following procedures for the ongoing monitoring of English fluency in the classroom of all undergraduate instructional personnel:

- A systematic program of classroom observation of both faculty and teaching assistants by faculty members or English language specialists.
Rose Funds for Research: April 14 Deadline

The Rose Foundation has generously provided a gift, known as the Rose Undergraduate Research Award Fund, whose income recognizes outstanding achievement in research by students in any of the undergraduate schools. The Rose Fund is administered by the College of Arts and Sciences, with awards made annually on a competitive basis by the Council of Undergraduate Deans.

To be considered for a Rose Award, a research project must be nominated by a member of the faculty. The deadline for nominations is Monday, April 14, 1997. Nominations consist of the faculty letter of nomination and an application prepared by the student. Students should complete the application (see locations below) and submit it to the faculty member who will be nominating the project. If the nomination is initiated by the faculty member, he or she should ensure that the student has filled out an application to accompany the letter of nomination.

The faculty letter of nomination should address the quality, originality, and importance of the student’s research. It should not exceed three pages. Nominations will be reviewed by a committee of faculty who will make recommendations to the Council of Undergraduate Deans.

All undergraduate research projects are eligible for the Rose Award; they need not have been funded by the Nassau Fund or by other undergraduate research grant in order to qualify for recognition. Depending upon the income available, up to five awards of up to $1,500 each will be made each year. In addition, an award of up to $500 may be made to the faculty advisor(s) of each project. In cases where there are multiple student research investigators and/or advisors, the awards will be divided among the participants. The criteria used in judging the projects will be the quality, the originality, and the importance of the research.

Awards will be announced by the Council of Undergraduate Deans before Commencement and publicized in the appropriate campus media. Applications may be obtained from any of the undergraduate deans.

Arts and Sciences: Dr. Robert Rescorla 133 South 36th Street/Mezzanine CGS: Dr. Richard Hendrix Suite 100, 3440 Market Street Engineering: Dr. David Pope 109 Towne Building School of Nursing: Dr. Mary Naylor 475 Nursing Education Building. Wharton School: Dr. Richard Herring 1100 Steinberg-Dietrich Hall

About the Tutoring and Learning Resources of the Department of Academic Support Programs

Tutoring and Learning Resources, a component of the Department of Academic Support Programs, offers a unique set of services. These services are used by many students at the University, but are sometimes overlooked by those who could benefit most. The Department is seeking the support of faculty and advisors, who are in a position to identify students in academic difficulty and refer them to services that will provide academic support. In addition, Tutoring and Learning Resources, like all of the Department of Academic Support Programs, seeks to cultivate and maintain partnerships with faculty and school administrators that create innovative academic support services for all students. This office offers an array of programs and services that address a variety of academic needs and concerns of students, and complement classroom instruction. Students benefit most when these services are developed in collaboration with individual faculty, schools and departments.

Some ways Tutoring and Learning Resources assists students are:

- individual assessment of learning needs;
- “walk-in” tutorial services and learning strategy instruction;
- individual tutoring sessions in most undergraduate courses;
- school-based on-site tutorial support;
- mid-term and final exam review workshops, and “clinics” (scheduled on-site help sessions for any course within a discipline);
- professional instruction focusing on academic reading, writing, critical thinking, studying and test-taking management;
- “Mastering the Ivy League,” a workshop series for first-year students;
- “Academics Plus,” a workshop series for international students;
- “Success at Penn,” a workshop series for returning adult learners;
- instructional resources for faculty, instructors, and teaching assistants;
- programs and services for students with learning differences or disabilities;
- faculty-approved Old Exam File.

During the 1995-96 academic year, Tutoring and Learning Resources employed 468 tutors who made 5249 tutoring contacts in a variety of venues. Eight hundred eighty-nine contacts were made in On-Site Tutoring sessions. One-on-one tutoring was offered in 112 courses in fall 1995, and 89 courses in spring 1996. During this same period, 10 learning instructors provided academic support in reading, writing, and studying to 1,038 undergraduate, graduate, and professional students in individual or group settings.

Seventy-five outreach workshops were presented throughout campus. While most students may access the services by self-identifying, it is extremely effective when referrals are made by faculty and/or advisors who recognize that a student has academic difficulty. Students may be referred by calling 573-9235 or sending an e-mail message to tutoring@pobox. Those making the referral are encouraged to inform the student of the service to which they are being referred.

Tutoring and Learning Resources has had successful working relationships with many individual faculty and departments in hiring tutors and developing special academic support initiatives such as those with the Mathematics and Biology Departments, Wharton, Nursing, SEAS, and the Department of Athletics.

For example, the Nursing Academic Resource Center (NARC), developed by Tutoring and Learning Resources in collaboration with the School of Nursing’s faculty and students, provides Nursing students with on-site walk-in instruction in academic reading and studying as well as workshops on learning strategies appropriate for Nursing courses.

Faculty and Tutoring and Learning Resources’ staff can collaborate in a variety of ways:

- referral of students needing help;
- identification of talented majors to serve as tutors;
- tutor training;
- development of group tutorial programs such as collaborative learning, student- and/or faculty-led discussion groups;
- development of creative instructional strategies to enhance learning in the course.

The staff from Tutoring and Learning Resources welcomes opportunities to work with faculty in developing creative support strategies or to work with students who need more assistance than a faculty member has time to provide.

For more information about the programs and services of Tutoring and Learning Resources, located in 110 High Rise East, contact Bernadine Abad, associate director, Tutoring Services (573-9235 or abad@pobox); Myrna Cohen, associate director, Learning Resources (573-9235 or mcohen@pobox); or Terri White, director, Department of Academic Support Programs (898-0809 or twhtie@pobox).

For more information on Academic Support Programs, located in 209 High Rise East, visit the web site at http://dolphin.upenn.edu/~dasp, or contact Terri White (above). [Ed. Note: See p. 18 for a related Compass feature.]
Women of Color Awards: the 1997 Honorees

At the tenth annual Women of Color luncheon on March 7, the highest awards given* were in the Outstanding Women of Color category, where one staff member and four students were chosen.

Terri White, Director of Academic Support Programs, was the staff honoree. Three graduate students, all members of Law ’97, won—Aretha D. Davis, Claudia Colindres Johnson and Jennifer Y. Kim—and one undergraduate, Shweta Parmar, C ’97.

Special Recognition plaques were given to two staff members—Melvis Williams, administrative assistant in the Office of Affirmative Action, and Winnie Smart-Mapp, staff assistant in the Center for Community Partnerships—and to one undergraduate, Lucy Lee, C ’97.

A special presentation was made to Women of Color’s campus founder, Joann Mitchell, the former director of the Office of Affirmative Action is now Associate Provost and Special Assistant to the President at Princeton.

Certificates were presented to three staff members—Doreen Beardon, an instructor at the Presbyterian Medical School of Practical Nursing; Irene Clements, an administrative assistant in the Materials Sciences and Engineering Department; and Mary Chapman, a senior secretary in Benefits/Human Resources; and to four students: Kentra Carby, C ’98; Melissa Muniz, C ’97; Janice Ferebee-Murphy, SSW ’98; and Aretha Davis, Law ’97.

* The Helen O. Dickens Award for Lifetime Achievement is not always given, and was not given this year. In years past it has been given to Cora Ingrum (1993), Director of the CEAS Minority Program since 1982; Dr. Gloria Twine Chisum (1994), a University alumna and trustee who headed the Commission on Strengthening the University; Peggy Thomas (1995), a surgical technician in Operations at HUP; and Ruth O. Seward (1996), Director of the Department of Social Work at Presbyterian Medical Center.

The Great Penny Drive for Kids Who are Seriously Ill

Donations to the Great Penny Drive—coordinated by the PennVIPS—support families caring for a seriously ill child, whether it be a terminal, critical, or chronic illness. The Great Penny Drive for the Kelly Anne Dolan Memorial Fund runs now through March 31.

The Fund was established in 1976 by Kelly Anne Dolan’s parents after experiencing their daughter’s five-year battle with a rare form of leukemia. It is dedicated to the uninsured needs of families caring for seriously ill dependent children through advocacy, financial assistance, education and resources. Volunteers across campus will be collecting loose change in jars. Everyone is asked to donate those unwanted pennies—stashed in strange places, dumped in former ash trays, weighing down pockets—that could add up to a small fortune. Bring them to one of the 20 drop-off locations at right. For more information call PennVIPS at 898-2020.

—Bonnie Ragsdale, Associate Director Staff, Faculty, & Alumni Volunteer Service Center for Community Partnerships

Penn Women Who Made History

The Penn Web’s series—now at www.upenn.edu—for Women’s History Month now highlights Alice Paul, who took her Ph.D. in 1912 with a dissertation on the legal status of women in Pennsylvania. The SSW alumna went on to chair the Congressional Committee of the National American Women’s Suffrage Association which succeeded in winning the vote forwomen in America. She also wrote the Equal Rights Amendment, and founded the National Woman’s Party and World Woman’s Party. On her death in 1977, at 92, Penn’s Association of Women Faculty and Administrators set up the Alice Paul Awards in her honor, and the Women’s Studies Program named its research arm for her.

OF RECORD

University Policy on Secular and Religious Holidays

(Effective July 1, 1996)

No secular or religious holidays are formally recognized by the University’s academic calendar. However, in setting the academic calendar for each year, the University does try to avoid obvious conflicts with any holidays that involve most University students, faculty, and staff, such as July 4, Thanksgiving, Labor Day, Christmas and New Year’s.

2. Other holidays affecting large numbers of University community members include Martin Luther King Day, Rosh Hashanah, Yom Kippur, the first two days of Passover, and Good Friday. In consideration of their significance for many students, no examinations may be given and no assigned work may be required on these days. Students who observe these holidays will be given an opportunity to make up missed work in both laboratories and lecture courses. If an examination is given on the first class day after one of these holidays, it must not cover material introduced in class on that holiday.

Faculty should realize that Jewish holidays begin at sundown on the evening before the published date of the holiday. Late afternoon exams should be avoided on these days. Also, no examinations may be held on Saturday or Sunday in the undergraduate schools unless they are also available on other days. Nor should seminars or other regular classes be scheduled on Saturdays or Sundays unless they are also available at other times.

3. The University recognizes that there are other holidays, both religious and secular, which are of importance to some individuals and groups on campus. Such occasions include, but are not limited to, Memorial Day, Sukkot, the last two days of Passover, Shavuot, Shemini Atzeret, and Simchat Torah, as well as the Muslim New Year, Ra’a al-sana, and the Islamic holidays Eid Al-Fitr and Eid Al-Adha. Students who wish to observe such holidays must inform their instructors within the first two weeks of each semester of their intent to observe the holiday even when the exact date of the holiday will not be known until later so that alternative arrangements can be made. In the event of a conflict, students and faculty can be excused at the earliest opportunity. Students who make such arrangements will not be required to attend classes or take examinations on the designated days, and faculty must provide reasonable opportunities for such students to make up missed work and examinations. For this reason it is desirable that faculty inform students of all examination dates at the start of each semester. Exceptions to the requirement of make-up examinations must be approved in advance by the undergraduate dean of the school in which the course is offered.

—Stanley Chodorow, Provost
A year ago, the Division of Public Safety’s Strategic Plan emphasized that the greatest promise for improvement of safety and security on campus is security technology.

Since that time, the Division has looked at a host of products and tested many that seemed promising for this campus and its varied needs. Perhaps more important is the planning work that sets up the framework for using technology, in combination with an array of police and emergency services, to address each safety problem in the most effective way.

This is an overview of some of the devices that can—in some cases already do—contribute to improved safety indoors or outdoors at Penn.

The primary systems being used are:
- **Command and Control Center**
- **Access Control System**
- **Intrusion Alarm System**
- **Computer Aided Dispatch System**
- **Closed Circuit Television Systems (CCTV)**
- **Blue Light Telephone System**
- **Radio Dispatch**

The large diagram at center shows the information flow of the systems into the command and control center, known as PENNCOM.

The philosophy for the use of technology is to increase the prevention of crime and decrease the response time for law enforcement or other life safety services to respond to any life threatening incident. Each system depicted above serves a certain function for meeting this criteria.

The Command and Control Center (PENNCOM) is the central dissemination point for all the information provided by the various field devices that are sent back to the corresponding system. All of these inputs of information are fed to the Computer Aided Dispatch System (CAD) where the appropriate response unit is called into action to deal with the event. For instance, if an alarm came in through the Access Control System that a door in a certain building had been forced open, that information would be relayed from the Access Control System operations monitor to the CAD. Here it would be recorded and a Police/Security Officer on patrol nearest that building would be Radio Dispatched to investigate. The radio communications would then allow PENNCOM to be in constant contact with the responding Officer should additional resources be required to deal with the incident.

Can be seen, the technology acts as additional “eyes and ears” allowing Public Safety to effectively and appropriately respond to Life Safety issues.

Each of the PENNCOM systems provides various features that are essential for the operation of a state-of-the-art Command and Control Center. Each area will be discussed generically with more detail to follow in future publications.

For the Command Center, the operations console/work area is ergonomically designed to allow the operators quick movement to any area and for arm’s length operations of any of the pieces of equipment used. The speed of assessing a situation, making a decision, then responding the correct way can sometimes mean the difference between life and death. This, then, is a factor in the wraparound design of a command center. All of the services outlined above will eventually operate out of a single Command and Control Center once the new Public Safety facility is completed. Currently, these operations are divided between the original Public Safety building on Locust Walk and the new facility on 40th Street.

The systems used all have field device or remote device inputs to there equivalent “head-end” central receiving station located at PENNCOM. The field devices provide specific inputs that allow for the CAD operators to correctly respond to any received alarm.

**Access Control System**

The Access Control System consists of a main computer at PENNCOM which controls the database for the system related to card holders, card readers, door locations per building, door alarm points per building, etc. At each building there is another smaller computer housed in a Controller Panel which is designed to manage up to 8 doors and the corresponding door devices. This panel can communicate with the main computer through a variety of network options. Based on the significant LAN and fiber network already in place, the panels will connect to the LAN via TCP/IP and communicate with the host. Should the network not be available in certain areas, the panels can be connected back to the host via fiber optics, dedicated copper lines, dial-up phone lines or even with cellular phones as a last resort. Each of these panels is equipped with a 4 hour battery back-up which will support all Access functions at the building level should the building power be interrupted. It will support all readers, door locks and hardware.

The panels are designed to control the access to the buildings independent of the host. Each panel can store up to 100,000 card holder records if necessary. Most will be configured to store from 10-40,000 on average. The most important reason the panels need to communicate with the host is in the event of an alarm. If an alarm is triggered, the panel will continue to attempt to connect with the host until such time it can deliver the alarm information. The panels will store thousands of transactions until such time as communications are restored.

As the PENNCOM diagram depicts the "Readers" can consist of a standard Magnetic Stripe card reader, or more sophisticated types, such as a Biometric “Reader” which can read a physical characteristic of the person to validate their identity. The Hand Geometry and Iris Scan Biometric Readers are being evaluated for possible use in the Residential facilities and certain laboratories where personal verification is required. Also depicted is a RF-Receiver “Reader.” This is used in cases where the individual has difficulty swiping or inserting a card into a reader. This will allow for the use of garage door opener type RF Transmitter, where simply pressing the device will emit a coded signal unique to that individual that will be recorded and verified just like any other card before automatically opening a door. Most ADA doors will be equipped with a similar device for ease of access, but yet not compromise the building security.

It is the vision of Public Safety that most buildings on campus will eventually have, as a minimum, all exterior doors monitored by standard Public Safety designated equipment through PENNCOM to ensure the security of those buildings. This would consist of a card reader for all standard “Entry” doors. Those doors would also have an electric lock to allow for automatic locking of doors after hours, door contacts for monitoring the status of the door, and some type of exit device that meets Public Safety Standards and the fire code for emergency egress. In addition each reader door would have a Request to Exit (REX) device that would shunt the door alarm when someone exits through the door. This is necessary since the door contacts when parted will set off an alarm. It is only when the system is electronically told through a valid card read or a Request to Exit shunt that it ignores the open contacts and sends no alarm. All doors can also be timed to allow them to stand open for a determined period of time with no alarm. Should someone hold the door open too long a “Propped Door Alarm” will be sent to PENNCOM. All exterior exit doors (typically non-entry doors) would have as a minimum door contacts to monitor the status of the door and the appropriate exit hardware to meet fire code requirements.
Access Control

Field Devices
- Card Readers
- Biometric Readers
- Door Contacts
- Electric Locks
- Motion Detectors
- Video Intercoms

Intrusion Detection/Field Devices
- Key Pads
- Door Contacts
- Motion Detectors
- Glass Break Detectors
- Holdup/Duress Alarms
- Asset Fiber Loops
- Asset Cable Pulls

Control Systems

- Computer Aided Dispatch
- Radio Dispatch
- Closed Circuit Television
- Emergency Blue Light Phones

This will give an alarm to PENNCOM should someone force the door open. This configuration will provide good ground floor level security. Card Reader doors may also be added to any interior doors in the buildings as deemed necessary. The Access Control System can also monitor Motion detectors, Glass Break detector, Environmental Alarms, etc., with all events being reported back to PENNCOM.

Intrusion Alarm System

The University has almost 400 different “Burglar Alarm Systems” or Intrusion Alarm Systems on campus. All were installed by different companies over many years and most are different from each other. Public Safety will standardize on a single intrusion alarm system and will convert over those systems that are currently being used. This will allow for a dramatic savings in maintenance alone, but will also provide the standard response to real alarms that will greatly improve the safety of the campus community. Due to the poor condition of many of the existing systems, Public Safety responds to mostly “false alarms.” This waste of workforce and the dilution of the people resources for “Real needs” will be eliminated with this standardization.

The field devices for the Intrusion Alarm System consist of Motion Detectors, for detecting movement in areas after normal working hours; Glass Break Detectors, that detect the frequency of breaking glass should someone break a window to gain entrance; Holdup/Panic Duress Alarms in the bathrooms, environmental detectors such as water, heat, cold are also supported. All areas of use are being standardized. For instance, in all the restrooms, Holdup/Duress Alarms are being installed as well as a local Audible Alarm outside the door of the room. The same alarms and audibles will be used throughout the campus. In addition, both the Access Control System and the Intrusion Alarm System support the use of Asset Protection devices.

Currently, some school units are securing computers and audiovisual equipment using Fiber Wire loops that when broken will sound an alarm or Pull Plug systems that when the equipment is unplugged will sound an alarm. Keypads are available with the systems to allow a user to ARM and DIS-ARM the system for the rooms that are being monitored. These keypads or Command Centers are usually mounted on a wall adjacent to the alarmed area or at one of the entrances to the building.

Similar to the Control Systems, one or a number of Communication Panels are required at the building location. The number and type of devices needed will be located based on the requirements of the building. The Communications Panel uses a digital dialer to speed dial PENNCOM to report any alarm conditions. They use standard telephone lines for reporting. These panels are also equipped with a 4 hour battery backup to insure security in the event of a power failure. The host computer at PENNCOM receives the alarm inputs and makes a permanent record of all alarms as they come in. The Access Control System has a software driver that will allow the system to read all of the Intrusion Alarms and report them directly through the one system. The advantage of this interface is that only one operator need be used to manage the operation of the system since most events will be coming through one system, one operations monitor screen.

Closed Circuit Television

Describing the technology as an extension of Public Safety’s “eyes and ears” best defines the purpose of the video technology in conjunction with other security systems. The use of video cameras has now become a part of our way of life. All retail stores, banks, ATM machines and even hospitals use cameras to monitor their customers. All use cameras and video for reasons of personal safety and property protection. The University is looking into the use of very high speed rotating cameras for certain applications, fixed cameras for others and remote dial-up video transmitters and receivers for even others.

One of the applications is the use of the High Speed Cameras in conjunction with the placement of the Emergency Blue Light Phone through out campus. The plans call for the cameras to be installed at strategic locations where 2 to 3 Emergency Blue Light Phones could be targeted by one camera. The SpeedDome can turn a complete 360 degree sweep in under a second. It can also be programmed to positions predefined.

With the speed and the programming flexibility, one camera can be programmed to target the 2 to 3 Phones. By integrating the two systems, i.e. the Emergency Blue Light Phones, and the SpeedDome camera system it will allow for the PENNCOM operator to immediately see when an Emergency Phone is picked up. Again back to the concept of speed being critical to the implementation of a successful Public Safety operation. When the picture pops up the operation immediately knows what service to send. Should the victim be injured, but unable to articulate that, the operator could see it and send a rescue unit along with a Police Officer. That difference in time could save a life. This is a good example of how the technology infra-structure can truly enhance performance.

Digital video transmitters and receivers will also be used for transmitting video over long distances using a dial-up telephone. Due to the very expensive installation cost for the use of fiber optics or coaxial cable, this is a very good alternative for most applications.

Cameras are under consideration for use in the parking garages and other public areas vulnerable to crime.

Emergency Blue Light Phones

Public Safety is in the process of installing Emergency Blue Light Phones throughout the campus. The purpose of this technology is to increase the accessibility of individuals to emergency communications for getting assistance. This section is going back to standards. The selected phones are designed using International Standards and are recognizable by citizens of all nations.

Also the location of the Phones will now be standardized, so that any student will know that a phone is located at all the intersections on campus. The 3 Phones, are solar-powered, self-testing and use cellular technology to communicate with the host computer at PENNCOM. As soon as the Phone handle is raised the operator knows immediately where that person is located and quickly dispatch assistance.

Computer Aided Dispatch

Another new and innovative technology being used is what is termed “Computer Aided Dispatch.” This is a fully automated system that will allow for expeditious dispatch of officers when in needed. All activity will be recorded and audited over time for performance management. All inputs from the systems, Access Control, CCTV, Intrusion Alarms, and 511 calls go directly to CAD for dispatch.

Radio Dispatch

Radio Dispatch is the cornerstone for PENNCOM communications with the 100 Uniformed Police Officers, and the 200 Security Guards. Through Radio Dispatch all alarms, incoming calls, etc. are relayed to the police officers most closely located to the incident area. It is this tool that the Police Officers and Security Guards use at all times in the field. In summary, Public Safety is determined to implement what ever it takes to provide the campus and surrounding community a continuing sense of security and well-being.

Mr. Algard is Director of Security in the Division of Public Safety.
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Listed below are the new 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.
Postings are posted on a daily basis. Monday through Friday, at the following locations:
Application Center—Funderburg, 3401 Walnut Street (Ground level) 9 a.m.-1 p.m.
Blockley Hall—418 Guardian Drive (1st Floor and 2nd Floor)
Dental School—40th & Spruce St. (Basement across from B-30)
Houston Hall—34th & Spruce St. (Basement-near the elevators)
Wharton—Steinberg Hall—Dietrich Hall (next to Room 303)

Job Opportunities and daily postings can also be accessed on the Human Resources web page (www.hr.upenn.edu). A posting 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.

ENGINEERING/APPLIED SCIENCE

Specialist: Clyde Peterson
SYSTEMS PROGRAMMER III (03282CP) Provide technical consulting on use of software to solve specific problems; familiarize researchers with new software packages; install & maintain work stations; inventory equipment; manage installation of new software & updates; responsible for distributing workstations, network connections and modifications; track software & hardware problems; handle equipment and software acquisitions.
Qualifications: BA/BS in Computer Science or related field require; MS preferred; 4 years in large-scale computing environment; ability to work independently; develop production quality software systems; and teach untrained users to use computer systems; some experience with Macintosh & IBM PC; ability to supervise; good interpersonal & organizational skills. Grade: P8; Range: $39,655-$52,015 3-12-97 CDS

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

Specialist: Sue Hess
AUDIT SPECIALIST (03318SH) Analyze medical records & health system bills; assure CPT codes & ICD-9 codes match diagnoses; formulate audit programs; review policies, procedures, & systems of internal controls; prepare audit work papers documenting audit test performance; make recommendations to improve controls & systems; prepares audit reports; conduct entrance & exit controls; prepare input, output & external reports in the performance of the annual audit; may supervise work of less experienced staff; develop and maintain effective relationships with staffs of the Medical Group, Department of Medicine, Hospital of the University of PA, Clinical Practices of the University of PA & Physicians.
Qualifications: BS in Nursing, Health Sciences, Accounting, Business, or related field; Master’s degree preferred; minimum of 5 years of experience in health services, patient care, or quality assurance in health care setting; experience in third party physician reimbursement, billing regulations, CPT-4 and ICD-9 coding and managed care; IDXX physician billing system experience preferred; internal audit or consulting experience preferred. Grade: P8; Range: $39,655-$52,015 3-12-97 Internal Audit

DIRECTOR, INTELECTUAL PROPERTY (02273SH) Manage intellectual property matters for the Center for Technology Transfer and the University; assess predictability & with fellow technology managers, commercial potential of university inventions; manage & maintain intellectual property protection through external counsel; provide guidance & manage the prosecution of patents, copyrights, trademarks; work with the Managing Director & fellow technology managers to develop & implement strategies to commercialize the intellectual property assets the University. Qualifications: Advanced degree in life sciences preferred; experience in patent prosecution of university research results; excellent communication & interpersonal skills; independent self-starter with a strong work ethic; professional experience in an intellectual property law firm preferred. Grade: P11; Range: $35,155-$70,246 3-11-97 Center for Technology Transfer

GARDENER II (02257SH) (40 Hours) Prune & remove trees, shrubs, and vines, using rope and saddle; supervise and train the Arborist Intern & others; install/provide cabling & lighting protection hardware n trees; maintain accurate records of work performed; operate chain saws, brush chipper, log splitter, hydraulic sprayer & trucks with trailers; perform light maintenance on equipment & buildings including cleaning & sharpening saws; assist in the teaching of classes. Qualifications: Minimum of 4 years climbing & chain saw experience required, including work on tall trees; degree in horticulture or related field preferred; ISA arborist certification preferred; familiar with all industry safety requirements as outlined in the current ANSI-133 standard; valid Pennsylvania driver’s license required; some supervisory experience & an aptitude for teaching essential. Grade: G11; Range: $23,425-29,723 3-12-97 Morris Arboretum

TELEPHONE SERVICES ASSISTANT II (02256SH) Receive, log & coordinate repair reports for telephone equipment, lines & voice mail & software changes; provide instructions to end users; perform first level diagnosis of users’ problems; investigate, follow-up, hand-off on questions with other office staff; receive & dispatch teleaxes; prepare telex bills; maintain telex records; receive end user request for adds, moves and changes; maintain record & historical files; ensure project coordination with Operations; interact with Bell of PA; coordinate orders with Bell of PA and resolve service and installation concerns; prepare input billing/chargeback; process chargeback orders; back-up & monitor telephone credit cards; prepare periodic reports; enter data into TMS (telecom management system); compiles and reports; order office supplies; greet customers and visitors.
Qualifications: Minimum 2 years responsible customer service & clerical experience with telecommunications experience is desired; 1 year experience as Telecom Service Assistant I or equivalent experience in telecommunication services, or equivalent experience in answering & operating a receptionist; strong customer relations skills and organizational skills required; attention to detail & good follow-up skills essential; self-directed; able to work in team environment; familiarity with University and University accounting system preferred; Macintosh/PC literate with spreadsheets, word processing and databases strongly preferred; familiar with data entry terminals preferred; (Some overtime & weekend may be required) Grade: G10; Range: $20,637-25,713 3-12-97 Telecommunications

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATOR I (03314JZ) Work with the business administrator to prepare & manage a payroll budget in excess of $7 million annually; create & monitor payroll spending plans for approximately 75 sources of funding & Center/Department staff in excess of 100; provide human resource services for Center/Department staff; coordinate faculty/staff support with other schools, institutes, departments & centers; prepare ad hoc financial reports. Qualifications: BA/BS in accounting, business or equivalent; experience with fundamental accounting and University financial policies and procedures preferred; proficient with computers & computerized accounting systems; ability to work under pressure; highly organized; ability to work independently; strong interpersonal skills; attention to detail. Grade: P3; Range: $24,617-31,982 3-11-97 CCB

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATOR I (03315JZ) Provide support for CPUP activities, including billing, collections, expenditures, reporting & chamber operations; assist in preparation & submission of Sponsored Program projects; prepare budget & payroll analysis; assist in preparation of Univ./CPUP operating budget; administer all personnel & payroll matters; serve as liaison with Business Services, Comptroller’s Office, Research Accounting, ORA & CPA. Qualifications: BA/BS preferable in business or equivalent; 2-4 years experience with accounting or equivalent; knowledge of IDXX, Finance, peripheral systems of University policies & procedures preferred; ability to prioritize work; sound judgement; good communication and interpersonal skills. Grade: P3; Range: $24,617-31,982 3-11-97 Institute for Environmental FISCal COORDINATOR I (03315JZ) Provide support for CPUP activities, including billing, collections, expenditures, reporting & chamber operations; assist in preparation & submission of Sponsored Program projects; prepare budget & payroll analysis; assist in preparation of University/CPUP operating budget; administer all personnel & payroll matters; serve as liaison with Business Services, Comptroller’s Office, Research Accounting, ORA & CPA; assist Chief Administrative Coordinator. Qualifications: BA/BS, preferably in business or equivalent; one-three yrs. experience with accounting preferred; working knowledge of IDXX, FinMis & familiarity with University...
minutes; draft comments; prepare written materials; oversee production of slide presentations; research, write and produce presentations and reports for AEPV, in conjunction with DEAB/University Affairs; with primary writing and involving Exec VP for Med Center and Health System and top volunteers; organize paper flow to ensure timely review and response on key items received; draft correspondence with Adv. Med Center; as appropriate; primary contact person for recognition by other offices; work with and support both executive directors on special projects. Qualifications: BA/BS; three years in an academic, development, or administrative setting with primary writing and special project responsibilities; excellent organizational skills, and communication skills - both oral and written; demonstrated ability to function independently, and participate in contributing to creating, operating, and computerizing knowledge of software programs such as Word Perfect, Excel, Filemaker Pro. Grade: P3; Range: $24,617-31,982 2-20-97 Development & Alumni Relations

STAFF WRITER I

Provide general writing services with major emphasis on gift acknowledgment letters, presidential correspondence and other communications projects for the Department of Development and Alumni Relations, including campaigning and other newsletters, research and writing for speeches and remarks, fundraising appeal letters and endowment stewardship reports. Qualifications: BA/BS or equivalent; one to three years professional writing experience; excellent writing and research skills; detail-oriented; computer literate; strong interpersonal skills; knowledge of and previous work experience in university environment preferred. Grade: P3; Range: $24,617-31,982 3-10-97 Development & Alumni Relations

PROVOST

Specialist: Clyde Peterson

ADMINISTRATION OFFICER II (02248CP) Aid in recruitment, evaluation, selection & matriculation of the transfer & international components of Penn’s first year class; coordinate, direct & maintain所有 systems (including transfer, class list, student records, financial aid) to assure smooth running of all student offices; coordinate advising of approximately 250 first-year students on the status of their advanced standing credit. Qualifications: BA/BS; familiarity with Penn, enrollment in Penn courses & Penn offices; ability to manage a large staff; excellent written & oral communication skills; ability to work with and support both executive directors on special projects. Grade: P4; Range: $26,986-35,123 2-28-97 Undergraduate Admissions

BUSINESS MANAGER III (01113CP) Reporting to the Managing Director, Annenberg Center (MD) and the Executive Director, Administrative Affairs, Office of the Provost (ED), coordinate, direct & maintain all systems for the Annenberg Center building & office procedures for all center financial transactions; develop & monitor annual & 5 yr budget plans; construct annual budgets using program & center reference options to facilitate expense tracking & revenue & expense matching; manage unrestricted, restricted (grant) gift & endowment funds; provide monthly analysis to MD & ED concerning financial position of center, including performance compared to budget,.provide year-end financial reports to MD & ED. Qualifications: BA/BS; familiarity with Penn, accounting & business systems; ability to adapt to changing work environments; excellent written & oral communication skills; high level of computer proficiency; ability to work with and support both executive directors on special projects. Grade: P4; Range: $26,986-35,123 2-28-97 Business Manager Office of the Provost

VETERINARY SCHOOL Specialist: Ronald Story

RESEARCH SPECIALIST I (03307RS) Perform cell biological experiments with particular emphasis on molecular biological techniques; maintain reagents related to immunological studies; maintain supplies & equipment orders; assist & train lab personnel & students. Qualifications: BA/BS; one-three yrs. experience with molecular biological techniques; experience in sterile tissue culture & cellular immunology techniques preferred; demonstrated mathematical skills; willingness to work with animals (specifically canine); demonstrated organizational skills & ability to maintain records & logs; attention to detail; experience with PC’s spreadsheet applications such as MS Excel is preferred. Grade: P2; Range: $19,490-22,628 2-8-97 Pathology

RESEARCH SPECIALIST II (03317RS) Perform experiments involving molecular biological techniques directed toward cloning & expression of canine IL-12; test cellular response to cytokines; establish essays; maintain scientific notebooks; contribute in writing of research papers; maintain reagents related to immunological studies; maintain supplies & equipment orders; assist & train lab personnel & students. Qualifications: BA/BS; one-three yrs. experience with molecular biological techniques; experience in sterile tissue culture & cellular immunology techniques preferred; demonstrated mathematical skills; willingness to work with animals (specifically canine); demonstrated organizational skills & ability to maintain records & logs; attention to detail; experience with PC’s spreadsheet applications such as MS Excel is preferred. Grade: P2; Range: $19,490-22,628 2-8-97 Pathology

STAFF VETERINARIAN (03334RS) Act as Clinical Advisor for Clinical Laboratory Committee; serve as clinical advisor for pharmacy & Chair of Pharmacy Committee; serve as liaison between School of Medicine & clinical pharmacy; coordinate & associated teaching; advise on TPN for patients; interact with NICU & ICU programs participate in & expand, didactic pharmacology within School; oversee therapeutic drug monitoring; provide consultations as needed. Grade: P3; Range: 3-13-97 Pathology

WHARTON SCHOOL Specialist: Janet Zinser

COORDINATOR II (03298ZJ) Provide administrative support to Program faculty; coordinate retreat for 750 students and faculty, registration of course, workflow, grading system, evaluation system, room scheduling, class material, presentation material, course work, fellowus programs, supervise work-study students; prepare letters, memos and other correspondence; coordinate filing systems; provide assistance to other programs within University of Pennsylvania; certification to dispense narcotics in PA required. Qualifications: BA/BS or equivalent; one to three years related administrative experience; demonstrated good written & oral communication skills; strong computer skills in Excel, Word Powerpoint and Windows 95; excellent skills in e-mail systems and familiar with University policies and procedures preferred; experience with University Budgeting System, FinMs preferred. Grade: P2; Range: $22,628-24,098 3-11-97 Administrative Office of the Provost

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I (03319JZ)(40 Hours) Provide administrative support to Program faculty; coordinate retreat for 750 students and faculty, registration of course, workflow, grading system, evaluation system, room scheduling, class material, presentation material, course work, fellowus programs, supervise work-study students; prepare letters, memos and other correspondence; coordinate filing systems; provide assistance to other programs within University of Pennsylvania; certification to dispense narcotics in PA required. Qualifications: BA/BS or equivalent; one to three years related administrative experience; demonstrated good written & oral communication skills; strong computer skills in Excel, Word Powerpoint and Windows 95; excellent skills in e-mail systems and familiar with University policies and procedures preferred; experience with University Budgeting System, FinMs preferred. Grade: P2; Range: $22,628-24,098 3-11-97 Administrative Office of the Provost

VICE PROVOST/UNIVERSITY LIFE Specialist: Clyde Peterson

P/T STAFF PSYCHIATRIST (02249CP) Provide psychiatric care to students of the University of Pennsylvania; provide outreach & consultation services for students, faculty & staff on an individual or group basis; provide on-call coverage for potential crisis situations; complete all appropriate paperwork & agency data collection; provide formal & informal supervision to trainees. Qualifications: M.D. degree and board eligibility or certification. Experience working in community medicine in Pennsylvania; certification to dispense narcotics in PA & from federal government; experience in college counseling & psychiatry. Grade: Ungraded; Range: 3-12-97 Counseling & Psychiatry
21 Souls of DuBois Conference—Penn and Philadelphia’s Community: Friends or Foes; keynote speaker Walter Palmer, SSW; 11 a.m.-5 p.m.; W.E.B. DuBois College House; to register: e-mail selliott@pobox.upenn.edu or call 898-3677 by March 21; $10, free/PENNcard holders and their families.

Building Asian American Studies at Penn: Contexts and Prospects; Gail M. Nomura, Michigan; Gary Okihiro, Cornell; Linda Min, ASSAM Undergraduate Advisory Board; Mark Chang, English and Asian American Studies; Grace Kao, Sociology and Asian American Studies; 5-7 p.m.; Franklin Room, Houston Hall (Asian American Studies).

The Expanded Job Market for Science Ph.D.’s: A Program for Doctoral Students; Linda Pullan, Zeneca Pharmaceuticals; Karen Kreeger, Center for Technology Policy and Ethics; Peter Kramer, Center for Technology in Society; 10 a.m.; Rittenhouse Labs; registration required: 8-7530 (215) 898-1427.

The Scientist; Walter Palmer, SSW; 11 a.m.-2 p.m.; Franklin Field. Contexts and Prospects; Peter Kramer, Center for Technology Policy and Ethics; 10 a.m.; Rittenhouse Labs; registration required: 8-7530 (215) 898-1427.

The Expanded Job Market for Science Ph.D.’s: A Program for Doctoral Students; Linda Pullan, Zeneca Pharmaceuticals; Karen Kreeger, Center for Technology Policy and Ethics; Peter Kramer, Center for Technology in Society; 10 a.m.; Rittenhouse Labs; registration required: 8-7530 (215) 898-1427.

The Scientist; Walter Palmer, SSW; 11 a.m.-2 p.m.; Franklin Field. Contexts and Prospects; Peter Kramer, Center for Technology Policy and Ethics; 10 a.m.; Rittenhouse Labs; registration required: 8-7530 (215) 898-1427.

The Scientist; Walter Palmer, SSW; 11 a.m.-2 p.m.; Franklin Field. Contexts and Prospects; Peter Kramer, Center for Technology Policy and Ethics; 10 a.m.; Rittenhouse Labs; registration required: 8-7530 (215) 898-1427.

The Scientist; Walter Palmer, SSW; 11 a.m.-2 p.m.; Franklin Field. Contexts and Prospects; Peter Kramer, Center for Technology Policy and Ethics; 10 a.m.; Rittenhouse Labs; registration required: 8-7530 (215) 898-1427.

The Scientist; Walter Palmer, SSW; 11 a.m.-2 p.m.; Franklin Field. Contexts and Prospects; Peter Kramer, Center for Technology Policy and Ethics; 10 a.m.; Rittenhouse Labs; registration required: 8-7530 (215) 898-1427.

The Scientist; Walter Palmer, SSW; 11 a.m.-2 p.m.; Franklin Field. Contexts and Prospects; Peter Kramer, Center for Technology Policy and Ethics; 10 a.m.; Rittenhouse Labs; registration required: 8-7530 (215) 898-1427.
Asbury Methodist Church  
(1884-89 to March 1997)

The destruction by fire of the Asbury Methodist Church closes a chapter in the history of the University of Pennsylvania’s neighborhood. Before its crossing the Schuykill, Hamilton Village was developed by the Hamilton family to take advantage of the proximity of their estate to the Market Street bridge. Sites were given to various religious denominations by the Hamilton family in the hope that the presence of those institutions would encourage families to buy and build in the wilds to the west side of the Schuykill. Asbury Methodist Church was founded in 1844 and soon built a church on Chestnut Street. Named for Francis Asbury, the circuit-riding 18th century preacher, it quickly became an important institution in the developing village.

Two generations later, in 1884, the cornerstone was laid for an immense new church, the largest in Hamilton Village. The congregation selected Scots-born architect John Ord (c. 1840 - 1910, active in Philadelphia after 1871) to design its new structure. After a short period on his own, Ord formed a short-lived partnership between 1877 and 1879 with Quaker architect Addison Hutton. The most remarkable buildings of that venture were Bryn Mawr College’s Taylor and Merion Halls. He then moved to the office of fellow Scot John McArthur who was directing the construction of his masterwork, Philadelphia’s City Hall. When McArthur died in 1890, Ord succeeded him and for three years continued that vast project.

Given his partnerships with other architects, the Asbury Church provided the best insights into the nature of Ord’s interests and tastes. Its broad, planar surfaces and pointed Gothic detail indicate that Ord had not succumbed to the round-arched forms of the Romanesque style. His taste remained rooted in the English architecture of the era when he was studying in Scotland. This is close to the work of such men as James Brooks whose work broke with the restrained historicism of Augustus Pugin’s Gothic. The ideas of the later architects were reflected in the eclectic mixture of details, broad plate-traceried windows from the 11th century overlaid with striking architectural polychromy established by the contrast of brown stone walls and lime-stone detail. In plan, the building followed an old type where they remained common. The entrance opened to the upstairs church. The first floor, carried on by the scaffolding still standing, braced on either side leading to the upstairs church. The first floor, carried on cast-iron columns, housed Sunday school and other facilities that denote the urban character of the church mission. The great sanctuary space was remarkable for its breadth and lightness.

Like many neighborhood churches, Asbury lost its congregation with the expansion of its University neighbors. However, it was long recognized that the great volumes of churches formed important landmarks in the community. After many years of searching, the University planners saw the opportunity to take advantage of its great interior volume by adapting the building to serve the needs of the Fine Arts studios of Graduate School of Fine Arts. That work was underway, directed by Santos-Levy Associates. In a dour Gothic exterior was being restored and its interior was being adapted thanks to a gift honoring the legendary New Yorker cartoonist (and former Penn Fine Arts student) Charles Addams, whose Gothic humor, it is often claimed, was nurtured at Penn.

George E. Thomas, Ph.D.

What’s Next for Addams Hall: ‘New Effort and New Plans’

At week’s end there were more questions than answers: How did the fire start? The fire marshal is still investigating. Are they going to have to tear it down? L&I hasn’t ruled yet. Was the building insured? Yes, under Penn’s blanket policy.

The former Asbury Methodist Church was well on its way to opening by fall as Charles Addams Hall, when fire was discovered about 1:45 p.m. Sunday, March 9.

About 100 firemen fought the fire for some five hours before they could bring it under control. Not just a building but a part of Philadelphia’s past was burning, and Penn’s architectural historian Dr. George Thomas wrote what amounts to an obituary for what went up in flames. Van Pelt Library’s Roberta Dougherty delved into a 1903 volume, West Philadelphia Illustrated, for the history of the building and its wooden predecessor, so vital to the Methodist community that it became the “mother church” for the area west of the river. And sometimes very far west: a Rev. J. F. Crouch, at Chester, is quoted as saying that “an old lady belonging to his congregation told him that she frequently in her younger days walked from Chester to Philadelphia, to attend the Sunday lovefeast at Asbury, returning the same day. The distance covered is about twenty-four miles.”

In the renovations under way by Santos Levy Associates, the designers were handling the fabric of the century--old church as respectfully as if it were still consecrated. Stained glass windows were removed for safekeeping (and they remain safe in storage). The basic layout of the church worked well for what the Graduate School of Fine Arts had in mind as a memorial to alumnus Addams. The sanctuary was not on the first floor but on the second—and the first was already divided for Sunday School rooms and offices while the second was an open delight, soaring 38 feet at its apex, the space broken only by a choir loft and the decorative details of its age. Setting a block of studios into the lofty upper room was in progress, and according to Alan Levy, who is on the faculty at GSFA as well as a partner of Adele Santos in the Center City firm, the word-of-mouth about its rightness came because “The steel was in, so the space could be experienced as it would become.” The floor where the congregation had worshiped was to have been a floor of classrooms and gallery, with 14-foot ceilings, while the studio floor’s walls, set in the vertical 24 feet above, would have walls only 12 feet high. Another special element was that while the original south facade and entry would still lead to the gallery and classrooms, a second entry on the west would give access to the studios above—an entry set back, to avoid any visual interference with the southern facade, and all glass, so that it obscured none of the stone.

“The fire was a very sad event for the Graduate School of Fine Arts, for Penn and for everyone who worked so hard to transform the Asbury Church into a splendid new Addams Hall,” said President Judith Rodin. “We are extremely fortunate that no one was harmed in the blaze. All of us who care so deeply about the future of this important site, Addams Hall and GSFA must now move forward with new inspiration, new effort and new plans — and we will.”